33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Speaker Crespo: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Walton Jones, who is with the Greater Antioch Baptist Church of Rock Island. Pastor Jones is the guest of Representative Halpin. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Jones."

Pastor Jones: "Shall we pray. Gracious and merciful God, we come before you with praise and thanksqiving for the occasion for which we have assembled. We give you thanks and praise for a wonderful blessing of seeing another day. In this chamber we pause to offer you gratitude for the blessings of this good land on which we live, for this great state which we have a inspired and developing and advancing its causes. Continue to inspire the leaders and citizens that through the difficulties of these days we might keep liberty and justice alive in our state, our nation, and throughout the global community. Guide us with wisdom, I pray, and temper us with respect for one another in this sacred hour. And a special moment in time, we open our hearts in prayer on behalf of our servicemembers who are in harm's way. Continue to shield and protect them from danger seen and unseen. Give them strength, courage, and wisdom as they journey onward in the fight for liberty and justice for all. Bless all the Members who are under the sound of my voice are traveling to gather information and knowledge about the issues that are pertinent to the work of this Body. May their presence among others be the inspiration for all considering public service. May all

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- that is done before you this day, you receive it with humility from your people. Amen."
- Speaker Crespo: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Conroy."
- Conroy 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 Crespo: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Martwick is excused today."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Butler is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Bennett, Demmer, Keicher, Mazzochi, Sosnowski, and Wehrli are excused today. It is opening day so don't infer anything from that. Go Cubs."
- Speaker Crespo: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? There being 111 Members... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 111 Members present, answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Representative Carroll, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Chair... Mr. Speaker. I want to introduce my Page for the day. Her name is Allie Hartman. She's here from Northbrook, Illinois. She wrote me this beautiful essay about how to help homeless people. So I gave her an opportunity to come out here and talk to you guys about that.

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

So if you see her please say hello and give her a moment. And let's give her a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Halpin, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."

"Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank, again, Reverend Jones for the invocation today and tell the Members a little bit more about him. In addition to being... or in addition to his long and honorable service in the ministry, having first received his call to the Gospel ministry at the young age of 25, Reverend Jones is an honorable veteran of our nation's armed forces. He enlisted in the United States Army in 1989 and served there for 28 years. He served during peace time and during combat operations. Reverend Jones retired from active duty in 2017, leaving the service as a nominative level Command Sergeant Major for the United States Army Joint Munitions Command. In that position, he over saw a budget of \$63 million in infrastructure operation and sustainment ammunition stock piles and equipment, and he managed as many as 11 thousand soldier and federal civilian employees all from the Rock Island arsenal, which is a vital part of the Illinois Quad Cities and my 72nd House District. He is a loving husband to Tina and together they have five children, Elijah, Kenya, Alexis, Daniel, and little Isaiah. I'm so honored to have him with us today. And I hope you'll join me in honoring him for his many, many years of service for his country, his congregations, and his community."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Speaker Crespo: "Thank you. Representative Batinick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."
- Batinick: "Personal privilege, I'm going to practice that. With me today is Brandon Olsen, an eighth grader from Sherwood...

 Sherwood, Troy School District. A fabulous young man, won an essay contest, wrote about the dangers of raising taxes too much and the effect of having people move out of the state.

 Big, big fan of his."
- Speaker Crespo: "Proceed to the Order of House Bills on Third Reading. And we are going to start with Bills that have been on the Calendar the longest. We'll start with on page 17 House Bill 3320, we have... offered by Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3320, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Mr. Andrade."

- Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3320 is an initiative by Delta Dental to clarify that a Dental Service Plan Act is also exempt from the third party administer licensing requirements since a dental service plan is a regulated... already regulated by the Director of Insurance. House Bill 3320 amends the Illinois Insurance Code to exclude any dental service plan regulated by the Insurance Code. There is no opposition to this Bill. I would respectfully request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Okay. Seeing no discussion, the question is 'Shall House Bill 3320... I repeat,

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3320 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there being 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar under Third Readings, we have House Bill 3340, Representative Harper. Out of the record. On page 17 of the Calendar under Third Readings, we have House Bill 3363, Representative Caulkins. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3363, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that was brought to me by a superintendent from the Monticello Community School Unit District 25. He's a bit of a superintendent geek, and he found this language in the charter, it's from the early 1900s and he asked that I clean this language up. There is no known opposition and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I believe this is your first Bill, correct?"

Caulkins: "Yes, it is."

Batinick: "So you're removing legislation from the early 1900s.

Is that correct?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Caulkins: "Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "When you wrote the legislation back then, why did you write it and why are you..."

Caulkins: "Well, I was in a one room schoolhouse at the time, and it seemed like we needed a superintendent back then."

Batinick: "All right. Thank you, Representative.

Congratulations."

Caulkins: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Caulkins: "Do I have to? Yes."

Speaker Crespo: "He indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Representative, will this raise taxes and if so by how much?"

Caulkins: "No, this has no effect, there is no fiscal effect of this Bill. It merely cleans up some language from the early 1900s."

Skillicorn: "So simplifying and condensing the language, you think that's a good idea?"

Caulkins: "Yes, Sir."

Skillicorn: "Then so do I."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Davis."

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

Caulkins: "Yes."

Speaker Crespo: "Says he will."

Davis: "Representative, heard you say that it'll cleanup language, but you still haven't said what the Bill does."

Caulkins: "It eliminates language from the early 1900s when we had one room schoolhouses and it made a rule in effect that

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

if you had four teachers that you had to have a superintendent. Now we don't have any of that, there's adequate language in the Bill... or in the regulations now for superintendents."

Davis: "So previously, there was a way for a school to not have a superintendent?"

Caulkins: "No, it was a way to have."

Davis: "So now... so your Bill is saying every school district has to have a superintendent?"

Caulkins: "Every school that had four teachers had to have a superintendent."

Davis: "So then what is..."

Caulkins: "This eliminates... there are no four-teacher schools."

Davis: "There are no four-teacher schools?"

Caulkins: "That is correct."

Davis: "Are you certain of that? We have some very small schools in the State of Illinois. I mean, I've heard graduating classes of 10 students."

Caulkins: "I understand, but they don't need a superintendent for that school."

Davis: "So what is the Bill? And, you know, it's your first Bill and I'm not trying to be funny, I'm just trying to be certain. So are you eliminating the fact that a school district does not have to have a superintendent?"

Caulkins: "No, I'm saying that a school that has four or more teachers doesn't have to have a superintendent."

Davis: "Oh, the actual school itself."

Caulkins: "Correct."

Davis: "Oh okay, you didn't... okay."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Caulkins: "I'm sorry if I didn't make that clear. I apologize."

Davis: "No, thank you very much."

Caulkins: "Okay."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Okay. I'm still not real clear on this Bill. If you look at the full text it says, and we discussed this in committee. Each school district must employ a superintendent. And that is the question I have, do you have to have a certain number of teachers to be considered a school district?"

Caulkins: "The language, if I may... the language says if there is only one school with fewer than four teachers than a superintendent is required."

Scherer: "Well, I'm reading not an analysis, I'm reading the full text and I am... I'm on Section 5 line 7, 8, and 9 and it says, each school district must employ a superintendent. So my question is... because I assume since we talked in committee you have changed it or something."

Caulkins: "No."

Scherer: "Oh, well so to be a school district do you have to have more than four teachers to be considered a district?"

Caulkins: "If I may. If you have... this pertains to a single school. This says if there is only one school with fewer than four teachers, it is required to have a superintendent. We don't have any school districts."

Scherer: "Well, so that's the part you cut out."

Caulkins: "That's the part we are going to cut out. Yes, Ma'am."

Scherer: "So the part that remains says, each school district must employ a superintendent."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Caulkins: "Yes, they already are. They are required to have a superintendent."
- Scherer: "So how... I don't think every school district has to have a... see I'm just worried that districts that share a superintendent, I agree with what Representative Davis, I think we are sharing a concern here. I'm not sure that currently every district has to have its own superintendent. They can share."
- Caulkins: "We're not changing the law, Ma'am... that says every school district, you know, has to have a superintendent. This is a particular school in this language it says that a school with four or more teachers has to have a superintendent. We have school districts. This is something from the days when we had one room schoolhouses back in the early 1900s."
- Scherer: "I'm trying to help you get this out, I just want to make sure that we're not causing problems."
- Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. I appreciate that."
- Scherer: "If we have a lawyer in the room that would weigh in, perhaps if you went on the record and said your intent was to say that each school district must employ a superintendent and what you mean by that is it's still okay if they share as long as they're employing someone."
- Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am, I have no problems with that. And that is the current law. A school district, they can share a superintendent if they wish. This has no effect on the current law as it effects school superintendents and the necessary... how necessary it is to hold... to have a superintendent. This is not intended to eliminate the need for a superintendent in

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

a school district. This just merely effects a school, a one school with four or more teachers."

Scherer: "So perhaps whoever carries this in the Senate would change the wording a little bit so it would be real clear that we're not saying that they can't share."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Scherer: "'Cause I'm not sure that that really... it just makes me nervous."

Caulkins: "I'll do my best to find that person and make sure that they understand the intent, our intent here in the House."

Scherer: "Right. I feel like that is your intent, we just need a lawyer to look at it to make sure it's worded correctly. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bourne is recognized."

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

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Bourne: "Representative, I'd like to ask you a couple clarifying questions."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Bourne: "Currently in statute before we change this, every school district has to have a superintendent, because we don't have any school districts with only one school with only four teachers. Is that correct?"

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Bourne: "So you had a constituent who came to you and said this is obsolete, this doesn't apply to any school districts, we should take out this exception and clarify in the law that every school district has a superintendent?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Bourne: "I think this is a good Bill. Thank you for cleaning up this language. Hopefully that clarifies it for the Body. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative DeLuca is recognized."

DeLuca: "Question."

Speaker Crespo: "The Sponsor yields."

DeLuca: "Representative, to the previous speakers point, is there anything currently that prohibits a school district from having a superintendent?"

Caulkins: "No, Sir. This only effects a one school with four or more teachers."

DeLuca: "Under current law, a school district can make the decision to not have a superintendent. Is that correct?"

Caulkins: "I'm sorry. Let me clarify. Let me clarify. It's four or fewer. Fewer than four teachers."

DeLuca: "Right. So in current statute, a board of ed could make the determination not to have a superintendent?"

Caulkins: "No, they're required... I'm sorry, Sir. They are required by law to have a superintendent. This only affects a school with fewer than four teachers to require them to have a superintendent. We don't have any schools with fewer than four teachers that I know of. This does not affect any existing school district."

DeLuca: "So you're saying that every school district currently must have a superintendent, but your Bill says every school district must have a superintendent?"

Caulkins: "I'm sorry, I didn't follow?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- DeLuca: "You just said, currently every school district must have a superintendent, it is not a choice that the Board of Education could make. But you're also saying your Bill says every school district must have a superintendent."
- Caulkins: "No, Sir. My Bill says that we will eliminate this language that says if you have a school with fewer than four teachers, you must have a superintendent."
- DeLuca: "Is it possible with your legislation that a school district could not have a superintendent currently and choose not to have one?"

Caulkins: "No, Sir."

DeLuca: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "The Chair recognizes the Sponsor to close."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. I appreciate the inquiries, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3363 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'in favor', 1 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Weber on House Bill 3369. Clerk, please read the record."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3369, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Weber is recognized."

Weber: "Thank you. What this is, 3369, it's a consolidation Bill between a sanitary district and a village. I had reached out

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

to the county, the village, and the sanitary district, all of them are in favor of this. There are no opponents. I please ask you for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I couldn't hear through all the noise exactly what this Bill does, could you give me a small synopsis of it, maybe while holding that tie proudly that you always wear."

Weber: "Sure thing, Representative Batinick. What this does is there is a sanitary district created to pay for a sewer plant for a village. It is a separate entity with stipends. They serve as no purpose other than to pay the bill. The village could take over these duties and save taxpayers money. It would eliminate one more level of bureaucracy and..."

Batinick: "And you think that's the patriotic American thing to do?"

Weber: "Absolutely."

Batinick: "Okay. Congratulations on your first Bill, Representative. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Weber: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: Representative Didech is recognized."

Didech: "Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Crespo: "Sponsor yields."

Didech: "This Bill it calls out a single sanitary district out of all the sanitary districts in the entire state, could you

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

explain why this is not unconstitutional special legislation?"

Weber: "This is a unique situation in which case the village sanitary district is only for the village, most sanitary districts cross into other areas where they are not coterminous, in which case this one is."

Didech: "So because it's unique because there are some differences in other sanitary districts across the state than it's permissible is your opinion?"

Weber: "That is correct."

Didech: "All right. Thank you. To the Bill. I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Weber to close."

Weber: "What's that?"

Speaker Crespo: "Do you have any closing remarks?"

Weber: "Oh yes. Thank you very much. I would urge an 'aye' vote and thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3369 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.

On this question, there are 109 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Representative Villa on House Bill 3405. Out of the record.

Representative Buckner on House Bill 3437. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3437, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Buckner."

Buckner: "House Bill 3437 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code to allow for the issuance of developmental disabilities awareness decals for universal special plates by the Department of Human Services. Provides fees for the decals and creates Developmental Disabled Awareness Fund as a special fund in State Treasury."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ford is recognized."

Ford: "Hello, Representative Buckner, how are you?"

Buckner: "Good morning, Representative Ford, I'm fine. How are you?"

Ford: "All right. Welcome to the House."

Buckner: "Thank you."

Ford: "Is this your first Bill?"

Buckner: "It is."

Ford: "And it deals with the Secretary of State, right?"

Buckner: "This is true."

Ford: "Did you talk to Representative D'Amico to pass this Bill?"

Buckner: "I did."

Ford: "Did he approve of it?"

Buckner: "He did."

Ford: "And his name... is he a Sponsor?"

Buckner: "He is not a Sponsor."

Ford: "That means I don't think he approves. Could you pull the Bill from the record and go get him to cosponsor it and then come back?"

Buckner: "I would rather not do that Sir, I'd rather move forward from where we are."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Ford: "Well, it's because you are very big I'm not going to fight you on this. And I have to tell you that I'm very happy that you are in the House because we have another big football player over in the other chamber and I think we've got him now."

Buckner: "I think so."

Ford: "Welcome to the House."

Buckner: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no further debate, 'Shall House Bill 3437 pass?' That's the question. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Gabel on House Bill 3481. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3481, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this Bill repeals the Kyoto Protocol Act of 1998, which currently prevents Illinois agencies from regulating greenhouse gas emissions by providing that the Illinois EPA and the Illinois Pollution Control Board shall not propose or adopt any new rules. This repeals that Act. That Act was passed here in the General Assembly in 1998 as a response to the Kyoto Act possibly passing on a national level which it did not. So this Bill is obsolete, and we would just like to repeal it. Thank you."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Speaker Crespo: "Any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

- Batinick: "Representative, we only had a small opportunity to talk about this in committee. I'm looking for you here. There you are. Only had a small opportunity to talk with you about this not even in this committee, in a separate committee. My understanding of the Bill though is slightly different. I understand we are going to... the Kyoto Bill didn't get passed so that part of the Bill in essence never became law, there's no effect. The aspirational stuff, it's just nonexistent, correct?"
- Gabel: "The National... we as a nation never signed onto it, but the General Assembly in 1998 did pass a Bill called the Kyoto Protocol Act."
- Batinick: "Right. Okay. But if we undo this Bill aren't there other parts in the Bill that are important to what we do today? That are separate from what was happening in the Kyoto treaty?"
- Gabel: "My understanding is no. No, that this Bill would just pave the way for Illinois agencies to have clear authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions in order to benefit the public health."
- Batinick: "Okay. So I guess so where my concern is is that we're turning over our legislative authority to bureaucratic agencies if we were to pass this Bill. So there's a lot of things that are going to be regulated through rule instead of through what we do here in this Assembly. That's my concern."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Gabel: "Well, the department already has the ability to regulate many of our air, water, and waste standards already, the Illinois EPA has that authority. This Bill was just limiting some of its ability to pass rules about air."
- Batinick: "Right. My understanding is that we're coupled to the federal standards now and it's in a smaller subset and this makes it extremely broad and decouples from what we are doing at the federal level."
- Gabel: "Well, already we have laws here that are stronger and stricter than the federal level... than the federal laws that we have. There are many other states who already are able to... who innovate with ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This would allow us to do that as well. As I said, we already have standards that are above and beyond the federal level."
- Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go to the Bill quickly. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate. My concern is just the massive expansion of those standards and I'm going to listen to some of my colleagues. Thank you for your answers."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Welter is recognized."

Welter: "Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "Says she will."

Welter: "Representative Gabel, I know we discussed this in committee a little bit, but if we were to repeal this Bill, who would create the rules for the Illinois standards moving forward?"

Gabel: "The Illinois EPA."

Welter: "And what type of oversight would they have in implementing those rules?"

Gabel: "The same oversight that they have now."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Welter: "So, as my Representative before me, Representative Batinick was talking about, what we are currently doing as a state in terms of policy is following the federal standards and guidelines just as many other states are. I think what we're so worried about and what we're concerned about is that by separating from that and making Illinois again more burdensome or creating even more layers here or more strict policy it could really put our state at a disadvantage when it comes to many different things because this isn't just regulating greenhouse gases is it really? It's any type of emissions?"

Gabel: "I'm not sure what the question is."

Welter: "So this would allow the EPA to set rules to regulate any type of emissions, yes?"

Gabel: "Yes, particularly as it relates to air though. I think we already have the authority to do water and waste standards."

Welter: "Which could go far and above the federal limits or standards as they are today?"

Gabel: "It would give them... they could do it. It doesn't... it
 doesn't require them to do it."

Welter: "Okay. Well, to the Bill. I would just caution my colleagues from again putting Illinois in a situation where we are going to be at a disadvantage by not following what other states or doing or the Federal Government's doing and being even more restrictive in terms of our policies on emissions. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "So I think that this is a good Bill. It will allow us to be able to have some innovations that other states already

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

have. This is an outdated Bill and I encourage an 'aye' vote to repeal it."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3481 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'in favor', 44 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers on House Bill 3511. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3511, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this house Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring to you House Bill 3511. And is there an Amendment that needs to be adopted on this Bill, Mr. Speaker?" Speaker Crespo: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "There are no Amendments filed for this Bill."

Flowers: "Thank you. House Bill 3511 creates the maternal mental health condition education, and it require an early diagnosis and treatment. Maternal mental health is crucial because of a long term and the short term consequences of the health of the mom and as well as the child. So House Bill 35 creates the Maternal Mental Health Condition Education and Early Diagnosis and Treatment Act. And again, it's very important because maternal depression is very common. Maternal health disorder include depression, anxiety, postpartum psychosis. And if left untreated, maternal mental health disorder can

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

have a devastating impact on the mother and the child. Such as: adverse birth outcomes, impaired maternal infant bonding, poor infant growth, childhood emotional and behavioral problems, and significant medical and economic costs. An increase in public education and awareness about this issue would help many families understand and know the signs and the symptoms. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3511 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have House Bill 3531, Representative Stava-Murray. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3531, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, HB3531 actually came about from an incident that happened to my neighbors, so, this past fall. So they had a surrogate, who was pregnant with their twins. And a couple weeks before the surrogate was going to have her C-section, the hospital... they called the hospital to make sure they could attend the birth of their children since the surrogate was fine with it. And the hospital said that it was hospital policy that whoever was on staff that day would get to decide. And so, they were super

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

stressed out the last couple of weeks before the babies were born that they might not get the chance to be there at the birth of their children. So HB3531 fixes that. It says that it's not up to hospital policy, but it's up to the surrogacy contract. And assuming that there's no medical emergency, of course if there's a medical emergency the intended parents would have to step out of the room and this was actually the Hospital Association was neutral on this and commended that we left in exceptions for that. But basically, this just says that intended parents can be at the birth of their child and they shouldn't have to worry about whether or not someone will make that decision for them. So I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3531 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stava-Murray, again, on House Bill 3536. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3536, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Third Reading."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative."

Stava-Murray: "Yes, so HB3536 was brought to me by a constituent, who noticed that he actually did not have the proper documentation to get a driver... a State ID or a driver's license that had a veteran designation although he is a

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

veteran. So this allows for an additional form, a DD-256, as applicable documentation so that way all veterans are able to achieve the veteran status."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ford is recognized."

Ford: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "Yes, she will."

Ford: "Representative, you can't do two Bills in one day as a new Member, so will you pull this Bill and come back tomorrow?"

Stava-Murray: "Unfortunately, no."

Ford: "Well I'm going to ask everyone vote 'no' on this Bill because she has no right to have two Bills in a row as a freshman. So urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Good try, Ford. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3536 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have House Bill 3554, Representative Scherer. Clerk, please read the Bill"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3554, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I'm presenting House Bill 3554, and this amends the Emergency Medical Services System Act. It came out of committee do pass. And it simply provides that when you fill out your paperwork, you're allowed

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

to give your email address and you can get your reminder through email in addition to the regular ways. Because his secretary for one of my firemen kind of dropped the ball and didn't know that he moved, but if he'd of had email moving wouldn't have been an issue. I'd be happy to answer any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3554 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed on House Bill 3576, Representative Wheeler. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3576, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill seeks to adjust some of the language we did in the Health Balance Protection Act for nurses last year. It opens the door for folks who are not just committed but under arrest or detained as being eligible to be prosecuted under the Act as we put it forth. I appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3576 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Costello on House Bill 3617. Out of the record. Representative Mayfield on House Bill 3631. Representative Mayfield. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3631, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "All right. Thank you so much for this Bill. Basically what this Bill is a constituent Bill that I'm running. The department of DCFS currently has been doing this. This is a practice that's already there. The statute, when it was changed, actually took away their ability to do... to provide a waiver for certain offenses, they were blocked out when they did the update two years ago. So I just want to give them the opportunity to do... to continue what they are doing but to do it legally. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Guzzardi."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Guzzardi: "Thanks, Representative Mayfield. Just taking a quick look at this piece of legislation right now, forgive me for not having any expertise in this question at all."

Mayfield: "It's okay."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Guzzardi: "Can you just walk us through... it seems like the legislation is saying that people cannot get licenses if they have certain convictions on their record, is that right?"

Mayfield: "Well basically, DCFS has been... you know, what they do is they run a very extensive background check. It is a fingerprint check, it is a nationwide FBI check. So they're not just allowing licenses to anyone. So what they currently are doing is in certain situations, they look at it on a case-by-case basis, they look at how old were you when you created the offense, how old is the offense, you know, what were the extenuating circumstances, and then they make a determination whether or not to waive it. That is what they are currently doing. However, when the law got changed, they lost discretion, but they're still doing it, so but they're not doing it under the compass of the law. So we want to give them back the discretion for what they are currently doing."

Guzzardi: "Okay."

Mayfield: "We want them to legally be able to do what they're already doing."

Guzzardi: "Sure. The analysis which I'm reading, and again I can dive into the full text here in a second, but the analysis says that they can be... they can receive a license unless they've been convicted of any of the following offenses including computer tampering, computer fraud, deceptive practices, and so on and so forth. Which seems to me like it means that they will be barred, it's not a discretionary question, but they would, in fact, be barred from receiving professional licenses if they had convicted these offenses."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Mayfield: "No, no, that's what we are trying to fix. We're trying to codify into law what they are currently doing and what the intent of the original legislation was. I'm trying to fix something here. To allow that."
- Guzzardi: "I understand. I just want to make sure that we're not enacting a new bar on people getting a license if convicted of these offenses."
- Mayfield: "No, no, no, it's already in law, and I'm codifying into law something that's currently being done and that was the initial in... the initial... oh my God... the initial reasoning for the Legislator that ran the Bill initially. So I'm just codifying into law what was going on back then. When they made the change this was stripped out by... the wording was not correct when they passed the initial law. So we are just trying to fix it because it's something that they're already doing, they already have discretion on a lot of other things. They're providing discretion and we want to allow them to continue to provide that discretion."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative. I've looked at the full text of the Bill and it seems like you are spot on with what this Bill is doing and I appreciate your efforts here. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "I ask... humbly ask for an 'aye' vote to allow the department to continue to provide this discretion. For those of you that are familiar with the licensing process, it is long, it is rigorous, and no one just walks away with a daycare license. DCFS, if what they have the same people doing

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

other things we would probably have less headlines. This department is extremely thorough, and they do a very good job of vetting these applications. So I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3631 pass?' So all in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'in favor', 44 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay, Members, we are going back to Bills on Third that were for some reason missed yesterday. And we will start with House Bill 2275, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2275, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Conyears."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The 1995 Chicago School Reform Law made many dramatic changes to Chicago school operations, including a long term pension holiday, giving the mayor total control over schools and changing the way contracts are negotiated. House Bill 2275 is an equity and fairness proposal that addresses one of these aspects of the 1995 law. This Bill equalizes collective bargaining processes between Chicago and every other district in the state. House Bill 2275 allows Chicago school employees to better advocate for their students and families. Chicago's class sizes have exploded since 1995. Since the School Reform Law where as they was once one of the smallest in the state, they are now

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

nearly the largest. CPS is currently under special education monitoring by the State Board of Education. None of the employees who do that work have any right to negotiate for better services. CPS has a secure shortage of phycologists, social workers, counselors, and other wrap around service providers. None of those employees have any right to negotiate over staffing. CPS outsourced school maintenance and operations to a private company and almost overnight schools became filthy, putting student's health at risk. CPS is the only district in Illinois that can make a decision without negotiating over it. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Batinick: "This Bill obviously wasn't in my committee, Representative, so I'm going to try to get to succinctly what it does. What are the specific items that are being changed? So you're talking about you're changing what can be collectively bargained. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So I'll go over the points that we're changing.

Decisions to contract with the third party for one or more services otherwise performed by employees in the bargaining unit. Decisions to layoff or reduce in force employees.

Decisions to determine class sizes, class staffing and assignment, class schedules, academic calendar, length of work in school year, hours in places of instruction, people assessment policies. Decisions concerning youths and staffing of experimental or pilot programs. And decisions concerning

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- use of technology to deliver educational programs and services and staffing to provide the technology."
- Batinick: "So my understanding, I'm looking at this and I think some of these things are a part of other school districts collective bargaining agreements, but it appears that the list is a little more broad than allowing for things that aren't in another school district CBA's, correct?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "I'm aware of that, Representative."
- Batinick: "What are the items that are now going to be collectively bargained in Chicago that the rest of the state doesn't have that opportunity for?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "I'll read again to you what this Bill proposes, Representative."
- Batinick: "No, no, you don't need to do that. What I... I understand that list. You said you are trying to have parity with the rest, with other school districts. I believe your parity would be parity. I believe there's items that are going to be put into collective bargaining for CPS that aren't available in the rest of the districts. Are you able to delineate between the items that are being put into the authority for... to be collectively bargained that aren't in other school districts, like class size? Does every school district downstate have the ability, is that part of their collective bargaining agreement, class size, or some of the other issues?"
- Conyears-Ervin: "I actually believe they do, but what I want to focus on is this legislation that is proposing to include what we are currently are not able to negotiate in Chicago that is being negotiated in other districts around the state."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Batinick: "Okay. I'm hearing something different on our side.

That some of the managerial things... that there's things that are being put in this contract that aren't in other agreements, but I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate.

Thank you.

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wheeler is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Wheeler: "Hi, Representative."

Conyears-Ervin: "Hello."

Wheeler: "I think we've discussed this Bill a couple times in the past, let's put some things on the record. The difference... the reason why CPS is different than other school districts in the state goes back to an agreement made in the 90s, am I right about that?"

Conyears-Ervin: "1995."

Wheeler: "Correct. And that was done at least from my recollection from discussions. Because at the time, CPS was undergoing a lot of situations where strikes were occurring, and it was disrupting schools, parents weren't happy, and an agreement was made down here in Springfield to set Chicago apart from the rest of the state about that issue, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "What is your question, Representative?"

Wheeler: "Do you agree with what I just said, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "What did you say?"

Wheeler: "Okay. I said the reason for Chicago being separated from the rest of the state regarding those issues had to do with the fact that there were a series of strikes that had

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

occurred, and it was disruptive to the students. It was disruptive to their parents, and this was a way to settle that down. I believe that was one of the reasons given for Chicago being separated from the rest of the state on those issues."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you for clarifying. I disagree. So the current law that was passed in 1995 at that time when CPS was required to bargain, over class size and staffing for instance, there had not been a strike in eight years."

Wheeler: "Okay. That is different from some of the data that we have. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is part of an arrangement that was made back in, like I said, 1995. For the most part Chicago has not experienced the same level of strikes that they had since then and, as far as we can tell, there is nothing else that provides the balance that Chicago gets that we don't get as far as downstate school districts are concerned. This is an unbalanced Bill. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And no offense to the Sponsor, but I'm awfully tired of Bills that treat Chicago special. This is a broad, diverse state, 102 counties. This isn't about one particular city controlling everybody else. I don't like how Chicago can do things on their own, and frankly I'm okay with a Chicago School Board being elected. I don't see why the General Assembly... I don't see why the people that I represent have to have me speak on this Bill. So that this is the time, this is the place that I'm going to stand with CPS because they oppose this Bill. So

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

mark this moment, I am agreeing with Chicago Public Schools
today. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Tarver is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

"This is really a commonsense Bill. It provides parity, and it's necessary. My aunt is an educator at CPS. My brother in law is an educator at CPS now, and most importantly my daughter attends a CPS school. I'm a roomer for her class and I get a chance to see what goes on in her school pretty often. The reality of it is that her school is one that does not starve for resources. They have a fundraiser tomorrow night, they'll raise \$150 thousand pretty easily, but that's not common throughout the city. There are other schools where there are no social workers, there's a nurse there once a week, and they have real life issues. I don't see why we would be opposed to allowing an individual, an organization, an entity to bargain for the ability to provide for our children. When my daughter has big feelings in class, she gets to go talk to a social worker. When she got sick a couple weeks ago, she had a nurse at the school. She didn't have to wait until you know the following week to get sick when the nurse was actually at the school. So I think it's a commonsense Bill. I commend you Representative Conyears-Ervin for bringing this and championing this. And I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Evans is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "Sponsor yields."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Evans: "Representative Conyears-Ervin, you are a business woman and in business you do bargains, so this Bill is referring to bargaining, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "This is... this is definitely referring to collective bargaining, the rights of employees and the rights of our children."

Evans: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we utilize data in this Body and we put demands, we put demands on our teachers and we want results. We want results for the students and for the families of Illinois, but we have to allow them to bargain. We have to allow them, the workers, the teachers of Illinois to get what they deserve, to bargain, to have a fair shot at getting what they need to produce those results. We asked them, teach our students. We ask them, you know, get those test scores up. But then in Chicago, not in some of your towns, but in Chicago we say, oh but you can't have this and you can't have that, but also deal with all of these other issues. You know, some of your towns, you have teachers who don't have to deal with crime, who don't have to deal with large numbers of low income students, but they do it and they come and they perform. But your parents and your teachers still get to negotiate but our teachers don't. It's not fair. It's not a mandate... it's not a mandate on any particular thing. It is a mandate for fairness; it is a mandate for the ability to negotiate. Come to the table, be fair to our teachers because they're dealing with a lot. Support this Bill, let's move forward."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative, I really would like to apologize to you and all the students and the teachers in the City of Chicago, because other than the Speaker, I was the only one here back in 1995 to vote for this bad piece of legislation. At the time, we thought it was needed. At the time we thought we were doing the right thing, because there were so many strikes and so many other things that was going on. But it's not often that I get the opportunity to do this, to say I'm sorry, but I'm sorry. And I want to correct the mistake that I made years ago. I want to empower the teachers to fight on behalf of my kids in the City of Chicago. I want them to be able to educate them with all the tools in their toolbox, just like they're building a house. I don't want them to leave no stone unturned. And so whatever it takes for them to do that and if it takes House Bill 2275, as you have written it as it is today, I want it to happen. So I thank you very much for bringing forth this legislation. This truly is for the teachers; it truly is for the children. Because it is the teachers, it's the teachers that's in the classroom. They know the environment in which they have to teach. They are held responsible, but yet they're not in control of the environment in which they have to work in. In which we, as parents, want to blame the teachers for. So thank you very much and I encourage everyone to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Thank you. To the Bill. I was one of the few Members that was around when this Bill was brought to the Republicans but it was an initiative of the Democrat Mayor of Chicago.

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Mayor Daley, his city council, and also the Chicago Board of Education. They said that this is important for us because we have a school system that finances are getting out of control. Money is not making its way into the classrooms, it's going into things that are... what we are talking about, about negotiations. We did this because we felt that this was the most important thing to ensure that kids are going to be able to get their best dollars' worth of education in the City of Chicago. And I did that last summer with the Education Reform Bill because you know what, I am for the kids in Chicago. I am for the kids in the public schools. I want them to succeed. But I also listened to the individuals who are responsible for the finances of running those schools, the ones who've opposed this, and I think we should give some deference to that. Because if this Bill passes, which I presume it probably will, there's going to be a significant cost that we have borne upon the Chicago Public Schools. And I'm telling you, it's not going to be the children who are the ones who are going to benefit from this, it's going to be from all the other individuals who have a stake in the schools. This is not the right way to operate, this should be negotiated with the school board and also with the mayor's office, not the Legislature. This was a good law in 1995, and it should stay the same, and we should not make any changes. I'm encouraging Members to vote against it or really think about what they're voting for."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We heard remarks from the Gentleman from East Dundee, my friend across the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

aisle, who said a moment ago that he's sick and tired of Bills that treat Chicago differently. I would suggest to the Gentleman, I think there is still two chief cosponsor spots left on this Bill and I think you might want to sign up for one of them. This Bill undoes the separate treatment of Chicago. In 1995 this Legislature chose to treat Chicago differently from every other district in the state by taking these matters out of collective bargaining. And this Bill reverses that trend that my dear friend and colleague is so darn sick and tired of. So I think that this Bill makes an awful lot of sense. I appreciate the Sponsor for bringing it forward and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Conyears to close."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make a few points as I close. Most of my career has been in the private sector, as was mentioned by the Representative from the South side of Chicago, and I could not imagine having to work under these conditions, fighting for basic rights. We know that having a manageable class size benefits the children in that class. Management control over positions like social workers, counselors, school nurses, and school psychologists has meant that Chicago students, many of whom are subject to incredibly traumatic circumstances, have lost access to vitally important support services. Meanwhile, students in other parts of the state have regular access to grievance counseling, wrap around support, and college and career guidance. We know that clean schools benefit our children. CPS enrolls mostly black and brown children and why would those children have to go to school in standards less than

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

others simply because of where they live? Equalizing bargaining between Chicago and the rest of the state school districts is a matter of fairness and better outcome for students. Being the mother of a two-year-old daughter, raising her on the West Side of Chicago, I stand with other parents to say that we want those that are caring for our most precious assets, our children, to work in a better and fairer environment. We want our teachers to work in a healthy environment and this, Ladies and Gentlemen, is a step in the right direction. Contrary as to what was stated, this Bill will provide parity and equality for Chicago and the rest of the state. And might I also mention it does not cost taxpayers anything. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2275 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'in favor', 35 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Willis on House Bill 2502. Clerk, please read the Bill.

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2502, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a follow up Bill from a
Bill that we did last year which allowed our downstate
firefighters and our Chicago firefighters, if they decided to
switch where they were going to start and end up their

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

careers, to be able to transfer their own employee contributions to that. Last year we went from downstate to Chicago, this year we're going from if you started in Chicago and decide to go to downstate, you are allowed to transfer any funds that you put into there. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go directly to the Bill. We talked about this pretty thoroughly in committee. One of our biggest concerns was the Chicago Fire Pension Fund is at 20 percent funded. We actually just passed a Bill out of committee today that will, if becomes law, might even move that down into the single digits for actuarial purposes. It's a technical thing, but the true actuarial funded ratio is kind of being hidden because we're not calculating the proper COLA for annuitants out of this fund. So while it says 20 percent, 20.1 percent it's actually less. So the concern is this, you're going to allow a window of opportunity for people to leave the Chicago Fire Pension Fund and go to a downstate fund. And I can tell you that if I was an employee of a pension fund that was at best 20 percent funded, maybe less, I would leave. And when you leave you bring those assets with you. So you're creating a potential for a run on the bank. I don't believe the Chicago Fire Pension Fund has the assets to withhold this. I'm very concerned about the risk with that. So for that reason I am urging a 'no' vote. Thank you."

30 TOT CHAC TEASON I AM diging a no voce. Thank you

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "So in response to that, one of the things is these employees are... do these funds anyway. So if they pulled out

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

and they left the departments they would be getting the fund anyways. It also is a very small number, actually I think it's probably under 10 to 15 members that this would actually matter to; and therefore, I really feel there is no impact. This is just being equitable to what we already did last year. And with that being said, I urge the Body to give me an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2502 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'in favor', 18 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Zalewski on House Bill 2582. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2582, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, this is a technical change to the MWRD's final average salary calculation. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "I was going to let that go, Representative, because I know the Bill but if you'd explain it a little bit more we would greatly appreciate it."

Zalewski: "Of course, of course, just one moment, Representative."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Batinick: "While you're waiting I would like to say that the MWRD pension fund is 58 percent funded which is one of the better funds in our state which scarily is."

Zalewski: "It is and I appreciate you bringing that up and I know that it's persuasive toward your fellow support of this legislation. Simply stated, this is an initiative of the MWRD that defines the average funded salary. It's actually never been followed, that definition, the fund is calculating salary in a different way than it should. We need to… we cleaned it up in '92 but we never attacked this piece of the statute, that's what the Bill does."

Batinick: "Okay. I appreciate your answers. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2582 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question' there are 110 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chesney on House Bill 2777. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2777, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members. HB2777 seeks to bring more visibility to the deer management program, also known as CWD. The IDNR oversees this program and I've asked that this

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Bill... that in this Bill that they provide a report for the number of deer taken, any CWD findings, and then also specifically what happens to deer after they're harvested. This was a local initiative by a number of deer hunters in my district. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Crespo: "Yes, he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I don't know if you weren't speaking into the microphone or you were whispering, but I didn't hear any of that."

Chesney: "Well, I appreciate the question. So House Bill 2777 seeks to bring more visibility to the CWD programs, specifically Chronic Waste Disease and it asks for a number of reports. The first is, it asks for any abnormalities that they may be found in the deer that are taken. And then it also asks for any deer that are taken, what they simply do after the deer are harvested. This was a local initiative that was brought to me by a number of deer hunters. And I hope you... this brings some clarity to your concerns and anything... any questions that you have I'm happy to answer them."

Batinick: "CWD. What's the acronym for that?"

Chesney: "That's Chronic Waste Disease."

Batinick: "Similar to mad cow in cows, but for deer?"

Chesney: "I don't believe so. Some may have heard of it also as zombie disease."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Batinick: "Zombie disease, okay. All right. I'm going to listen to... I'm not sure about this Bill. I need more clarity, so I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Butler is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Butler: "Representative, are you a deer hunter?"

Chesney: "I am."

Butler: "Do you know that we now are able to have blaze pink as your outfit for deer hunting?"

Chesney: "I'm aware that we've made additional accommodations for visibility."

Butler: "So in this last fall, for deer season, did you purchase some blaze pink to wear?"

Chesney: "I give preference to orange."

Butler: "Very good. Well I think you'll look very good in blaze pink in the 2019 deer season. I would encourage you to purchase some."

Chesney: "I'll certainly take that under consideration but it would add additional cost to my outfits, so I'll stick with the blaze orange."

Butler: "That's a good conservative Republican answer, I like that."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "Yes, he will."

McCombie: "I think this will probably be hopefully the final question so we can see if he can actually pass his first Bill

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

here. But my question is, can you explain a little bit, you said zombie disease. So can you explain, like are the deer like going after other deer? What are they... are they eating each other's brains? What's happening? Can you explain it?"

Chesney: "Well, the zombie disease would simply just be an unscientific definition that you might see in social media. The specific disease that I'm noting is CWD but for those that are not familiar with that, there's been some media outlets that have referred that specific disease to a zombie disease. However, I prefer the more technical definition of CWD which I know Representative McCombie, as a fellow neighbor of mine in Carroll County you are very familiar with this disease, and I would suspect you've had similar inquiries."

McCombie: "Thank you. I appreciate your explanation. You were not here, but Representative Welch, last General Assembly, had a zombie preparedness Bill. So hopefully we can maybe... might have to change that to include deer for the future but I appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Are you prepared for the deer zombie apocalypse?"

Chesney: "I am not. I don't suspect you are either."

Davidsmeyer: "Have you started digging a bunker yet or collecting canned food?"

Chesney: "I am not a prepper."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay, just checking. So last night were you preparing for this or were you decorating your office?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Chesney: "I was decorating the office and then I was... I was rudely... there was a group of individuals that came into my office without my permission and I felt incredibly violated in my space. And I think that those people need to be mindful of the sensitivity of specific offices, especially professional Legislators that are trying to do the good work of the people."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, the office looks great and the picture looked even better. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: Representative Chesney to close."

Chesney: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2777 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Burke on House Bill 2837. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2837, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a cleanup Bill from the ABLE account legislation that we passed a couple years ago. ABLE accounts are tax advantaged accounts for folks with developmental and other disabilities that allows them to save while still being able to preserve their benefits. Illinois is a leader in this area. We were one of the first states to

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

pass and to authorize ABLE accounts, and since then the State Treasurer's Office has done a remarkable job creating a pool with other states that Illinois manages the pool. And we handle ABLE accounts for folks from other states where able accounts have been authorized. I think we are up to about 17 states. And in the course of working through that pool and setting up those accounts, the State Treasurer has found some things that needed to be changed in the ABLE Act that make the administration of those accounts a little smoother. So this cleanup Bill does just that. I know of no opposition, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2837 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mayfield on House Bill 3053. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3053, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill creates a school district efficiency committee. Basically what this committee will be charged with is looking at school districts across the state to see where there are efficiencies, where we have the opportunity to save money within our districts, particularly

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

tax dollars. This is a very, very good Bill. I'm asking for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Batinick: "You know, with what you've said sounds lovely."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Batinick: "Why... and I don't know if this was changed with the Amendment, but why are Farm Bureau, ED-RED, management alliance all against it? Is that the underlying Bill before the Amendment?"

Mayfield: "Okay. Well, we tabled the Amendment because the Amendment added an unforeseen cost, and this is not a mandate and we don't want any cost associated."

Batinick: "Okay. And that removed opposition?"

Mayfield: "No. The underlying Bill there was only the Statewide School Management Alliance was opposed. They're the only ones that came to committee to talk about it. I did have a conversation with the Farm Bureau because they were mentioned during committee, but they were not there, they did not testify, and they're not actively going against the Bill. Their concern was that they were going to be forced to consolidate and I did explain that this Bill does not mandate any consolidation, there's no forcing. It basically just puts a report out there and then allows taxpayers to know if there's an opportunity."

Batinick: "Okay. I really appreciate the explanation that explains... it explains... I didn't know why the Farm Bureau was

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

jumping in on this particular Bill. That explains it. I appreciate the answers. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Yes. Okay."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "This Bill, like I said, it does not mandate anything, we're not forcing any schools to consolidate. It basically just looks at efficiencies within your district and allows the taxpayers to make an informed decision. School boards can vote it down, they can lobby against it, they can do whatever they want. We're not mandating anything, we're just looking at a means for property tax relief in certain districts. So I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3053 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harper on House Bill 3343. Out of the record. Returning to Bills on the top of the Calendar, Third Readings, we will start out with House Bill 1, Representative Flowers. Representative Flowers, I believe you have a Floor Amendment, would you like to return this to Second? Yes, Clerk, please place this Bill on Second and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Flowers."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers, would you please explain the Amendment?"
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is an Amendment that was given by the med society and it would add two members to the task force on infant and maternal mortality. And I would urge for the adoption."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers. Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, you've heard the stories about African-American women dying here in Illinois six times more than any other group of women in regards to maternal mortality. And there is a real serious problem in our health care system, and for some reason there is racial discrimination, inequality in care, lack of access to care. And House Bill 1 would create a task force that will bring people in across the state to have a discussion and a debate about what is going on in regards to African-American women and infants dying at a higher rate and what we could do to prevent it. We have a broken health care system and oftentimes people want to blame

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

the victim. They want to blame the patients for maybe their lifestyle or their environment that has nothing to do with other communities and it really should not have anything to do with the high rate of death and the discrimination that's going on in our community. And we need to find out why is it that African-American women and our babies are dying at a higher rate. And I would move for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers on House Bill 6. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 6... I would like to take this Bill out of the record because I am having an Amendment drafted because currently it would require the Department of Public Health to establish women health clinics throughout the state. And I am in agreement with my colleague on the other side of the aisle that that is not the preview of the department. So I am waiting on an Amendment."

Speaker Crespo: "Out of the record. Representative Flowers on House Bill 157. Clerk, please read the Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 157, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "House Bill 157 creates the Implementation of Legislation Reporting Act, and it would require the Executive Branch and its agencies to provide benefits and services under this provision... one minute please, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is merely asking the state agencies once we pass a Bill that they would report back to us if for whatever reason that they are not able to implement it. And I would be more than happy to answer any questions, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 157 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'in favor', 10 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers on House Bill 160. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 160, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 160 merely says that if the school is closed and/or the school has been closed down, the building has been closed and is no longer used at a school that a person that is smoking marijuana or doing drugs cannot be... cannot have enhanced penalties placed on them for being

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

on the school grounds. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Parkhurst is recognized."

Parkhurst: "Thank you. So this Bill is for schools that are no longer active. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Parkhurst: "Okay. So if a school is operating as a school but it's just closed for business purposes for the day, there's no more activities there, it doesn't apply to those schools. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

Parkhurst: "Okay. So it's for abandoned schools... schools that are no longer in use, in service, the property is no longer being used in any way for a school?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

Parkhurst: "Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bryant is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Bryant: "Representative Flowers, thank you so much for listening in committee, making the necessary changes. We had some concerns about this primarily because of the type of drugs that were maybe still included and also it was unclear about whether the school was closed for activities or totally closed. You made those changes, we appreciate that you took the time to do that. I urge an 'aye' vote for this Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

3/28/2019

Flowers: "And I want to thank you, Representative, for bringing it to my attention and working with me. Thank you, again."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Davidsmeyer: "I have a couple of questions, a couple of concerns. So if the school… does the definition of temporarily closed cover the summer period, the summer months? So if it's still a school, but in the summer months it's closed for two, two and a half, three months does that… is that included in the

Flowers: "In Section (f) of the Bill... of the Amendment, it says, this Section does not apply to a violation that occurs in or on the school grounds of a building that is designated as a school but is no longer operational or active as a school."

Davidsmeyer: "So your intent is that if it's just closed for the summer there would still be the enhanced penalties, but if it's completely shut down then it wouldn't, correct?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

definition?"

Davidsmeyer: "What about... I know that in my district, actually in my home town there's a closed school but it still has a playground, so kids still often go there. Is there any concern that this will take away a penalty to a place where kids will actually will still be?"

Flowers: "The original law that we passed stated that on school grounds, where the presence of children, but I cannot... I really cannot... if the school is closed..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Flowers: "...and it's not operational. That's what the law says."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Davidsmeyer: "Correct, but if it still has a playground that the public is still allowed to use, that I would have concerns that it still would set up as a place for kids to come and a place for kids to be safe even if the school district is no longer operating it as a school."
- Flowers: "Well, remember a lot of schools are closed and abandoned and boarded up, but the property is still there. So you can't stop people from trespassing on the school premises. It is no longer a school, an operational school."
- Davidsmeyer: "If it's still owned by the school district and kids are still allowed to use the playground, I think I still have the same concerns and I think it's a step in the right direction, but could we say if there is still an operational playground or something, or activities for kids held there that it would still be held to the same standard?"
- Flowers: "Well you know what, maybe if you work something out, you could fix it in the Senate. What do you think about that?"
- Davidsmeyer: "That's reasonable, I think, because as long as you agree with that intent, I'm happy to work on something in the Senate."
- Flowers: "If you can work on something, I'll be more than happy to have you to work on it in the Senate please."

Davidsmeyer: "I will. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 160 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'in favor', 49 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant on House Bill 210. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 210, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is very simple. When Tamms Supermax was closed, right next door to it is a minimum security facility. They were lumped together. And this puts together a task force that will take a look at the possibility of reopening Tamms Minimum Security Facility as a vocational training facility. It is only a task force. I've talked to Representative Kifowit about this previously, it was her suggestion that we make this a task force. We're going to amend it in the Senate to add a couple more entities to it so that we have some more labor. Conceptually I would see this as a vocational training school where we could teach incarcerated individual's heavy equipment operations, some trades, and then put them back into the workforce with a well-trained individual at a high paying job. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Mayfield is recognized."

Mayfield: "Just to the Bill. Representative, I just want to say thank you for bringing this. I know we had talked about this before and the use of making sure that our inmates are using

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

their time productively so that when they do come out that they're going to be productive citizens in the community. So I just want to thank you for this and I recommend an 'aye' vote as well."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bryant to close."

Bryant: "It's a good Bill. We want to look at how we can reopen a facility, get our folks trained. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 210 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers on House Bill 217. Representative Flowers. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 217, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's an Amendment on this Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you. House Bill 217, as amended, it removes the barriers to higher education for people with past criminal... past criminal records. This Bill would prevent a college from inquiring about or considering an application because... an

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

applicant because he has a criminal record. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Batinick: "Representative, it's a banner day. How many Bills have you passed today?"

Flowers: "Not enough, Representative, not enough."

Batinick: "We actually unfortunately have several of our people who represent universities not here today but I know there is strong opposition to this and I want to read something that was given to me. This Bill, as it stands, will put convicted felons and sexual offenders in classrooms and potentially cohabitation dorms with our students. While I understand the need to forgive past misdeeds, this person would like the Sponsor to know that there are situations which warrant additional need to be flexible in the admission process as it pertains to violent felons. While NIU is not a violent place, we do have a sad history of violent events that have impacted the student body, the alumni, one just occurred a couple weeks ago again in Aurora, Illinois. We live on campus with a constant reminder of the tragedy of February 14. I have with me a letter from the Northern Illinois University Student Senate and I'd like to read just a section. This is from the Student Senate, Parents trusting their 17- and 18-year-old daughters and sons to our security and our universities are going to think twice about the level of safety on campus. This Bill is going to harm the current enrollment issues we

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

are seeing in our state university system. As a parent of a daughter soon to go live at college, my heart breaks that as written, this Bill is one bad actor on a failed background check away from a tragedy that could have been avoided. The suggestion we offered in committee is to indeed ban the box in the initial application but allow for a backdoor process to allow our kids, those in care, who are able to learn in a safe environment. This offers the Sponsor a win-win. To share with my peers, I asked for some data on how serious of an issue this is and the information I have from NIU as followed: 132 boxes checked, 7 denied, only one of those 7 were denied based on a felony. I understand that state universities are seeing similar data. This isn't a problem that can be addressed in... this isn't a problem that can't be addressed in another matter. As was asked in committee two weeks ago, we would like the Sponsor to amend the Bill and place a provision that would allow for the possibility that enrollment can be conditional until background checks are able to be done on those with a felony history. Our concern here is that... This from Northern Illinois University: Colleges universities do not currently automatically deny admissions to individuals for criminal history disclosures. At Northern Illinois University, in the fall of 2018, 132 applicants checked the box. Once again, 7 were denied and only one of those individuals was denied admission as a result of their criminal history. The idea that we don't want to have background checks and have any sort of screening for people that are going to be potentially living together in dorm rooms and together in classes sounds concerning to me. I know some

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

of this comes from Representatives who are not here today, but I was hoping you could address some of those issues."

Flowers: "Well, there was a lot of issues there and I'm going to try to address all of them. Number one, Representative, the people that committed the crime, they've done their time. That's number one. And this legislation merely says that upon acception after... if they accept the student, they can then ask the question, do you have a criminal background. And the reason why the question really needs to be asked and answered is because of the nature of whatever that student may want to major in. Because of the nature of their past history and the crime, there's certain dorms or certain environments in which they will not be able to live in. And so, this is not preventing the schools from asking the question. It's merely preventing them from not allowing the student to register in the school. And another thing, Representative, the campuses are not walled off. So strangers could come on the campus at any time. And so while you're focusing in on the students with a criminal record or the background, there's problems everyday on the campus from students who never had a background or never had any type of criminal record. And so in keeping the schools safe, it should be done for everyone, not just the ones with the criminal background."

Batinick: "Have you had much feedback from the universities on this Bill, Representative?"

Flowers: "The only feedback I had is when they wanted me to change the application words so that they would be able to ask the question first. And to me that would have been discrimination. Other schools are doing the same thing and they have been

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

doing it. And we have what you call the common app. The common app removed the box and if a student wanted to, they could use the common app, they don't necessarily have to use the school app. So that's the reason why it's still okay for the school to ask."

Batinick: "Okay. So a couple things here. My understanding is not everybody uses the common app, but we have the Illinois Campus on Law Enforcement Administrators as an opponent. Southern Illinois is an opponent. Illinois State University is an opponent. Northern Illinois University is an opponent. Eastern Illinois University is an opponent. Association of Chiefs of Police are opponents. Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities are opponents. I mean, these are... these are instruments in our state... these are institutions in our state that have certainly had their fair share of issues, much of which was caused within this chamber, and they all seem to be aligned against this Bill. I have a lot of concerns, I'm kind of getting cross talk on the true effects of what's happening here, but I'm not sure this makes the state a better or safer place. To the Bill. I'm going to go ahead and listen to the rest of the discussion, but we've got students against this. We've got universities against this. We have administrators against this. I strongly urge... this is a little bit of a bridge too far. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halpin is recognized.

Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Flowers: "Yes."

Halpin: "Representative, I know you've worked very hard on these issues and I definitely respect these efforts. Were you... you were here in the Legislature back in 2014 when we passed the ban the box on the employment side, correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Halpin: "And if you recall, that allows... the goal that that was to address was to prevent people from being afraid to fill out the application, correct?"

Flowers: "Right."

Halpin: "And the goal of that was to prevent them from being
 dismissed before they even got to the interview stage,
 correct?"

Flowers: "Correct."

Halpin: "And so I think that by all measures so far that has been successful, has it not?"

Flowers: "It has been. It has been."

Halpin: "So in the past four years that we've had that policy, more people have had access to employment that have had felonies on their records, correct?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

Halpin: "But under that law, employers are permitted to ask… after they've already offered you the job, they're allowed to ask, do you have any convictions? And we'd do a quick background check, correct?"

Flowers: "This is the same principal. You are correct, yes."

Halpin: "So I guess I would ask, and we talked about this at committee, is there a way where we can apply that same theory where a university could make a conditional offer of

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

acceptance and say, yes, you seem to be the kind of student we want to have here. After you make that offer, then the university would be able to do... ask that question and do the background check to determine whether it is a serious safety concern for the university. Is that not an approach that would work the same way as the employer side?"

- Flowers: "That's exactly what this... yes, it would work the same identical way... under this legislation, it would work the same identical way."
- Halpin: "But that's not... I don't read the text to be that way though. It doesn't offer them an opportunity to ask about the felony. It prohibits them from asking at any point in the process is my understanding."
- Flowers: "They are allowed to ask about the felonies for campus activity reasons, but they cannot reject them because of educational purposes."
- Halpin: "Correct. And that's different from what we do for employment. So on the employment side an employer can retract the job offer if they have a conviction that is essentially not compatible with the job they are getting, correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

- Halpin: "So I guess I would ask you, would you be willing to have that same type of proposal where the university could withdraw that acceptance under those circumstances if they feel there is a significant threat to public safety or the safety of their faculty or students?"
- Flowers: "Representative, may I just say this with all due respect, and I just would like to remind the Members that former Representative Barbra Wheeler, she was a Republican,

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

and this is her Bill. We started working on it together, and she was... she passed it out of the House over to the Senate last year. And to answer your question, people... there's a law called or something called double jeopardy. And so, we are constantly sentencing these people who have paid their dues to society, they've paid for their crime. And so now ... maybe they were younger, and now they're free, and they've learned the errors of their ways, and they want to become a tax contributor. They've been a tax burden for a very long time. And so now we're going to deprive them of their due process. We're going to deprive them of their right to liberty, life, and pursuit of happiness. And they... how do they feed and take care of their family? Now the same people that try to better themselves, they didn't get any help while they were in prison. But they had a plan when they came out and it wasn't to rob a bank or it wasn't to harm anyone else, it was to get an education and move on. They want to move on. They want to be... we have spent so much money on locking up innocent people, on locking up people for crimes that used to be probationable, and now that they're out, they want to just continue on with their lives, they made a mistake. There was an article in the paper the other day about a rape on campus. That kid that committed that rape, he had no prior record."

Halpin: "And I totally understand that and I very much agree with that principle. And I'm glad that we've taken that step when it comes to employment already to further give folks the opportunity to at least get to that stage where they can prove to that interviewer that you've paid your dues, you've served your time, you've bettered yourself, you're now approaching

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

to try to get gainful employment, be a productive member of society. But we already allow employers to have that out if there's something that is truly incompatible with the job. And I think we need to offer our universities the same opportunity when it comes to some of these crimes."

"You know what, Representative, and I probably would have given this a real consideration if I thought there was going to be parity. If I thought real consideration, but we do know that the vast majority of the people that we're going to be talking about or we're talking about are African-Americans. And we do know that discrimination is already on these campuses. We do know that we're the hardest ones to try to get in. One of my colleagues yesterday talked about, well why don't we get them educated, well I'm trying to get them educated, but there's all these obstacles even for people that have paid their dues to society. So what more is a person to do? How does this person better themselves? Do they get the jobs? Do they get the job training? They still have to ask the question, they're still under scrutiny. It's not like the State Police or the police officers cannot look at their records and background to see if they do have a criminal record or criminal background, you know. As a matter of fact, they know who the people are on the campus and they're watching them. But then there are some there that you don't know about and you're not watching them and they're causing the most chaos."

Halpin: "Thank you, Representative. And I'll go to the Bill now.

I very much respect pushing back the asking of this question
to make sure that colleges afford every opportunity for people

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

to apply and not to discourage people from applying simply because they know they might be asked this question before they even get a chance to interview. I would say though that we should treat this very similarly to the way we do the ban the box in employment. Let the students make the application, let the universities get to meet that student, get to decide whether or not they'd be a good fit on the campus, and then only then ask that question, whether there's a felony conviction or other criminal history and only then be able to make the decision as whether or not that's actually an impediment to that student being on campus. I think it is the better way to go. And so, unfortunately, as it is in this form I cannot support it today, but I definitely support your efforts."

Speaker Crespo: "Members, there are nine Members that seek recognition, so we're going to ask you before we consider putting on the timer if you can be brief whenever you can.

And with that Leader Brady is recognized."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Brady: "Thank you. Representative Flowers, just a couple questions. I think I heard in your discussion earlier where the questions can be asked of the applicant after they're admitted to the university. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Brady: "Okay. But once admitted, the convicted person has rights to the same access as any other student denying them access or participation in events without cause, results in liability to the institution which means liability to that

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

institution if that is not followed through. How does your Bill address that?"

Flowers: "Well, Representative, if... again, as far as the dorm situation, if it's a person that has violated other people, you know, there will be certain living conditions that would be considered. That person would not be able to live in the co-ed dorm or... it depends on what the situation is, you know. And I think... I just can't even... I can't think of anything now other than, you know, the dorm situation or, you know, maybe going to school to be a child psychiatrist if he's violated kids. That would be something that the counselor would say no, well you can't go into this particular field and this is the reason why."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you. And going back to your discussion of the dorm, et cetera, does your Bill address, in any way, the difference living situations in campuses of dorms verse off campus, verse, you know, residential apartment areas verse... does your Bill address any different living experience, if you will, for the student at the university or is it just tightly fit if they're accepted to the campus itself?"

Flowers: "You know, the only thing that is as far as campus is concerned would be is the dorms, right? As far as the living conditions."

Brady: "Okay."

Flowers: "Those private apartments, you know, whatever guidelines, whatever rules, whatever they have, they have. But this is the thing, if that student... let's pretend like that student or the person is not a student there. Let's just pretend like that student... that kid is hanging out on the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

campus. He's hanging out in the gym. He's hanging out around the playground around the kids, you know, he's just hanging out. What can you do to that person with a criminal record, what can you do to him? What can you do to that person that's walking around that campus as if he is or she is a student? What can you do to him to prevent him or her from doing that?" Brady: "Well, one would think, Representative, that when you are the institution responsible for screening students who are going to be in your university to promote a safe campus environment, that you are that go between, that you have that say. And if I understand the Bill correctly, and we had discussion in committee and I understand about second chances and helping people, but we're potentially putting the larger segment of a campus university at greater risk by not having the ability to screen individuals in a process of applying to your university. Saying that you can only ask the questions after you've been admitted to the university is kind of like trying to close the barn door after the horse is gone, it's a little late now. And the potential is greater for having a problem when there has been a past history that the university may not have the opportunity to know about. And that puts ... in my opinion, that puts those other students at great risk, and it puts the university at great risk from a liability stand point. I'm the farthest thing from an attorney as you well know, but to me those are concerns I have heard from the university campuses. As you well know the chief, from our university I represent at Illinois State, has been very diligent about his testimony and his concerns about this. And so while I appreciate what you're trying to do, I think

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

there's more work that needs to be done for the safety of all in that campus."

Flowers: "Well, let me ask this. So have we passed a law prohibiting anyone with a criminal background... have we said that you are not able or allowed to go to school? Have we done that?"

Brady: "I'm not aware of that, no."

Flowers: "Because if we haven't passed that law, what are we doing? You know, if we want to prohibit them from going to college, maybe we need to do that. But my question that I asked you earlier is what is preventing a person that's not a student from walking around that campus as if he or she is?"

Brady: "He or she is and can walk around that campus. They didn't apply to the campus."

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Brady: "I said they didn't apply to be on that campus if I understand what you're saying correctly."

Flowers: "No, but my point..."

Brady: "I'm talking about those individuals, potential students who've applied to go there with some form of a criminal record which ties the hands of the universities to be able to ask questions to be able to help and make sure..."

Flowers: "But they can ask the question."

Brady: "After they're accepted to the university potentially, if I understand what you said correctly?"

Flowers: "Well, it's the same principal with the job. Once the job has been... after the applicant has completed the job application and has been given a job offer and then the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

employer could ask, by the way do you have a criminal record? And if the person say yes and explain. And then the employer can say, well because this is a bank and you robbed a bank, so unfortunately, I'm going to have to rescind my offer because of your background. Now that makes sense."

Brady: "Well, Representative, unfortunately it can make sense the way you look at things. The way I'm looking at the Bill and what I read and what I've asked questions about and continue to is the fact that I believe this seriously ties the hands of the application process from a university stand point for those who have serious convictions that could be potentially harmful in the future and disrupt the public safety and put those in harm's way and so those are my concerns. You've answered a couple of my questions and I appreciate what you're trying to do, but I think that there's an entire process that's at risk here for that university campus and for those students, and for the parents that believes their son or daughter is going to a campus in a safe environment where questions are asked of potential students going to that university be accepted."

Flowers: "But, Representative, this is the point though... there's a couple of points I want to make. Let's... this is a common app, this is a common app. This is it right here. There's no question on here about my background. You couldn't tell from... if I filled out this application and if I sent it in, I live in California and I want to apply to the University of Illinois and this is the common app that I'm using. What are you going to do? You don't know if I have a record. You don't know anything about my background. But you've accepted me

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

because I have used the common app. And so, Representative, just not too long ago, we had a big story about something happened over at Millikin University. Really? What happened? That was years ago, everybody loved the professor, he's still there. So what is the problem? We have to move on."

- Brady: "Well, Representative, I know there's others who want to speak, but let me just simply say that every university doesn't use a common app application, number one. And number two, the fact of the matter is what I'm trying to get at is that each individual university should not have the situation where their hands are tied to ask questions of individuals that potentially could pose a threat to others and their safety on our college campuses. So I'll be voting 'no' on the Bill. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Crespo: "So, Members, there are several Members who are seeking recognition, there are many Bills that we are trying to get through. So moving forward we'll start the timer, and we will give Members four minutes. With that, we recognize Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to rise in support of Representative Flowers' Bill this afternoon. And the most important reason why I'm rising in support and I represent the University of Illinois community. The University of Illinois has a partnership with Danville Correctional Institution. They currently offer Danville inmates college level courses and credits. Those students who complete their enrollment at Danville Correctional Institution have the ability, when they leave Danville, to apply to become a student at the University of Illinois. The

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

conversations that are taking place here and some of the letters that I read around this Bill were so offensive and had serious dog whistles in the letters. Things that use words like 'convicted felon' or 'sexual predator' of which many current people who work at the universities across this state may have in their past convictions that rise to the same level of significance. Some of those people are actually professors currently. I want us to check our biases in this room. Let us really reason together about what is happening here. The university systems... Mr. Speaker, if you could quiet the chamber that would be appropriate."

Speaker Crespo: "Folks, please lower the volume. Thank you."

"The university systems have an internal student policy Ammons: for discipline of students, and in that policy many students are committing many crimes including possession of drugs at the university level. And through that student discipline policy those students are dealt with by the university as opposed to the State's Attorney's Office. Which many of those PWIs, 'predominantly white students are usually at institutions'. And those students are given a pass where other students may not get that same opportunity. The reason why you have to ban the box on the application process is because we have a number of students currently in Champaign-Urbana who have committed sexual assaults that are still on the campus and have not been charged with a single crime. Some of them may not have a previous conviction whatsoever, and many efforts are used to ensure that those students' lives are not destroyed. And that is a quote from our State's Attorney, they don't want to destroy their lives. So we should not take

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

the position in this chamber that by removing the box in some way we are providing an unsafe environment that doesn't currently exist. We also have to be careful because this is a built-in structural discrimination practice. It allows for discrimination by using the word criminal or convict that has been researched and studied by many of these universities as well. And so I urge my colleagues to look very carefully at the vote that you take on this measure, because what this measure signals to the black community is that regardless of what we do, we have no entry point into this society that does not see us or see our young men and women as potential predators and we must be careful about that. And so I urge an 'aye' vote for the removal of the question because there are many steps that are currently in the admission process that will allow a person to be questioned about their background at a later time. I also urge my colleagues..."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ammons, will you please bring your remarks to a close?"

Ammons: "I will do that, Mr. Speaker, thank you so much. I also would like my colleagues to think also about their internal biases that have been built into our system that allow the discrimination on college applications in employment, in housing, and other benefits that impact largely people of color from a cycle... a vicious cycle of criminalizing certain things and certain communities and not others. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hammond is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Hammond: "Thank you. Representative Flowers, I listened when you presented this Bill in committee and one of the things that you speak to concerning your Bill is the common app. And are you aware how many of our public universities currently use a common app?"

Flowers: "I don't know how many in Illinois, but I think it's 800... 830 colleges and universities throughout the country, but I can't give you..."

Hammond: "So of our public Illinois universities, Representative, there are three that use a common app. But also on their common app they have the ability to add additional questions that fit for them, for their campus, for their programs, but there are only three. Now saying that, as part of our higher ed working group for the last two years, a common app has been one of the subjects that we often talk about, one of the issues that we talk about. Quite frankly, we haven't been able to get there yet. There are lots of moving pieces to a common app that will fit the Bill for all of our public universities. I'm not speaking to the privates, I'm speaking strictly to the publics. But also in committee we heard quite a bit of opposition. The opposition came from a number of our public universities and also from law enforcement on those university campuses. Their concern is that public safety is number one. Representative, we need to be able to assure our parents of our Illinois students that when they send their children to school in Illinois, their children will be safe. And I know you, Representative, I know that is one of your number one priorities, absolutely and I respect you for that. And I believe that that should be a priority here and now and

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

with your Bill. And I believe the opposition is absolutely correct that number one should be the safety of our children. Thank you. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bryant is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Bryant: "Representative, this... just a question. So I have some notes that say that there was some language offered that would move the box from the application to following admittance, ensuring that students are admitted to the institution based solely on merit and then this compromise would be supported by Chicago State University and Northern Illinois University. Have you had any conversations about moving the box from the application to the admittance, you know, once they've been admitted?"

Flowers: "Can you repeat the question, please, I didn't hear you?"
Bryant: "Yes. Here's what the notes say basically, the University of Illinois has offered language that would move the box from application to following admittance, ensuring students are admitted to the institution based solely on merit. This compromise is also supported by Chicago State University and Northern Illinois University. I think the issue is that once you have... once you've gone past the application process and you've kind of said yeah, we're going to... we've accepted your application, then it becomes an issue of you not being able to say, after you've done the background check and everything, no we can't take you now unless they've committed some kind of new offense. So there is some question about the fact that once you... if you don't have the box at the point where it is

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

right now, that later a university could be sued because they've said yes you can come, then they do the background check and they say, whoops, now we see that you don't have something, so that's the first part. The second part is almost every university has requested the exclusion of violent offenses including rape and murder. Can you... why not include those two in what you are trying to do?"

Flowers: "Representative, let me just say that, again, as my colleague just enunciated, there are all kinds of bells and whistles out there that would allow white kids to have rape and murder in their background and other nationalities and continue on to go to school. There are young people on campuses today that the rape has not been reported because they're trying to protect the child. And so here's another group, mostly African-Americans, they have done their time. They've done their time. They've done their time for rape, and they've done their time for murder. And they want to get on with their life. It was 20 years ago, 20 years ago."

Bryant: "Maybe, maybe it was 20 years ago."

Flowers: "Maybe it was 10 years ago."

Bryant: "Maybe it was 10 years ago, but... so the university can have the opportunity to look at it and say, yes on your merits we want to accept you, but it hasn't always been a long period of time and I'm disappointed that we're making this about race instead of about whether or not someone should be admitted to a university."

Flowers: "But no, no, it is about race. Representative..."

Bryant: "Because I support the education part of this."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Flowers: "That's what I want. I want the education part. That's the only thing that's going to allow these young people or people from going back to the prison. See we pay more for them to be incarcerated than we did for them to be educated. We don't want to pay for their education."
- Bryant: "Yes, ma'am. I'm on a timer so I don't mean to cut you off. I understand where you are going with this, so to the Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bryant, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Bryant: "Thirty more seconds. This is about the safety of the individual. You mentioned the person who's walking around the institution, I get that, but that person doesn't necessarily have access to going into the dorms and so on and so on. I'm sorry. I'm not going to be able to support you on this. I understand what you're trying to do, but I don't agree with this without excluding rapists and murderers. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Representative, I served as a trustee at Eastern for three years and the university systems in Illinois are struggling for students. We're not looking for ways to exclude anyone. We're looking for success stories, we're looking for ways to bring people on campus of diverse backgrounds. This is not a naturally exclusive process. If you look at the outreach programs, you look at the advertising, you look at all of the recruiting that goes on

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

around this state to bring more students into our public universities. We're not trying to exclude people; and in fact, I think we celebrate those that have troubled pasts that are able to come onto our campus and gain an education. We hold them up in high esteem in hopes that they can encourage others to follow them and take that path. I don't believe that what your Bill actually says is going to make our campuses safer. And I think that there are other ways to do this, and I would urge you to please find a way to amend your Bill to make it easier for us to screen the applicants as they come into our university system. It's not a way to exclude people, it's only a way to allow the administration to know who they are admitting, and what issues may exist, and how they can accommodate them."

Flowers: "Representative, I would like to do that. I would like to do that. But I just need to ask one question. Currently on our campuses here in Illinois, we have a few professors that's teaching and they have a background in the things that you enunciated."

Caulkins: "I can't address that."

Flowers: "No, I'm just saying, but we are addressing that."

Caulkins: "No, Ma'am. This is an application for students that want to come to school."

Flowers: "But they were once a student and now they are professor.

But it just goes to show you... it just goes to show you that
what education does. It does not allow... they didn't go back
to prison. They stayed in school and then they became
professors."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Caulkins: "We have in Decatur, I don't believe, he's still teaching, but we did have a professor at Millikin University who had been convicted of murder. I mean I understand that, but this Bill..."

Flowers: "Right. But this Bill..."

Caulkins: "No, ma'am."

Flowers: "...under what we're doing today, he never would have gotten that opportunity, that's my point."

Caulkins: "No, no, he was not excluded from going to college and getting a degree because of his background."

Flowers: "But you... we didn't know about that. That did not come out until it was in the newspapers."

Caulkins: "That was way after the fact."

Flowers: "That's my point."

Caulkins: "This Bill addresses incoming students, people that are applying for admission to a university. It has nothing to do..."

Flowers: "Give me an example of how you would do it."

Caulkins: "...well..."

Flowers: "Give me an example, without discriminating how you would have that question asked and answered and how you would eliminate that?"

Caulkins: "I think Representative Bryant made a very good suggestion."

Flowers: "And so, just because a person have something in their background, he would automatically be excluded."

Caulkins: "No, the person that had something in the background would... the university would be able to ask that question at some point. Yeah, I mean there is nothing that stops a

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

university... I can tell you from personal experience, we want students, we want people to come on our campus, that's the only way we survive."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins, please bring your remarks to a close."

Caulkins: "Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ma'am, I urge you to please find a way to amend your Bill to make it easier and fairer on the universities to protect the students that are on their campus. As the Bill stands now, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Andrade is recognized."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want clarification here, so it says... will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Andrade: "It says, a college may not use information gathered in making an inquiry under this Section to rescind an offer of admission. So clearly once that university accepts a person, they under no circumstance or condition can rescind their offer. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "Correct."

Andrade: "Rapist, child offender, nothing, murderer?"

Flowers: "Representative..."

Andrade: "I mean, I'm a student right now... I'm a student right now and I use the school's gym. I take a shower there. I change in the locker room. I undress, so the guy standing next to me could be a rapist. Could be... so to the Bill. I am extremely offended that another colleague of mine would say based on my vote, I'm a racist. I'm a racist? That I should look at mine carefully before because if I vote 'no' because

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

I'm concerned about my daughter or kid, I'm a racist. I got a Bill here that has one, two, three, four, five, six 'no' votes. So when staff forgets to vote my Bill, I'm sorry."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers."

"And, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to Flowers: be... I'm going to say this very plainly and very clearly. I asked the question, have we passed a law in this state that said if you are a rapist, if you are a murderer, if you are a child molester, you cannot go to school, you cannot go to work, you cannot do anything? But you can walk the streets, you could go to the store, you can hang on the campuses, you can walk through any dorm that you want to. Yes, you can. You can walk through any dorm, you can walk through any facility, you could walk on any campus, you could go to any classroom that you so choose to and no one is going to be there to stop you. And the only thing that I'm asking for is to give these people an opportunity that have served their time. And if we don't want to give them that opportunity then pass a Bill. What else should they do? How do they... they have been a burden on this state for a long time, they've been a burden to other people. And you sent them to the Department of Corrections so they can be corrected, well now they are... they've been corrected and they want to come out and they want to make better of their lives. I just want to share with you some information that the University of Texas System, SUNY, the California System, the Washington State University, and others have already started including Northeastern University. They have already allowed this to happen. The Department of Education is encouraging change, they have

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

released a statement that if your college or university currently collects criminal justice information considering whether this inquiry is necessary to make an informed decision or should it be removed. Higher education recidivism has dropped to under five percent with a bachelor's degree and less than one percent with a master's degree according to the U.S. News and World Today. There is no evidence that making... that asking about a criminal record contribute to good public safety. The Department of Education, the University of Minnesota, Eastern California University conducted a study on whether having this question increased safety and came to the conclusion that there is no evidence that asking the question at admissions contribute to campus safety. Sexual assaults, the universities are already informed about any student who have a sex crime conviction under the Sex Offender Registry Act. This information may be used after the admission. Campuses are open places, people are going to pay \$30 thousand to commit a crime on campus? I don't think so. Rather they could just walk in on the campus if they want to because the doors are open, it's not a closed campus. The only thing we're doing is preventing people from improving their situation by denying them an opportunity for a good education. And I really would appreciate if you would reconsider. I'm not looking for your sons and daughters and my daughters and nieces and nephews to be violated on the streets nor in the campuses or on the campuses. I'm just looking for an opportunity that we can cut down on the crime in my community and for those who want to be able to go to college to better themselves. We as lawmakers in the State of Illinois should not be breaking the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

law by denying them their due process. If we are going to do this, we need to pass a law preventing them from bettering themselves."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Andrade, you still had two minutes left, would you please continue with your remarks for two minutes."

Andrade: "Thank you. Here's my student ID. I can't go inside the library without my student ID. I can't go in the gym without my student ID. They have to buzz me in. No one is going around my school freely. Nothing... no one here wants to prevent any education, anyone. The issue is, the university cannot rescind their offer under any circumstances. There's online education, there's other... there's all different ways to get an education. But like I said before, House Bill 246, staff actually forgot to press buttons after 5 thousand bills. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Arroyo is recognized."

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

Speaker: "She says she will."

Arroyo: "Mary, there has been a lot of testimony here, and a lot of people twisting things around, a lot of people are saying you can't go to school, you can't do this. I'm confused here. What are you trying to do with this Bill? I want to vote for this Bill, but I see a lot of the police departments are against this Bill. You got twice as much opponents than you do proponents. Can you tell me why I should vote for this Bill? I want to help you to pass this Bill but with all this testimony, I'm lost here. I don't know where I'm at right now."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Flowers: "Representative, we are trying to undo some of the things that we've done wrong here in the State of Illinois. We've locked up a lot of innocent people, we've destroyed a lot of lives. And a lot of people have destroyed their own lives. But now they want to better themselves. And there's no manufacturing jobs anymore where they can go and get a job because of the impediments, they haven't had the job training."
- Arroyo: "So I know of that part, Mary. How does this Bill help that? I've heard all the testimony."
- Flowers: "Because they will be educated. They're going to school to get an education. They're going to school to learn about behavior. They're learning about science. They want to be writers. They want to be professors. They just want to better themselves. They have a family."
- Arroyo: "So the people that are opponents to this Bill don't want our young kids, the minority kids to go to school? Are they trying to let them out? They can't go if they have a record. I thought we banned the box, what are you trying to do, put an app..."
- Flowers: "Well we did ban the box. We did ban the box on the job application."

Arroyo: "Right."

Flowers: "And we really have banned the box on the college application, that's the reason why we have the common application now. Because we found out the same reason why we banned the box on the job application, it didn't make us any better, it didn't make us any safer. We had more people out there that was... we had more employers who were seeking

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

employees and so it was in the employer's best interest to ban the box. We have some empty classrooms that could bring some monies to the schools and so we could either continue to keep people out and pay for them to be incarcerated as opposed being educated. But these people that incarcerated, they want to become educated so they can better themselves, to have an opportunity to take care of their families and no longer be a burden to society. We have paid for them already, we've spent over \$35 thousand for their incarceration. Now they're willing to spend their own money on their education. Why would we deprive them of that? And as far as the police officers and the other people that are concerned, we should all be concerned about our safeties on campuses and off of campuses. These same people that you're worried about coming on the campus, they're walking the streets. So why would we not want them to be educated and have something tangible to do?"

Arroyo: "Mary, but that's what I want to know. Why so many people against it? What are you trying to do? Are you trying to get kids with records to go to school, minority kids to go to school? It's not clear enough to me what all these people are opposing the Bill or talking against the Bill. Tell me why should I vote for this Bill? I want to support your Bill, I supported all your other Bills that you had today. Today is Mary Flowers day, because you've had four Bills, three Bills. Tell me what this Bill does in one sentence, Mary."

Flowers: "It's a cost savings to the..."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Arroyo, can you please bring your remarks to a close?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Arroyo: "I just need a one sentence if I'm going to vote for it or not."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers, please answer."
- Flowers: "It's a cost savings to the state, and it's an investment in a person's future. It's an investment in someone's future, and it's a cost savings to the state. That person we will not have to worry about any more about being a burden, he or she would be able to get an education and be able to be self-sufficient and provide for his or her family."
- Arroyo: "Mary, I'm still... I'm still a little confused. I'm going to probably vote 'present' on this Bill."
- Flowers: "Why do other people go to college? Why do they go to college?"
- Arroyo: "Everybody should go to college. Everybody's got the right to go to college and nobody should be denied entry to a college, nobody should be denied to get an education. Whether minority or any race, or anybody. So if this does that... so you see it's still not clear to me why I should vote for this Bill."
- Flowers: "This by denying these people the opportunity, and I'm going to say this loud and clear, by denying these people an opportunity to get a good education is discrimination. It's discrimination. There's no other reason why... because they are no longer incarcerated. They're no longer a convict. They've served their time. So the only reason why we would deny them an education is because we are discriminating. Because there's people that's on that campus that is guilty of the same thing, but because they are of a different nationality, they can continue on with their education without being

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

interrupted. And one thing about education, education is something that you cannot take away from a person. They will always have it. And if you... I'm sorry."

Arroyo: "I agree."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Arroyo, your time has expired."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "And for our last speaker, we have Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Yes, so I'd like to rise in support of this Bill as well and I think it's... I have a question for Representative Flowers that's pretty basic, I think."

Speaker Crespo: "Sponsor yields."

Stava-Murray: "So I have a question. So this is about right now in Illinois, currently our universities are allowed to ask if someone has a record, correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Stava-Murray: "Yes. So right now Illinois colleges are able to ask. And when someone asks, do they have control over whether or not they have internal biases on if they are making that decision or not?"

Flowers: "No."

Stava-Murray: "No. So they don't have... so they might be discriminating without even intending to do so?"

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Stava-Murray: "So they might be discriminating without even intending to do so?"

Flowers: "Yes, right."

Stava-Murray: "So I think what this Bill does, is it takes away the chance that someone could be unintentionally

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

discriminating, because they are and then that doesn't even layer onto the fact that black and brown children are much more likely to be policed, to be treated as adults, when they are younger and to not necessarily have the financial resources to get something wiped from their record. Because I think there is very much a socioeconomic factor here in play too, because if someone can afford to have their parents wipe their record clean, then they don't have to check that box. Do they?"

Flowers: "That's true. That's true."

Stava-Murray: "So what we're really looking at is making an even playing field. And to your point, the rapist that their futures are always so considered it's deeply ironic that this is... that there's concern about letting in someone who has paid time for that and likely has received some help in overcoming that. Meanwhile, there is an abundance of rape on college campuses that doesn't go fixed. And I would encourage every single person who has mentioned that today, who has concern of college campuses safety to really look at what is causing college campuses to be unsafe today and what's actually causing the issue of rape to go ongoing and why are so many people leaving college with sexual assaults. And lets address that in a separate Bill and support this Bill which is a good Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that everyone gave in regards to this legislation and... to me, this legislation is too important to just let it go to the way side, so I would

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

like to take this Bill out of the record and have an Amendment."

Speaker Crespo: "Out of the record."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi on House Bill 253. Please read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 253, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Members. This is an opening that you've heard from me before. We've debated this Bill at great length in the previous General Assembly. This Bill passed this House before so it was vetoed by the Governor, we are returning to address it again. This simply addresses an inconsistency in the Education Labor Relations Act, which currently says that only certain types of graduate students are eligible to join labor unions or treated as employees. Those are specifically teaching assistants. We wanted to ensure that research assistants who equally do important employment-related activities for the university are classed as employees; and therefore, allowing them to be protected by the Labor Relations Act. It's a simple cleanup measure and I ask for your support."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? We recognize Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "Representative, so this is just a small technical change, you're saying?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Guzzardi: "Some might describe it in that way, Representative."
- Batinick: "Okay, some might not. Tell me, Representative, how does this make the cost of education cheaper for students in the State of Illinois?"
- Guzzardi: "So, this came up in committee. This Bill has no bearing on the cost of education, whether it would increase or decrease costs is an immaterial question. And as I said to you before, I stand ready, eager, and willing to work with my colleagues across the aisle to reduce the cost of college in Illinois."
- Batinick: "Well, that's interesting because you keep introducing
 Bills that increase the cost of college in Illinois. It
 started with your minimum wage Bill and it continues to this."
- Guzzardi: "I could not be more eager to learn how this Bill, in your view, would increase costs. All this Bill does is treats students who are doing work for the university as employees, which they are. It's a very simple measure, and I don't understand the nature of the opposition to this Bill."
- Batinick: "So, let's go through this. How many... when you're talking about graduate teaching assistants, right? That's essentially who's covered by this Bill."
- Guzzardi: "No, graduate teaching assistants are already treated as employees. This Bill would address graduate research assistants who are currently not treated as employees..."
- Batinick: "Okay, research assistants."
- Guzzardi: "...but who are doing important work for the university."
- Batinick: "Okay. And I read an article, so you can... let's see if this all matches. They're getting free tuition, correct?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Guzzardi: "In many instances, they're receiving a stipend, in fact, yes."
- Batinick: "No, I understand they are getting a stipend and free tuition generally."
- Guzzardi: "Yes, that is correct."
- Batinick: "So, I was looking at one of the universities, I think they were getting a stipend of about 12, 13 thousand dollars a year plus free tuition that's untaxed?"
- Guzzardi: "That's... I'll take your word for it, Representative."
- Batinick: "Okay. Where I'm going with this is this pushes it to the \$40 thousand a year... you know, if you've got your own job and then you have to pay for tuition versus having tuition waived, I mean you're going to be earning about... have to get about \$40 thousand a year to get what this group of individuals are earning, okay."
- Guzzardi: "Representative this..."
- Batinick: "My understanding is then it's 20 hours a week for each semester. So you've got 2 semesters of work, how long is a semester, 16 weeks?"
- Guzzardi: "Representative, this Bill does not address specifically any changes to compensation. These will be matters of collective bargaining."
- Batinick: "Well, I got it... I... look... I'm seriously trying to go with it. The purpose of doing with this... I'm supposed to feel bad for the graduate assistant that's getting free tuition?"
- Guzzardi: "No, Representative, this Bill does not dictate how you're supposed to feel. This Bill simply says that people who work for universities should be treated as employees. And if you've ever met a research assistant, I can tell you the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

thing they do is work. They are told when to show up, and what to do and they are compensated for that. That's work by any definition except for the definition in statute today."

Batinick: "I don't dispute what they're doing. I certainly don't dispute what they are doing as work. Just back to the math calculation."

Guzzardi: "If you don't dispute that what they're doing as work, how can you dispute that should be called employees? They're doing work, therefore they're employees. That's all the Bill does, Representative."

Batinick: "What this... this is going to end up doing a lot more than that. Here's the point."

Guzzardi: "No."

Batinick: "You have students, you have people who are earning 40 to \$50 an hour when you take in all their compensation, okay. That's not my concern right now. My concern is the skyrocketing student debt situation that we have. My concern is the fact that we fund universities and nobody on that side of the aisle wants to understand it, but looking at your phones, the State of Higher Education Executive Officers Report and you will find out that we are third in the nation of funding higher education, yet we still have some of the highest tuitions. It's little Bills like this. We always seem to be worried about everybody else around the system and not worried about the student. We're worried about how things are built? Who designs it? How long a lease can be? What type of print we use? What rules are, and what we have to label and don't label? We do all these little Bills, and you know what happens? The cost of higher education goes up. And that's ...

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

this is not going to put downward pressure on the cost of education, this is going to put upward pressure on the cost of education. And right now my concern is with the undergraduate students that have to pay a whole heck of a lot of money to get a degree in this state."

Guzzardi: "And I look forward to working with you on legislation that will actually lower the cost of tuition. I'm very eager to work with you on that subject. As you know, I've introduced Bills in that area in the past, and I'm sure we'll be able to find some consensus. Thanks for your questions."

Batinick: "Have you introduced Bills that weren't additional funding since we're already at the third highest in the nation? I mean it's about efficiencies, Representative. To the Bill. Let's stand with the undergraduate student that is paying an extremely high amount for tuition in this state, especially versus our neighboring states and other states. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wheeler is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Wheeler: "Will, I think we've debated this Bill about five times so far. Is my count pretty close there?"

Guzzardi: "I will take your word for it, Representative."

Wheeler: "I think of all the times in committee and then on the floor and then the committee on the floor."

Guzzardi: "Every time it's been a pleasure."

Wheeler: "Always, always look forward to it. I wanted to ask you which House Bill we had debated or part of your negotiation team, but we did that once already, so we'll let that one go.

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Representative, we had tried to get to the bottom of the issue of why the research assistants were not part of the original language that was used to make them eligible or make other student employees eligible for a collective bargaining, do you have an answer for that yet?"

- Guzzardi: "You know, as I've said before, that legislation was enacted well before my time here. And I think as we've already heard in the floor debate earlier today, sometimes we enact legislation that is not... that contains errors or is poorly drafted or ought to be revised in the future. If we said that every Bill that we passed would never be changed in perpetuity, we wouldn't do anything at all in this Body."
- Wheeler: "No, no, I understand that. But at the same time..."
- Guzzardi: "I think we are improving a Bill that we passed in the past."
- Wheeler: "Perhaps. Many times we also have unintended consequences and try to ascertain what those are before we pass the Bill is part of our jobs here. And that's what I think what Floor Leader on our side was trying to do was trying to say, okay, great. First of all, are these people not employees right now of the university?"
- Guzzardi: "In my view, and I think a layman's understanding of the word employee, they absolutely are. However, in statute they're not. That's all we are changing, in fact, is the definition of employee in statute to encompass these people."
- Wheeler: "Right, so we agree that they're employees, they're getting payment."
- Guzzardi: "No, no, no. If you're going to vote 'no' on this Bill, you don't agree that they're employees. Because all this Bill

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

does is classifies them as employees. So if you don't agree... if you agree that they're employees then you're going to vote 'yes' for this Bill."

- Wheeler: "But hold on a second, there's more than... employees can be classified in other ways here. In this case, we're going with the Education Labor Relations Act, I believe, and that's not the same as being an employee of this Body, my company, anything else."
- Guzzardi: "With respect, Representative, that's literally all this Bill does. Is it changes the definition of employee to include these people who now you and the Representative from Plainfield have both acknowledged are employees. If you think they're employees then define them as employees in statute and vote for this Bill. It's very simple."
- Wheeler: "Hold on a second, that's my point, Will. There's unintended consequences that come along with saying we are going to put them underneath this umbrella. This umbrella might have different consequences. And that's where I think Representative Wehrli, when he was in committee was asking about. This has the potential to raise the cost of doing business for these universities because we are going to have these collective bargaining things, which generally raise costs to be honest. So that's where the question comes from. There's not a balance in this Bill, we don't understand the background of it yet. There are still reasons that I... you know, I understand where you are trying to go, I get it. I just don't agree with it yet as far as the reason this is the solution we need to do in this situation. So I'm still going

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

to be a 'no' vote, my friend, but I look forward to further debates with you as always."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Skillicorn: "Hi there, Representative. First question, do you own a tie?"

Guzzardi: "I own a few."

Skillicorn: "Okay. So let's kind of dive into this a little bit.

This little exchange about students, education costs, do you admit that this is not going to lower the cost of education?"

Guzzardi: "I have never argued that this Bill would lower the cost of education. That's never been a reason why I put forward this Bill. The reason I put forward this Bill is that these people are by all accounts, and by your colleague's admission, employees of the university, except statute doesn't treat them that way. So all we are doing is changing the definition of employee to include these people as employees, which your colleagues and I think everybody else in this state understands that they are."

Skillicorn: "And I think you've communicated clear enough that that's what your goal is. I'm just more concerned about the unintended consequences."

Guzzardi: "I keep hearing that phrase."

Skillicorn: "I mean, do you admit that this will raise costs for students?"

Guzzardi: "I'm sorry, can you ask your question again?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Skillicorn: "Yeah. Do you admit or acknowledge that this will have the potential to raise costs for students?"

Guzzardi: "My guess is that what you guys are driving at is that in the course of collective bargaining, union employees may bargain over wages. And it's possible that these research assistants might, in the course of their collective bargaining in the future, bargain over wages. And they might, in fact, gain an increase in wages. So I suppose in that hypothetical instance, there would be a higher cost to the university system as a whole. Whether that then translates to a tuition increase or not... you guys are... it's a very attenuated stream of logic that winds up at this costs more to students."

Skillicorn: "Well, I thank you for, you know, commenting on, what you did. And here's where the misconception really is, it's not about wages, it's about how we arrive at wages and how we arrive at that bargaining. There's a cost to that. So there's going to be attorneys involved, and there's going to be a fee, and there's going to be negotiation, and there's going to be fees..."

Guzzardi: "Representative, if I could stop you for a second."

Skillicorn: "Yeah."

Guzzardi: "It sounds to me like you don't believe that public employees should be able to collectively bargain. If that's your position, file that Bill and we'll debate that Bill. As far as I understand it."

Skillicorn: "I think I filed something similar to that. But here's the thing, they have the right to associate, right? They have the right to associate."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Guzzardi: "I agree with you. Unfortunately, these research assistants don't currently have that right because of an inaccuracy in State Law which we are here to correct."
- Skillicorn: "But there's also a certain component, they have a special relationship being a research assistant, being students themselves. There is a special relationship there that is a little bit different. But it... and I don't know that we're going to get too far, but once we open these doors... it's not that their wages are higher, maybe they are negotiating higher wages... it's the cost of getting to that agreement which is high. And frankly if these wages are so demeaning they have to currently pay, they have the option not to do it. So to the Bill. We talk about lowering costs for education, we talk about school debt. This hurts students, this raises costs, this puts students in debt... deeper debt for a longer period of time. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kalish is recognized."

Kalish: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

- Kalish: "Mr. Sponsor, I see that you have tremendous support for this Bill, but the Coal Association is opposed to the Bill. Can you speak to your opposition?"
- Guzzardi: "This is the first I'm learning of it, Representative.

 I'm not sure how this Bill effects the Coal Associations doings, but I look more to hearing more from them in the future."
- Kalish: "As a former research assistant who was treated so unfairly by my university, I thank you for bringing this Bill to our attention. I urge an 'aye' vote and I thank you."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Carroll is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Carroll: "I have some questions of the Sponsor. So is college free?"

Guzzardi: "For very few students, Representative."

Carroll: "Okay. So, these people are at universities providing services for what is an organization that charges money. So they're theoretically doing the services as an employee. Is that correct?"

Guzzardi: "I think there's no other way to look at this then these are people who are employees of these institutions. Yes, Sir."

Carroll: "So as employees of the institution, do they have any rights?"

Guzzardi: "Well, unfortunately under..."

Carroll: "I'm sorry. Let me rephrase the question."

Guzzardi: "Yeah."

Carroll: "Do they have any rights as not being employees of university?"

Guzzardi: "So… right. The problem in statute is that they're not currently treated as employees; and therefore, don't fall under the Labor Relations Act and are not able to collectively bargain as other employees are."

Carroll: "As our esteemed colleague from Skokie pointed out, have many graduate assistants been used and abused during their experiences?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, unfortunately when you talk to research assistants, you find that their hours are untenable, their

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

compensation is poor, and their working conditions often leave a lot to be desired."

Carroll: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. This is a great piece of legislation. This protects people that are students that are getting abused in this process. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ugaste is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Just for clarification, I think I've already heard it today, but I just wanted to make sure because I've heard of these graduate assistants who are doing research called employees. Are they also students still?"

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Ugaste: "Okay. And they're receiving educational credit for the research they're doing?"

Guzzardi: "Not always."

Ugaste: "But they can receive credit, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Well, in fact, in most cases as research assistants, there... in many cases they have already completed their course credits, so they no longer require course credits and don't receive them for this work and in many cases they don't receive credit at all. This is just work that they're doing as a research assistantship for which they receive a stipend. So they receive compensation for doing work for an employer. Which, I think, by any rational definition of the word makes them employees."

Ugaste: "Does your Bill distinguish between the groups?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Guzzardi: "So, yes. People who are research assistants, who have an assistantship fall in the category I just described, as people who receive compensation, remuneration, financial gain for performing labor for an employer; and therefore, I think almost indisputably are employees."
- Ugaste: "Even students though at times will receive remuneration from the school for certain tasks they perform, correct? Strict students."
- Guzzardi: "I suppose some students do. This Bill does not address that in any way, Representative."
- Ugaste: "Okay. The work they're doing, will they continue after they're done with their graduate program?"
- Guzzardi: "Some do and many don't, sure."
- Ugaste: "And does this draw a distinction between those two groups?"
- Guzzardi: "Absolutely. Research assistantships are offered to PHD candidates and candidates for other high degrees, right, higher degrees. So this does not apply to people who have completed their work at the institution, these assistantships are given to... I think I've answered your question, I'm not going to repeat myself."
- Ugaste: "Well actually, what I was asking was does your Bill distinguish between the two groups if one gets to continue and one doesn't, does it draw distinction once they're done?"
- Guzzardi: "So people who are hired after they are completing their degree aren't hired for assistantships, they're hired for jobs and those people are very plainly in statute already employees."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Ugaste: "Okay. So in other words it doesn't draw the distinction.

To the Bill. I would urge a vote against it, I think it's just going to raise costs. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morgan is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Morgan: "Will the Sponsor perhaps just give a little bit more background about how we got to this place and the idea that this is a new concept of graduate employees not being treated the way they should as actual employees. Maybe a little bit of history might help the chamber?"

Guzzardi: "So this Body has recognized that graduate students who also have assistantships at the university provide an employer... engage in an employer-employee relationship and provide work value to the university. When we passed legislation that allowed teaching assistants to be treated as employees under the Labor Relations Act. However, that legislation in my view fell short because it did not address other types of assistantships, particularly research assistants who also by any commonsense of the word employee, are employees of the institution but the Labor Relations Act does not recognize them as such."

Morgan: "To the Bill. Thank you to the Sponsor for bringing this forward. I had been working on this issue since I was a student, just a few years ago at the University of Illinois when graduate employees needed to organize because they were not receiving the benefits and pay that they should have, even though they were working as employees. And this just

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

further cleans that up. So thank you to the Sponsor and I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Butler is recognized.

 Representative Guzzardi to close."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the debate. I feel as though my colleagues on the other side of the aisle made the point very eloquently for me. These people, as you all have already acknowledged, are very plainly employees. They are clearly employees of an institution. They are told by that institution where to go and what to do, and they receive compensation for doing that. So I think there is no other way to describe them except as employees. However, current State Law does not do that. This is the only change we are hoping to make, to describe people who are employees as employees under statute. I urge an 'aye' vote.
- Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 253 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'in favor', 37 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler is recognized."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Bryant and Parkhurst are excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Crespo: "Leader Harris is recognized."
- Harris: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Cassidy is excused for the rest of the day."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Speaker Crespo: "Next we have Representative Welch on House Bill 816. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 816, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 816 is an attempt to recognize that most people use their smartphones as their computer. In fact, in many communities their smartphone is all that they have, they don't even own a computer. What they do with their smartphone is they use it for everything like it is their computer. And so what this would do is allow... it would mandate that our state websites are mobile friendly websites by July 1, 2022. There was a recent study done on all state websites across the country, Illinois ranked 46 out of 50 in mobile friendliness. And this Bill would require us to get up to speed into the new century and have our websites mobile friendly. I ask for approval."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 816 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Representative Willis with House Bill 823. Out of the record. Representative Kifowit, House Bill 831. Clerk, please read the Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 831, a Bill for an act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Foster Care Alumni of Illinois. In short, this Bill works to ensure that DCFS, DPH, and HFS are talking together with regards to child abuse and neglect and making sure that in essence they are working together for the benefit of the children."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Sommer is recognized."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

One of the problems in the past is that DCFS may or may not forward information about neglect and abuse of a child in a hospital setting, and we've had unfortunate results. So this protects the child... forwards that information to public health, who has the responsibility to license hospitals and ultimately protect the public. I think its good legislation and I support its passage. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 831 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question, there are 109 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against',
0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Representative Gong-Gershowitz on House Bill 836. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 836, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill improves the process for parents to designate a legal quardian so that children can be cared for by someone that they know and trust if their parents are separated from their children by immigration officials. To be clear, this Bill does not create new rights or entitlements and costs the state nothing. In fact, the goal is to keep children out of the system and with someone they know and trust. A legal quardian is necessary to ensure that the person entrusted by parents to care for their children in their absence have the legal authority to provide for medical care, education, and if appropriate, to travel internationally with the child to reunite with family. This Bill is designed to help families cope with uncertainty and plan for the possibility that they may be separated from their children. It does nothing to change the course of immigration proceedings at the federal level. Families like my own grandparents come to the United States from all over the world seeking a better life for themselves and their children. All we are asking for here is to treat immigrant parents with the same compassion that we would hope for other... that we would hope others would treat us and our children facing the same situation. I appreciate the bipartisan support that this Bill has received, passing

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

unanimously out of committee, and I want to thank Leader Durkin for signing on as co-chief of this important legislation to help protect children. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Sommer is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Sommer: "Representative, you presented this Bill in committee and did a great job as far as explaining administrative separation and what happens in these circumstances where a parent may be detained. And part of the legislation I understand is the extending the timeframe that a guardian or a stand by guardian can be appointed for a minor. Is that correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct, Representative. For a short-term guardianship, it allows a one time, 365-day renewal. And this is not for a court appointed guardianship that does not necessarily have a time limit, it's for the short-term guardianship where a parent can designate a legal guardian to care for their children without needing a court appointment."

Sommer: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative to close."

Gong-Gershowitz: "House Bill 836 is about protecting children, giving parents a tool to keep them safe in an uncertain future. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 836 pass?'
All in favor say '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, take the record. On this

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

question, there are 89 voting 'in favor', 19 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Swanson on House Bill 889. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 889, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 889 mandates insurance coverage for antibiotic therapy for a person with tick-borne disease. Many Lyme sufferers are paying for health insurance expecting coverage only to learn once diagnosed with Lyme and after initial care their insurance does not cover their medical expenses. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 889 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Barbara Hernandez on House Bill 922. Out of the record. Representative Mussman on House Bill 1442. Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on House Bill 1443. Out of the record. Leader Harris on House Bill 1466. Out of the record. Representative Bryant on House Bill 1475. Out of the record. Representative Miller on House Bill 1494. Clerk, please read the Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1494, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you very much. What this Bill does, it gives the people that have donated cars to charity. It gives them 90-day turnaround in order to repair the vehicle and get it delivered to the appropriate charity."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "Representative, this is your first Bill, correct?"

Miller: "That is correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So this has to do with issuing a license...
temporary license so this would... this is a state issue with
permits on non-for-profit vehicles, right?"

Miller: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Is there anything in this legislation that deals with how this legislation would transfer to new Illinois if it became the 51st state?"

Miller: "Well, we would have to propose an Amendment probably by Representative Wilhour to do that."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for answering that question. Congratulations."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Miller to close."

Miller: "I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1494 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carroll on House Bill 1552. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Carroll."
- Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill basically allows racetracks and OTB's to send their fees to the government within... the 20th of the month as opposed to the original being 48 hours a month. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1552 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Gong-Gershowitz on House Bill 1553. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1553, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "House Bill 1553 codifies current practice in state courts and conforms our State Law to Federal Law requiring us to make findings of abuse, abandonment, and neglect for a child to be eligible for a Special Immigrant

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Juvenile Visa. Our current state statute is 11 years out of date with Federal Law that was amended in 2008. This updates the state statute to conform to Federal Law. Our courts determine abuse, abandonment, and neglect as we are required to do so and then the Federal Government determines who is eligible for the visa. This Bill also received bipartisan support and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Sommer is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Sommer: "I believe, as you've explained, this according to an adoption attorney that I consult on a regular basis about legislation, this is necessary to comply with Federal Law. Is that correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct."

Sommer: "Can you explain what this classification means, Special Immigrant Juvenile?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah, so this is a federal classification that allows a child who is abused, abandoned, or neglected and cannot therefore be reunited with family to obtain a pathway to a green card. A parent cannot obtain legal status through their child, this essentially makes the child a ward of the state as the only option for their safety."

Sommer: "Well I appreciate your expertise. Many of us may not know that you're an immigration attorney with 20 years of practice and that... a key point of this legislation is that the child has been either abused, neglected, or abandoned. Is that correct?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct."

Sommer: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ramirez is recognized."

Ramirez: "Does the Representative yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Ramirez: "So, speaking to the Bill. I want to say just how incredibly grateful I am for this Bill. Personally this Bill speaks to my little sister, Iris Ramirez, who as of 12 years ago became my sister who was exactly the kind of person that you are talking about. A child that was 60 pounds when my family was able to sponsor her and a child that had gone through everything that's wrong with the systems in this nation and this country and the world. And it took us more than seven years, a lot of resources, a lot of resources for her to finally get her green card. So today I urge a 'yes' vote for Iris Ramirez and for the thousands of children that have been abandoned, neglected, forgotten and that this nation, this beautiful nation that we all love and we call home can also welcome them. So thank you so much and I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."

Gong-Gershowitz: "House Bill 1553 sends a clear signal to immigrant children that if they're abused, neglected, or abandoned by one or both of their parents the State of Illinois is fully prepared to assist and protect them to the full extent permitted under Federal Law. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1553 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'in favor', 18 voting 'against', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler is recognized."

- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Amy Grant is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Crespo: "Next we have Representative Elizabeth Hernandez on House Bill 1557. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1557, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hernandez."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1557 requires the Secretary of State to provide information informing customers of the availability of literacy and English as a second language classes. The Secretary may satisfy this requirement by providing the internet address of non for profit entities offering the information. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

- Batinick: "Sponsor, I apologize, I was in a side bar. I noticed that there were some opposition in committee, can you speak to that?"
- Hernandez, L.: "No, no opposition. Secretary is a supporter, a proponent of it."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Batinick: "Let me back up. There was some opposition by Members in committee. Do you know what the opposition by Membership was in committee?"

Hernandez, L.: "I don't recall."

Batinick: "Okay, it was 10 to 2. And you just... one sentence, what the Bill does? It allows everything..."

Hernandez, L.: "It just allows for the Secretary of State to have information available. And this information can be available through the internet and that was perfectly fine with me."

Batinick: "It's a 'shall' or a 'may'?"

Hernandez, L.: "May."

Batinick: "It's a 'may'? Okay, that's important. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hernandez to close."

Hernandez, L.: "I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1557 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'in favor', 28 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McCombie on House Bill 1634. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1634, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1634 is a Bill that I believe will help citizens that have in the past made a mistake and received a DUI. Last year I believe it was

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Representative Lilly had a large sealing Bill and this was one violation that was not included in this Bill. It has to be a perfect DUI, if there is ever such a thing, to have this sealed rather than expunded, and let me express that again, sealed, not expunded. It is also permissive of the judge to go ahead and declare this. So there's several factors for this to be perfect. One, it has to be ten years ago. Two, it could not have caused any bodily harm or death. You would have had to submit to the test, you have not been convicted for any previous, and you have had no any other misdemeanor or felony driving under that. You also had to submit for the test and agree... on the road and agree that you are guilty of this. Again this is a sealing, not an expungement, and it is still permissive from the judge. It's for that person who has made that one mistake over 10 years ago. We often find in district that individuals are not able to get a job because they have a DUI on their records. And a lot of us that live in downstate have to travel anywhere from 30 to 60 to sometimes 90 miles on the road to get to work and this is going to give those folks the opportunity to be employed by those folks that do not allow DUI's on their record. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Stava-Murray is recognized."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Stava-Murray: "So I was in the committee and I found the Secretary of State's testimony helpful, so would it be possible for you to summarize the opposition to this Bill from the Secretary of State please?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

McCombie: "Yes, absolutely. They were concerned with their ability driving abstracts. I think there was miscommunication, we have not had any additional conversations on it, but they were afraid that they would not have the ability to get the driving record of individuals. But they can get the criminal abstract from the ISP, the Illinois State Police. So I don't necessarily think that is a good concern, certainly a concern, but I hope that during our committee hearing that that did clear that up for them."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah. And it sounded to me like additionally their concern was that right now they have an automatic process that if someone has a second or third DUI it triggers differently and automatically what happens in their system. And so is that something that was cleared up with them after the committee vote?"

McCombie: "Well, if you have additional that's going to show up on the criminal side, so. And they would not be able to... if they had a second, they would not be able to get it sealed anyway, so it wouldn't be a factor here. You have to have the perfect scenario and that would not be the case."

Stava-Murray: "Okay. Thank you."

McCombie: "You're welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Walker is recognized."

Walker: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Walker: "Representative, the... my understanding is the Secretary of State has a whole process by which they decide whether people get driving privileges back and whether they keep and maintain a BAIID device on their automobile and that includes

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

DUI convictions older than 10 years. Are you removing that ability of them to continue with that program?"

McCombie: "The Secretary of State would still be able to see it through the criminal abstract so that's not going to change, they're just going to have to request the criminal."

Walker: "Thank you."

McCombie: "You're welcome."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Frese is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Frese: "You mentioned that this is in regards to if there was any bodily harm, but what about property damage, was that mentioned if there was extensive property damage?"

McCombie: "Yes. Yes, it's caused death or personal injury or to any person or any damage to a property of any other person.

So yes, it will."

Frese: "So if then the court rewarded the property owner or anybody any damage that would have to be taken care of prior to this sealing as well, right?"

McCombie: "Yeah, and they wouldn't be able to get it sealed if they did that."

Frese: "Okay. Thank you."

McCombie: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie to close."

McCombie: "I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1634 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

this question, there are 44 voting 'in favor', 52 voting 'against', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, failed a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative DeLuca on House Bill 1639. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 1639 is identical to a Bill last year, Senate Bill 2444 which passed the Senate unanimously and it was never called in the House. So House Bill 1639 will uniformly exclude supplemental policies from mandated coverages of an individual or a group accident and health insurance policy unless specified otherwise. Supplemental insurers try to amend the code every time a new mandate is established so the mandate which is not intended to apply to certain supplemental policies does not. Furthermore, supplemental policies are distinguishable from major medical and hospitalization policies. Supplemental policies are sold in addition to major medical and hospitalization policies, and these supplemental policies are intended to be limited coverage and include specific coverages. Supplemental policies are purchased to help offset the nonmedical cost that arise when a family member suffers an injury, specified illness, or hospitalization. These policies do not nor are they intended to provide comprehensive medical and hospitalization coverage. House Bill 1639 will simplify the Legislature's consideration of health expense insurance mandated benefits in the future by removing the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- necessity of carving out accepted benefits from any contemplated mandated coverage. Thank you, and please vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1639 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'in favor', 30 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler is recognized."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Welter and Wilhour are excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ammons on House Bill 2045. Clerk, please read the... out of the record. Representative Stuart on House Bill 2078. Out of the record. Representative Evans on House Bill 2121. Out of the record. Representative Welch on House Bill 2124. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2124, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2124 is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Park Districts. What it does is it permits public bodies to hold closed door meetings when considering personnel related issues specific to independent contractors and volunteers including complaints lodged against those. What you have is in many cases in park districts and even in school districts, you have people who

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

are independent contractors or volunteers that may serve as coaches, tennis coach, golf coach, or something... they're not technically an employee of the body and the bodies are confused on what exception applies. This would clarify that you can go in a closed session to discuss those specific people. And I've been working with this Bill with the Park District Association, also been working through issues with the Press Association and Broadcasters, and we have reached an agreement on this issue. I would ask for approval of House Bill 2124."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2124 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, you're kind of slow today. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'in favor', 3 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Willis on House Bill 2174. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2174, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this is to try to make sure that we have some options for people when they're looking at their health care, specifically looking at drug plans. So what this does is it requires all of our insurance companies to make sure that they have a minimal of 25 percent of their individual or group plans that offer a service that

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

has a level coverage, which is basically a flat rate for their prescriptions. This will certainly help people know what the cost of their medications can be and they can make an educated guess as to which type of drug benefit plan they would like. The copayment structure is certainly going to help alleviate the added increase of prescriptions, but it also with it only being at 25 percent I do feel that it will be a minimal impact on our insurance industry; and therefore, I urge an 'aye' vote and will be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I wasn't... this isn't my committee, but my understanding is that in committee there was some discussion as to the way people would pick plans that it might actually end up raising... significantly raising the cost of health insurance because of kind of a negative selection issue."

Willis: "Well, Sir, what we have seen there are other states that have this and it has not shown undue raising of those costs of prescription plans."

Batinick: "So can you... do they have this exact wording or what is the set up that the other states have?"

Willis: "So it's very similar to Colorado and Montana. The structure is exactly the same as Montana's and they've both shown that it has not had any adverse effect on the insurance industry."

Batinick: "So you're saying this has no..."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Willis: "Like I said, we are not asking for them to do 100 percent of their insurance at this way, we're asking for them to have options and only 25 percent of the plans that they offer should have this option."
- Batinick: "So in terms of that percentage is that like raw number of plans, aggregate number of people, how is that 25 percent determined?"
- Willis: "So it's the number plans per tier that are offered is what we're looking at."
- Batinick: "Okay. Number of plans per... I mean, I would caution against comparing a state like Illinois to Montana but I'm going to sit back and listen to the rest of the debate. I appreciate your answers. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Spain is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."

- Spain: "Leader Willis, thank you for bringing this Bill forward.

 And can you describe the rationale for opposition for the insurance carriers here in Illinois?"
- Willis: "Well, I think that we have seen certainly in the front page of many papers that the insurance industry is probably one of the few industries that if you have a job there, you're making really good money. We have seen that Blue Cross Blue Shield has... their CEO was making millions and millions of dollars. So they don't want anything to cut into their profit."
- Spain: "But you also mentioned that in your view that this Bill would not have an adverse effect on the insurance industry.

 Is that correct?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Willis: "That is correct, but I... obviously the insurance industry feels differently."

Spain: "Sure. What about the impact on individuals?"

"Well, I'll tell you. I think this is something that is certainly going to help individuals, especially those that have chronic illnesses where they have to take prescriptions on a regular basis so they know that they have to have a certain amount. And when that happens, if you're somebody... for example, I have a daughter who is a type I diabetic. She has to take insulin. The cost for her insulin, which keeps her alive, is \$500 a month. When she takes out an insurance policy and she has insurance through work, every January until she reaches her deductible, she has to pay \$500 a month to cover that. If she had an insurance policy instead that had a copay that might mean \$30 per prescription, she would know that that would be her cost throughout the entire 12 months as she's doing it. That's something that we need to have people have that in mind so that they can make the educated choice on where that may be."

Spain: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The Sponsor indicates that on this initiative there may not be an adverse impact on the industry. That may be true. But that's actually certainly not my concern with this piece of legislation. The concern is what could be the adverse impact on the very individuals that we think we're trying to help. This is a Bill that places limitations on the ability for coinsurance for certain types of drugs. And the problem with that... and we know what coinsurance is, paying a percentage of total cost versus a flat copayment which is usually a much smaller amount of

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

money. The problem is we're not dealing with these issues in isolation and so making limitations on coinsurance in one area can impact the cost of prescription drugs to the very people we are trying to help in other areas. And so if you think about the healthcare delivery system, and you think about insurance making restrictions on coinsurance can be something that will increase costs in other areas where premiums go up and deductibles go up for the very patients and people that we are seeking to help. This is a great example of trying to do good in one area and creating harm in another area. And health care is like a balloon and when you are making a squeeze in one section, that cost is going to be absorbed and understood in another area. So I urge very strong caution on this Bill and continue to be very concerned that this type of manipulation on pricing for prescription drugs is going to come back and end up biting us in areas that just raise the cost of health care delivery with increased premiums and increased deductibles. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mazzochi is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Mazzochi: "One question that I have is when you're talking in the language here and you're talking about tier status, what exactly are you trying to target with the different tier status restrictions?"

Willis: "So what we're looking at, you have different tiers where when you... at open enrollment time people can decide what their deductibles are going to be, whether they're going to go into HMO, PPO, those are your different tiers. So you can have a

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

silver plan, a bronze plan that you make the determination as to what your deductible may be or what type of copay you want to be depending upon what it is. In this what we're looking at is you can decide in each tier, so when we have a silver tier that might cover the medium amount for someone that has to do regular visits or whatever and you can pick what your deductible would be and an additional 25 percent of it would be those that have copays. A bronze plan might be a little bit less coverage, you might not have everything covered in there. And this is where we look at people make their own personal decisions. Am I generally a healthy person? Then I really don't need to have... everything covered, I just need to have, it's a really sad thing to say, but that coverage in case something major wrong happens to me that I can afford to be in the hospital and get that taken care of."

Mazzochi: "Right. Well, you know, normally when I see the word tiers in the context of talking about pharmaceutical products, you're usually talking about a formulary tier status. So are you trying to suggest, with this language, that people have to... will be locked into a particular formulary tier status in terms of what they're paying on the copay or just that any pharmaceutical benefit is... and in terms of which tier it comes from, in terms of whether it's covered by managed care or a particular plan is going to be stuck with a formulary tier or it's going to go across all of the different tiers?"

Willis: "We are looking at across all of the different tiers. So like when you go at open enrollment time, let's say your company offers Blue Cross Blue Shield as their carrier and

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

then they usually have different tiers that you can make your decision as to which you want to do to customize to your own household."

Mazzochi: "Yeah, I think we're talking in a bit of cross purposes."

Willis: "Okay, could be. But along those same lines, some have the drug plans built right into theirs, some have separate where you pay separately out for a drug plan."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Are you familiar with a concept of what it means to be, for example, a Tier 1 drug in a pharmaceutical benefit plan?"

Willis: "No, I'm not, but give me a minute and I can find out.

Okay. So I just got the CliffsNotes version on it. So, yes,

I get now, the difference here is on when you are talking
about specialty drugs, experimental drugs and that kind of
stuff. This is not where we are going with this. This is
something that says across the board on all drug plans..."

Mazzochi: "Right, but I think the concern..."

Willis: "...and all tiers."

Mazzochi: "Right, but I think that one of the reasons, for example, why... I mean, isn't it correct that one of the reasons why you'll see pricing differentials particularly when you're in the branded or specialty drug category is that if, for example, there is a generic available, then it's going to... the reason why you have the differentials in copay is to try to encourage people to go towards a generic that's less expensive as opposed to the branded or specialty."

Willis: "And that's perfectly fine. And we're not saying you can't have differentials in copay, we're saying you need to have 25

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

percent of the plans have a copay. We have not set what that copay has to be, we are just saying it has to be there in 25 percent of the plans that are offered. So that the consumer, or the patient, or however you want to look at it knows what they're getting into and can judge and make the best informed decision possible."

- Mazzochi: "Right, but if I understand this correctly, you're saying that you want to ensure that these plans... or that the insurers mandate... or are mandated to provide what I see here on line 15 as a flat dollar copayment structure to the entire drug benefit. So that doesn't strike me as consistent with the language that's in here particularly at line 15 to 16."
- Willis: "Okay. So what we have in here is that it must be reasonably graduated and proportionately related at all tiers such that the copay structure as a whole does not discriminate against or discourage the enrollment of individuals with significant health care needs. So we're saying that it can switch out as the tiers go, but it has to be a reasonable copay that's in there."
- Mazzochi: "But how do we determine reasonable? So that's where I'm confused because if your goal is to try to create, you know, a uniform-predictable copay where..."
- Willis: "It would be... it would be stated right in the beginning."

 Mazzochi: "...well now, wait, wait, where it's going to be one amount each month then you can't have this graduated structure without defeating your original purpose of I've got a single uniform copay amount and it's going to be more or less locked in at each level."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Willis: "But the copay is for each tier level. So if you're taking drugs that are on Tier 1 or on a specialty tier, those different copays may apply."

Mazzochi: "Right. So when you're saying... but so if you're going to allow the graduation on the copay for the different tiers on the formulary, then the question is are you going to... do you think this text still allows, for example, if it's a specialty drug I will... that the insurers can offer something that's going to be a percentage of the cost of the specialty drug or are you trying to get rid of that and keep that at just flat fee amounts?"

Willis: "We're saying it's a copay only on 25 percent of the plans that are offered."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Willis: "That's it. It's as simple as possible on that."

Mazzochi: "But what I'm trying to understand is how you want this 25 percent copay structure to actually operate in real life. That's what I'm trying to understand because some of the ways in which this have been touted and some of the explanations in terms of how people in industry and how some of the people on the patient side are interpreting this, the way in which they're perceiving what this is supposed to do is that the insurance company will have 25 percent of their plans and in 25 percent of their plans they will have a fixed copay amount. So whether it's a fixed amount no matter what you can't go over \$100 per month or no matter what drug on formulary tier status you're taking, your copay will be set at \$10, you know, \$40, something along... and that what you won't have are the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

percentage of the drug cost copay structures. That's how it's been suggested to me is what you're trying to get at."

Willis: "Yes, I think you just did it exactly right. That's what we are looking at doing."

Mazzochi: "Right. And that's exactly where I have the concern..."

Willis: "Okay, good."

Mazzochi: "...because..."

Willis: "Not good that you have a concern, but good that we are at least looking at the same picture."

Mazzochi: "...yeah, so the whole reason why we have the percentage of the cost of the drug style copays... and they're usually one of the bottom tier status, they're Tier 2, Tier 3, Tier 4 depending on, you know, what type of other competition is out there. We're now basically saying that the insurance companies are going to be eating nearly all of the cost of the specialty drugs, charging a flat fee to patients. And my concern is is that that's a little bit of false advertising in the sense that the only way the insurance company is going to be able to price that risk is to really increase the overall cost of the prescription drug benefit. Because the whole reason why they have that percentage of the drug copay structure is too... my understanding... and correct me if you think I'm wrong, but my understanding is that the reason why they have that structure is to try to ensure that if people really are taking those more expensive drugs and there's alternatives available, they would prefer you, and they use the copay structure to incentivize it, they'd prefer you to go into the less expensive drug option and that's one of the ways in which they can try in theory to manage costs. I mean,

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- that's my understanding of the structure. Is that one that you have as well?"
- Willis: "I... I guess in some ways. But what we're saying... that's not what we're doing and that would be a valid argument if we said 100 percent of the policies had to have copay, that's not what we're saying. We're saying 25 percent of the policies that you offer have to follow the copay scenario or option."
- Mazzochi: "Okay. So under this structure though are you saying, for example, let's say, I offer prescription drug benefit that costs... these are hypothetical numbers... that costs a thousand dollars a month and no copay and that would qualify as one of your 25 percent plans, right?"
- Willis: "That would... no, because they wouldn't have a co... so if you're going and you're saying that your drug cost a thousand because it's a specialty drug and it is not under the 25 percent is copay it would be in the 75 percent other plans. Now if you were the person that chose to take a copay option, then you would have to have the set copay and it would not be a thousand dollars because a thousand dollars is the set price for the prescription. So it would be a much more reasonable cost of what that copay is on it across the board, whether it's \$100 or whatever they may have. Maybe in the specialty drugs they say, you know, drugs that cost on market over \$500 you're going to pay \$100 for it as your copay. That's the scenario I'm envisioning."
- Mazzochi: "Okay. Well let me ask you this, for these types of 25 percent plans that you're proposing, will the insurers be able to exclude the really expensive specialty drugs as part of the plan and still qualify?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Willis: "No, not under the way this is written."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Right, so that's where..."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mazzochi, if you could please start bringing it to a close. We have some other Members who are seeking recognition please."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. One thing that I would like to know is, you know, your daughter... and if you don't want to disclose that, that's fine... which brand of insulin is she taking that's costing the \$500 per month out of pocket?"

Willis: "You know, she doesn't live with me right now, but I believe it's the Humalog."

Mazzochi: "Right. So Humalog is one of the newer, fancier, more inventive versions of insulin. It's not the cheaper generic insulin. And I understand that insulin has all kinds of benefits in terms of, you know, there has been all kinds of engineering and advancements, but the fact of the matter is she could lower the cost, she just chooses not to. So if I may, to the Bill. The concern that I have with regard to this particular Bill is that what we're essentially creating... what I think is an impossible scenario, because by putting limits on the total amount of copay each month, by saying that there can't really be any flexibility tied to the most expensive drugs, even if there's alternatives on the market through the tier structure, then what you're really trying to create is a plan where the only way in which an insurance company is going to be able to offer it is it's going to be so expensive it's not going to actually be affordable to people. So I applaud the desire to try to give people some fixed planning on copays, but I think that because the insurance company in

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

the long run is going to have to make up the cost somewhere what's ultimately going to wind up happening is these plans are going to be too high priced. I think you might be able to get there if you, for example, allowed it to be a generic only plan or if you allowed it to be one that was limited to Tier 1, Tier 2 on the formulary status, but if you're truly going to say that this plan has to apply across all of the different tier structures, I'm concerned that it's not going to actually get there. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Guzzardi: "I think that we've gotten a bit far afield in the past 10 minutes or so, so I want to drill down into the very simple essence of what this Bill accomplishes. So right now my understanding is that for some drugs, patients rather than having a copay when they go fill out their prescription, they have a coinsurance which is a percentage of the cost of the drug rather than a flat copay. Is that right?"

Willis: "Correct."

Guzzardi: "Okay. And some of these drugs are, as we've heard a little discussion about a moment ago, high priced specialty drugs, right?"

Willis: "Some not even specialty drugs, but yes."

Guzzardi: "Right, yeah some even regular old drugs are awfully high priced these days. And so my understanding of the way your Bill works is that it says that some plans, not all plans, but some plans, a quarter of the plans, have to offer a copay structure without coinsurance. So not the thing that

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

charges a percentage, just the thing that charges a flat rate, right?"

Willis: "Correct."

"Okay. To the Bill. We had this discussion in my Guzzardi: committee, and I said this there and I'll say this here, it sounds like the doomsday scenario that our colleagues are worried about is that the cost of these high price prescription drugs will be taken off the backs of sick people and distributed across the entire customer base. That to me is the definition of insurance. The point of insurance is that when you get sick you don't have to bare all the cost yourself, the cost is shared among the entire pool. This Bill simply does what health insurance is supposed to do, it takes the price burden off of the shoulders of very sick people who require very expensive medication simply to survive and, you know, may share that cost among the entire pool, but that's why we have insurance in the first place. I think it's a smart measure that will help people who need these important medications afford them. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you. I couldn't have said it more eloquently than the previous speaker, but that is the goal of this. It's to make... give people the option so that those people that are dependent upon medications to really sustain their life as my own daughter is with her diabetes, don't have to make the choice between paying rent, having food, or having the insulin that will keep her alive. This is not going to crush the insurance companies, we are just asking them to put in 25 percent of the policies that they carry have this option so

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

people can budget and work accordingly, and we don't have people in the first few months of the year struggling to make ends meet. I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2174 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'in favor', 33 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Unes on House Bill 2182. Out of the record. Leader Manley on House Bill 2189. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2189, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Manley."

Manley: "House Bill 2189, we adopted Committee Amendment 1, it was a gut and replace Amendment. It provides that a... it prevents a company from providing direct to consumer commercial genetic testing information or other personally identifiable information about a consumer with any health or life insurance company without written consent from the consumer. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2189 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Yednock on House Bill 2215. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2215, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Yednock."

Yednock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm presenting HB2215.

Simply House Bill 2215 allows for candidates in a fire academy to receive a brief educational presentation, provide them with historical perspective on unions in the fire service.

This Bill is an initiative of the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois, who I have been proud to work on this Bill with, and I would certainly appreciate your vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "Representative, is this your first Bill?"

Yednock: "That it is, Sir."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to have a couple questions for you, I don't think it's going to be one of those clean super easy ones. Just curious. Where did this Bill come from? What was the genesis of this Bill?"

Yednock: "This Bill was brought to me by my friends at the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois."

Batinick: "And they're asking who to provide training or education on the history of labor unions in fire departments?"

Yednock: "They're asking that when the professional firefighters go to the academy that the curriculum that is already in place

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

for them has a small section for the history of the fire service in the labor movement."

Batinick: "I guess my question is, how does that help us... how does teaching the history of labor unions in fires help us put out fires?"

Yednock: "Well, many of the safety... much of the safety that was brought in in the last century was done through the fire service, through their union labor movement because they found a lot of things that were wrong and helped to push those. And so that's why they're bringing this forward today is to let everyone know that there was a union movement... a labor movement that was started in the fire service and part of that brought a lot of the safety measures that we have today."

Batinick: "I understand that the education and the safety measures is important. It seems like this would be a job for the union to educate its members on as opposed to taxpayer funds and training and time to be spent. I'm not sure this helps a firefighter do a better job as a firefighter, teaching the history of this, but I'm going to go ahead and go light and listen to see if anybody else has anything to say for you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "Says he will."

Skillicorn: "So is there a, like a fire academy? Tell me how this works."

Yednock: "Yeah, so if you join the firefighter service and it's the professional full time service you are sent to a school

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

and part of that school is all the training, you know, on medical procedures, things that they would normally do. So you're sent to a school and at that time they could possibly have a small introduction to the labor movement in the fire service."

Skillicorn: "And how many hours, how long does this school take?"

Yednock: "The idea is probably somewhere in the neighborhood of a half hour is what their thinking."

Skillicorn: "The overall fire training school."

Yednock: "That is a good question, I think its a few weeks or more."

Skillicorn: "Okay. It would be nice to know that, I mean, if it's, you know, a week, you know, it might be 40 hours, if it's two weeks it might be 80 hours of that. So during that time they would learn about safety, they would learn about how to keep themselves safe, they might learn on how they can protect other people, you know, do they learn things about response time or anything?"

Yednock: "I don't know that that's necessarily in their curriculum, but certainly everything that you brought up before is."

Skillicorn: "Okay, and then just... in the 76th District, do you represent the fire districts of the LaSalle, Mendota, Ottawa, Peru? Is that correct?"

Yednock: "That is correct, Sir."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Thank you very much. So specifically to the Bill, what is interesting is that we're taking time away from education to promote the union I perceive. I mean, I would assume this is about signing people up for the union cards.

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Now you might be for that and that's fine, but we're taking time away from firefighters staying safe, we're taking time away from firefighters learning how to safely put out a fire, and we're taking time away from learning about response time and stuff. And furthermore, I wonder if the Sponsor would be more interested in protecting the firefighters of the 76th District. So I'm looking at the pension funding for these fire departments and I'm going to see here in 2016, the LaSalle Fire Department, their funding ratio was only 54 percent. And I also ... then I take another look and I see that LaSalle's pension contribution was \$6,473 below the statutory requirement. And then when I look at the Mendota Fire Department. So the guys there, I mean, their pension is better funded at 66 percent but then when I look at how much it was funded I find that their pension was shorted by over \$75 thousand just in 2016. So let's look at Ottawa. Ottawa firefighters. These guys, their pension is the worst of the bunch funded only 46 percent and their pension was shorted \$40 thousand in 2016. I look at the guys who work in Peru, the guys and gals. Now they're at 66 percent tied for the best. And look at this, Peru is actually trying to get their firefighters actually funded. They actually over funded the statutory amount there. You know, the same goes for 2017. LaSalle, 57 percent, just barely made the payment there. Mendota, 66 percent, still 66 percent was shorted by almost \$30 thousand. Ottawa, 43 percent, lower funding ratio than 2016, still shorted. And again, Peru at 67 percent actually did fund the pension fully and put a little extra in there. I suspect if we cared about firefighters, we would fund their

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

pensions. I think that this is inappropriate, this is risk to the firefighters and then we are going to take away time from them to learn about signing up the union card and taking time away from their safety. This is dangerous and we're not funding their pensions. I suspect you work on the guys back home before spreading a statewide policy."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Stava-Murray is recognized."

Stava-Murray: "So as a former commissioner on the Board of Fire and Police, I'd like to thank Representative Yednock for bringing this forward. Part of the history that they can be learning here is actually the history of how unions have helped firefighters as they've had to battle different types of diseases that are unique to firefighting and making sure that their health and safety for the long term as they are retiring and returning to the community is incredibly important. And to say wholesale that somehow they're not spending time staying safe is very disingenuous so I... and I'm happy to be in support of this Bill, and I'd like to thank the Representative for bringing it forward. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

McCombie: "She says? He says? Oh sorry, I was confused for a second who was doing it. This here... our analysis says that the professional union firefighter in the state is the one who is going to provide the curriculum and the instructors.

Is that correct?"

Yednock: "That is correct."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

McCombie: "So that would not be a cost to the State of Illinois.

Is that correct?"

Yednock: "You are correct on that."

McCombie: "Okay. My husband is a volunteer fireman and... so this doesn't affect him, but one of the things that is AFFI and other organizations do oftentimes is provide free training for others in the fire service. So to... you know, say that they're maybe not, I think they're good partners to the entire industry. But this is, like you said, this is an 8 to 10 week class. If you're going to go to an EMT that's a whole nother semester. So to spend 15, 20, 30 minutes, or even an hour talking about the benefits that AFFI can give you or whoever it happens to be, another professional organization, do you think that would be a benefit to the entire fire service regardless if they're volunteered or paid?"

Yednock: "And actually they may just go to offer this online, so as to not do it during part of the classroom time so then maybe that would be open to the volunteer fire department people also which, you know, would be better for everyone to have an idea of where the labor movement has... what that has done for the professional firefighters to make sure they're safe and push for things. I think it would be a benefit to the volunteer fire departments to have this course also actually."

McCombie: "And to me, I'll be honest, it's really not about necessarily the labor movement for me, it's more about the services that AFFI provide the entire industry. So, for example, Representative Halpin and I were lucky enough to go to a training and go into a smoke filled house or building,

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

rappel off of a wall and do some really scary things. So I also highly recommend any Members to contact your local AFFI folks so you can actually do that and see what's going on. So I appreciate you bringing the Bill. I don't think it's an overreach, I don't think it's going to cost taxpayers any dollars, and I thank you for bringing it."

Yednock: "Thank you, Representative McCombie. I would also say back to Representative Skillicorn I'd love to work with him on a Bill that helps us fund downstate fire and police pensions better."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Connor is recognized."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative, are Dalmatians a part of fire service history?"

Yednock: "Probably as much as the tooth fairy."

Connor: "Did you bring a Dalmatian puppy with today in order to help the AFFI pass this Bill?"

Yednock: "If they would have let me have one on the floor, I certainly would have."

Connor: "Can I get your pledge that for any future Bills involving the history of the fire service you will bring a Dalmatian puppy to the floor to assist us in passing your Bill?"

Yednock: "Representative Connor, I am short on promises but I'll do my best."

Conner: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Cabello is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Cabello: "Representative, can you tell us is there a cost to anyone for this training?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Yednock: "It is... no. It is part of the curriculum that they do so there is no cost out of pocket for anybody attending the fire service that I know of."

Cabello: "So what you're saying is we wasted more money debating this Bill than it's going to cost to train this firemen in this?"

Yednock: "I wasn't going to say that, but since you brought it up, yes."

Cabello: "I highly recommend a 'yes' vote."

Yednock: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Jones is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Jones: "Representative, someone on the other side made the statement that... they asked you about pensions. I'm going to direct your attention to the fiscal notes. So there were two fiscal notes filed on the Bill, do you see those?"

Yednock: "Yes, Sir."

Jones: "So there was not a pension note that was filed on this Bill, correct?"

Yednock: "Correct."

Jones: "So one of the Representatives on the other side asked you a question about pension and this Bill has no impact on pensions, does it?"

Yednock: "No, it does not."

Jones: "Representative on the other side had the opportunity to file a pension note but he didn't. There is a note that the fiscal note is filed, correct?"

Yednock: "Correct."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Jones: "And could you read what that says, Representative?"

Yednock: "This Bill will have no fiscal impact on the Office of the Illinois State Fire Marshal. This Bill does not create a state mandate."

Jones: "And, Representative, there's also in here the training aspect of it and in the analysis it said there are two training aspects of it, one that they're going to be trained in first aide and the other one they're going to be trained in opiate. Is that correct, Representative?"

Yednock: "Yes, that's part of a larger package of training."

Jones: "So, Representative, I believe that the Representative on the other side owes an apology not only to you, but to all the firefighters who he tried to insult with this Bill in saying that we are wasting our time in doing this for firefighters who risk their lives and who need to be trained to help our residents. Not only is this a good Bill, Representative, but I urge an 'aye' vote but I also urge the Representative to be cautious when they are trying to insult our firefighters. So thank you."

Yednock: "Thank you, Representative. I did not take it that way, but I can certainly see how it would be construed that way."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Yednock to close."

Yednock: "Thank you. Again, this was sponsored by the Professional Fire Fighters Service, the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. And I'm urging an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2215 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

this question, there are 91 voting 'in favor', 11 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stuart on House Bill 2239. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2239, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. House Bill 2239 simply allows both student trustees who are elected to the SIU Board of Trustees to be voting members at all times."

Speaker Crespo: "Is the any discussion? Leader Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Batinick: "Representative, my understanding was that this was kind of... I know that there were some 'no' votes in committee but did this get to sort of agreed Bill some sort of situation?"

Stuart: "Well, I mean, some of the discussion was to how this affects other systems and it does not have an effect on any of our other university systems. It's only the Southern Illinois University system."

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. My understanding, though, even with the Southern Illinois systems that kind of got worked out?"

Stuart: "It has only ever been about the Southern Illinois University system."

Batinick: "Correct. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mazzochi is recognized."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Mazzochi: "Do you have an understanding as to what the original theory was as to why we would not have student trustees have a binding vote?"

Stuart: "No, the issue at hand is that we do have student trustees that have a vote. They are elected from each campus, Carbondale and Edwardsville, it is at the whim of the Governor as to which one has the voting stance at any given time. It doesn't make sense to me why we exclude the voice of one campus of students at any given time."

Mazzochi: "All right. But I guess the question is, is that right now we have a nonvoting student member and you're deleting that to voting. So I'm just curious, in terms of can a student trustees vote be one that actually binds the board one way or the other if there is otherwise a split amongst the trustees?"

Stuart: "Yeah, and it has actually been used in that way where these students have been played as political pawns."

Mazzochi: "Right. And that's... and isn't that one of the reasons why the student trustee votes, certainly at the Public Community College Act, the student votes are nonbinding precisely to avoid the risk that students are going to be placed in an untenable position by someone who is either an employee or an administrator at the university that essentially if they actually have a binding vote that can change the outcome of a particular board action then they are effectively are most vulnerable... in the most vulnerable position and they could be exploited to cast that vote in one direction or the other?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Stuart: "Well... I don't really think that's the issue that we are discussing here, Representative. In my point of view, we give these student trustees a seat at the table. These student trustees when they run on the campuses, they run very long, very hard fought campaigns to have these seats. And I believe that each campus deserves a voice when decisions are made. I think the voice of our students at our universities is vital."
- Mazzochi: "No, I agree, but I also understand that students are particularly vulnerable to this. Which is why, for example, under the Public Community College Act, students' votes are nonbinding, were you aware of that? They get to cast a vote, but they're nonbinding."
- Stuart: "So these students choose to run for this position, they're not put up without knowing what it's going to entail. So I appreciate you being concerned for vulnerable students but, like I said, these are students, they run a long and hard campaign to get these spots. They know full well what their responsibilities are going to be on the Board of Trustees."
- Mazzochi: "Right, but in the Illinois Public Community College Act, we likewise have seven member boards plus one student trustee and by statute..."

Stuart: "These are not community colleges."

Mazzochi: "...and by statute..."

Stuart: "These are not community colleges."

Mazzochi: "...by statute those student trustees they also run for election, but they are not permitted to actually have a binding vote. It's an advisory vote. I would be perfectly happy to support this if it mirrored the way in which the

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

statutory framework is in the Public Community College Act, but I think that there were some sound policy reasons for ensuring that the student votes were advisory as opposed to binding, because it does put the students at risk for political pressure in a way... and grade pressure and all sorts of leverage in a way that other people were not. So... and I'm just concerned that we're creating one particular subset, we are carving out Southern Illinois University, so we're creating, you know, a situation that is just not found in any of the... at many of our other institutions of higher learning. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. I just wanted to on behalf of Representative Bryant, she had to leave, but she did want to speak in support on this Bill. We did vote 'no' in committee, but I think you've had conversation with her and she just wanted me to say that she 100 percent supports the Bill and would like to be added as a cosponsor."

Stuart: "Thank you for sharing that. Yes, she and I have had multiple conversations and yeah, she did express to me that she is in full support. So thank you for sharing that."

McCombie: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Costa Howard: "Representative Stuart, are the students that are you are discussing at this time, do they run for office publicly on their campus?"

Stuart: "Yeah, they do, it's a large campaign."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Costa Howard: "So is it fair to say that unlike community colleges who don't necessarily have to publicly announce a vacancy or application process for a person to join that board and then have full voting rights, these students have actually publicly run for office?"

Stuart: "They publicly run, they run large social media campaigns, they chalk all around the campus and their name is everywhere and these are very often very highly contested seats."

Costa Howard: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Stuart to close."

Stuart: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2239 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'in favor', 6 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wheeler is recognized."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Butler and Spain are excused for the rest of today."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Lisa Hernandez is recognized."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Speaker. Can you let the record reflect that I meant to vote for House Bill 1639 as a 'no'?"

Speaker Crespo: "The Journal will reflect your wishes.

Representative Evans on House Bill 2244. Out of the record.

Representative Lilly on House Bill 2265. Clerk, please read the Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2265, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Lilly."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Lilly: General Assembly. I rise to present HB2265. It provides public school elementary grades sixth, seventh, and eighth to have curriculum in the area of civic education and civic engagement. The current Bill reflects that the social science requirement of the code requirements will be complete in a one... at least one semester. The requirement is effective for students entering ninth grade currently by the help of Representative Conroy for our high schools. Civic education should help students acquire and learn the use and skill, knowledge, and attitude that will prepare students understand and comprehend their civic responsibilities. These courses will focus on government institution, the discussion of current societal issues, service learning, stimulation of the ... simulation of the democratic process, civic education in accordance to the Illinois Learning Standards of Social Sciences. This Bill is critical to the fabric of our society. We must equip our young people to understand the civic responsibility now. Giving them the opportunity of getting the elementary sixth, seventh, or eighth grade establish a foundation that allows them to participate in a process that we are doing today. I ask for your 'aye' vote if there's no questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick is recognized."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go directly to the Bill. There's a lot of opponents. It's another mandate on our schools. I recommend a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Lilly to close."
- Lilly: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2265 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'in favor', 31 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carroll on House Bill 2276. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2276, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Carroll."
- Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is... will make sure that people do not smoke in cars with minors. And it is not the main reason somebody will be pulled over, it's a secondary reason somebody will be pulled over. And I ask for a 'yes' vote. And I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2276 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there being 78 voting 'in favor', 20 voting 'against', 0 voting

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kifowit on House Bill 2293. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2293, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kifowit."

- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative from the Marine Corps Coordinating Council of Illinois. It does two things. It redistributes some of the money from the license plate that marines buy that have the Marine Corp logo. In addition it expands the scholarship perimeters, before it was very narrowly defined, we expanded it to include technical education also with regards to undergraduate/graduate degrees."
- Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2293 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meyers-Martin on House Bill 2301. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2301, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Meyers-Martin. Out of the record.

 Leader Davis on House Bill 2460. Out of the record.

 Representative Andrade on House Bill 2466. Out of the record.

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Leader Burke on House Bill 2470. Out of the record. Leader Willis on House Bill 2473. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that allows fire protection districts to enter into supply contracts over \$20 thousand and participate in out-of-state joint governmental or nongovernmental purchasing programs. It still has all of our transparency issues in here, but it does allow a little bit more flexibility for the special purchase of fire protection district needs. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She says she will."

Batinick: "So they can't... what... they can't enter into these contracts now through a joint government agreement without this legislation?"

Willis: "That's correct, Sir."

Batinick: "This does not change any of the transparency or raise levels of purchasing? Okay, thank you very much."

Willis: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Willis to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2473 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Willis on House Bill 2488. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2488, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a result of a Bill that I was carrying last year that ran into a little bit of difficulty. We're trying to work towards making sure that we have some transparency in our continuing care retirement communities. There are a lot of new... as our population ages, there are a lot of new options for people as to age in these specialty communities, but there's also some confusion as to what it truly means for them. So this is putting together a task force to help make sure that we identify these communities appropriately and make sure that we have the best practices in place. It is simply a task force, it's a volunteer task force, nobody is compensated for it. And this is agreed upon by the industry. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2488 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative West on House Bill 2505. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2505, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. House Bill 2505 is an initiative of the Illinois Environmental Council along with the Illinois Stewardship Alliance and other local food advocacy groups. The General Assembly passed a Local Food, Farms, and Jobs Act in 2009 with a goal of increasing markets for Illinois grown food including through state procurement. State procurement administrators have suggested clarifying the language to better express their original intent for value added Illinois products to count as local food. Otherwise they have been erring on the side of caution and not counting something as local if it contains an ingredient from out of state. For example, jam. Jam may contain locally grown strawberries but sugar is not grown in Illinois. Despite the nonlocal ingredients, procuring such as jam would still benefit the local food and farm economy which was the primary goal of the Act. I will entertain any questions but I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, is this your first Bill?"

West: "Yes, it is."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Davidsmeyer: "I actually appreciate what you're trying to do here.

You're trying to include everything in the Illinois products.

Speaking of Illinois, where did you go to college?"

West: "I went to Illinois College."

Davidsmeyer: "Where is that located?"

West: "I don't remember."

Davidsmeyer: "You don't remember?"

West: "Jacksonville, Illinois."

Davidsmeyer: "Jacksonville, Illinois. What a wonderful place to be. I'm happy to support your Bill. Thank you."

West: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Carroll is recognized."

Carroll: "So this is your first Bill you said?"

West: "Yes, it is."

Carroll: "What about cheese from another Representative, is that covered in this Bill, too?"

West: "The cheese?"

Carroll: "Yes."

West: "Yes. Since the cow is mainly from Wisconsin I think we can count that as well."

Carroll: "Thank you very much. Congratulations, great Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Skillicorn: "Great. Representative, you know, I read the title and I read the brief description here and it's talking about local farm and food products. Isn't it true that this Bill makes it easier for farmers to retail their products in these local markets?"

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

West: "Yes."

Skillicorn: "Doesn't that help them make more money and help local economies?"

West: "Definitely."

Skillicorn: "Well, anything that will help our local economies and help farmers make more money, I'm going to support. So I love your Bill, I'm going to vote for it. I ask for a 'yay' vote."

West: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

McCombie: "Have you ever been to a farm, Representative?"

West: "Yes, I have."

McCombie: "Oh, okay. I wanted to make sure because I was going to ask you to come with Representative Welch to Whiteside County. He is our adopted Legislator for Farm Bureau and he does, I would say, one of the best jobs as an adopted Legislator. And I also just wanted to say that I appreciate you bringing this Bill forward and McCombie is a 'yes'."

West: "Thank you, Ma'am."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Chesney is recognized."

Chesney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Chesney: "Representative, just a real quick question, I see that the Farm Bureau slipped in in opposition, was that all cleaned up in the final language?"

West: "Yes. After we submitted the Amendment they became a proponent of the Bill."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Chesney: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He says he will."

Batinick: "Real quick, you talked about jam, sugar, and something
in your description, correct?"

West: "Yes."

Batinick: "What's the difference between jam, jelly, and a preserve?"

West: "That is an excellent question. If I can get back to you on that, I will let you know."

Batinick: "Okay. I will let it slide this one time since it's your first Bill."

West: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Meier is recognized."

Meier: "Yes, I just wondered have you ever milked a cow?"

West: "I can't ... I can't say that I have."

Meier: "Well, make sure you come down to a farm that has dairy cows on it or come to our county, and I'll be glad to do a milking contest with you."

West: "You already won, so I'll give you that one."

Meier: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative West to close."

West: "Thank you all for your questions. I will urge an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2505 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

this question, there are 102 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having, received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Zalewski on House Bill 2577. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2577, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill removes a small bond requirement that the Federal Government got rid of a few years ago. This is a similar measure that just decouples from that and allows us to remove the same bond requirement for small liquor manufacturers. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2577 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Zalewski on House Bill 2578. Will the Clerk please read the Bill?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2578, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This extends a property tax exemption for railroads that's been on the books for a good amount of time for a 10... for further amount of time. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Speaker Crespo: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2578 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'in favor', 2 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cabello on House Bill 2594. Out of the record. Leader Harris is recognized."
- Harris: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so the following Bill can be heard in Executive Committee today: House Bill 3358 for the Executive Committee."
- Speaker Crespo: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements, is there any... is there leave? Leave is granted.

 And the posting requirements are waived. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session: the Executive Committee is meeting in Room 118, Judiciary Civil is meeting in D-1, Public Utilities is meeting in Room 114, Judiciary Criminal is meeting in C-1, and Elementary Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policy is meeting in Room 413."
- Speaker Crespo: "Representative Chesney, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Chesney: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."

Chesney: "Members of the General Assembly of the House, I have some very bad news. A trooper, Trooper Brooke Jones-Story, was inspecting a commercial motor vehicle on United States

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Route 20 Westbound just west of Illinois Route 75 in Stevenson County. At approximately 12:20 p.m., Trooper Jones-Story was outside her squad car where she was struck and fatally wounded when a truck tractor semi-trailer combination struck her squad car and the semi Trooper Jones-Story was inspecting. I would ask this Body to please keep her family, the troopers, and all those who are impacted and I would ask Mr. Speaker for a moment of silence."

Speaker Crespo: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Representative Severin, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Severin: "Point of personal privilege please."

Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."

Severin: "We have the privilege of having a couple of Pages with us today and I wanted to introduce them to you before they leave this afternoon. Representative Windhorst and I, we have a couple young ladies from McLeansboro. They are the Lynn sisters, Courtney and Danielle. So we'd like to welcome them to the House Floor. They stuck it out today, had a great time, learned a lot of stuff. And one's going to be a zoologist and the other ones going to be a undertaker, so they are excited about finding out what's going on in here. So if any of you people feel like you're in the zoo, they feel at home and Representative Brady can help the other one. So we would like to welcome to the floor, the Lynn sisters. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Wheeler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

- Wheeler: "I just wanted to announce that I have a Page here for the day. Nora Eggers, a seventh grader back in Hinckley, studying language arts and wants to be a political leader one day. Let's give her and her parents a big welcome to Springfield. Thank you."
- Speaker Crespo: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 226, offered by Representative Ugaste and House Resolution 228, offered by Representative Moeller."
- Speaker Crespo: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution #37, offered by Representative Harris. Be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 28, 2019, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, April 3, 2019 or until the call of the President; and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, March 29, 2019, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 2, 2019 or until the call of the Speaker."
- Speaker Crespo: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Friday, March 29 at the hour of 8:30 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, 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 1474, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 227, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 229, offered by Representative McSweeney. And Senate Joint Resolution 28 offered by Representative Conroy are referred to the Rules Committee. First Reading... Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 72, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 211, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act 219. concerning finance. Senate Bill offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 725, offered by Representative Costa Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1217, offered by Representative Pappas, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1257, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1291, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1411, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1460, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1492, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1526, offered by Representative Gong-Gershowitz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1533, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Senate Bill 1558, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 1572, offered Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Senate Bill 1581, offered by Leader Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1608, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1621, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1630, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1667, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1669, offered by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1670, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 1712, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1724, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1758, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1786, offered by Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1788, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1800, offered by Representative Marron, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1842, offered

33rd Legislative Day

3/28/2019

Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1847, offered by Representative Mah, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2099, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."