59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Scott Porter who is with the Abiding Word Church in Sterling. Reverend Scott Porter is the guest of Representative McCombie. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Porter."

Reverend Porter: "Thank you. I was last here in 1997 at the invitation of Representative Jerry Mitchell. And at that time, the Cubs were on a long losing streak. And I prayed that day that they would win and they did. So, things have turned around. My prayer today is that we get on a winning streak in our state. Amen. Let's pray. Heavenly Father, we thank you today. Yesterday all over this great state we gathered in the cities, the towns, the villages and hamlets to celebrate... to observe Memorial Day. To pay homage to the men and women who have given their all in the service of our country. We thank you, Father, that these men and women showed remarkable courage. They showed remarkable valor in their service, in the giving of their lives. Recently, a Corporal from Sterling where I Pastor, his remains were returned home. He died in Korea back in the '50s. His twin brother had died the same day but his remains were lost. And they were recently returned. And our city came together. Americans, not Democrats and Republicans, but Americans came together to pay homage to Corporal Krebs as he was laid to rest in Calvary Cemetery. Yesterday, on Memorial Day, people all over the state gathered at band shells, in parks, at schools and they

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

paid homage as well. Not as Democrats, or Republicans, or Independents but as Americans. And my prayer, today, Father, is that this great House would come together with great courage to serve the people of this state, from the elderly to the unborn and everyone in between. Father, give us the courage to live out our convictions to the best of our ability with great respect for people of all faiths, creeds, and beliefs. I pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen."

- Speaker Manley: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit 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 Manley: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Welch is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There are no excused absences today. All Democrats are present and ready to work."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Butler is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Sommer is excused today."
- Speaker Manley: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 117 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. The Chair recognizes Representative Kalish. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Kalish: "Thank you, Madam Chair. A point of personal privilege."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Kalish: "I'd like to invite Mrs. Shulamis Kalish to the House Floor, her first visit to the floor. If we could give her a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you for being with us. The Chair recognizes Representative Severin, for what reason do you rise?"

Severin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. For a point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

"So, I have with me today a Page, his name is Henry Severin: Meinert. He actually was with us last year about this time. And he's here again today. He's going to be an eighth grader at the Sesser-Valier Junior High. This guy is quite an interesting young man. He already has two businesses. You guys here that? He's going to be in eighth grade, he has two businesses. He has Henry's Happy Hens. He raises chickens, sells eggs, and he has his own line of apparel that he sells. And he also has the SIL Produce. So, him and a buddy of his they're raising produce in Southern Illinois. And he's in the student council at Sesser-Valier. When he came last year he thought he wanted to be a train engineer. He's changed his mind in the last year, he's going to go into political science. And he also wants to go into agriculture. So, I'd like to ask for a warm welcome to Mr. Henry Meinert. Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you future business owner. The Chair recognizes Representative Greenwood, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the General Assembly. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Greenwood: "I rise to congratulate the East St. Louis Senior High School Boys Track and Field Team for winning the Class 2A State Championship. They did an outstanding job representing the City of East St. Louis. And I wanted to give a shout out to Coach Barry Malloyd and the coaching staff there for their leadership and dedication. Thank you, and congratulations."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. The Chair recognizes Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Personal privilege, please, if you would?"

Speaker Manley: "Please procced."

Bennett: "This morning a Page for the day is Owen Martin. I'm very glad to have him here. He's going to be going into seventh grade at the Eureka Middle School. In his free time he's involved in band, he plays the tenor saxophone. It's a mean saxophone. It's pretty good, I bet you. He also enjoys spending most of his time outdoors exploring nature. And his dad, Jamie, is with us in the gallery. So, if you would please help us give them a warm really warm Springfield welcome, please. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Welcome to Springfield. Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

McCombie: "I'm busy today. These two young gentlemen are here for the second time this year. The first time they came to visit

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

is with Tom Demmer and, unfortunately, we were only in for about an hour. So, today I... I'm introducing Tate Downs and Kenny Boesen. And they just both graduated eighth grade and are going to be freshmen at Newman High School in Sterling. And they are both very interested in... some of you will get a kick out of this... watching Fox News, Ben Shapiro and Louder with Crowder. So, we can all imagine that we are going to see them here in a few years. And be ready to debate because they're practicing right now. Their Grandma, Connie Selmi, have brought them here. And please give them a very, very warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes, with May being Mental Health Month I'd like to just put a little information out here. Studies have been done that show the IQ's of children with autism who participated in early intervention programs, some as young as 12 months of age, had improved by an average of approximately 18 points compared to those toddlers who do not have any early intervention, which showed only a 4 point increase. The carefully structured teaching approach to learning with many learning opportunities embedded in play led to the best results. Parental involvement and use of early intervention strategies at home during routine and daily activities are likely important ingredients of the success of early intervention. Parents and therapists both carried out the intervention towards individual goals for each child and worked collaboratively to improve how the children were responding socially, playing with toys and communities. So we must remember, as we have people out there all across our

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

districts, to be there to help them, to get early help for these children so we can have very productive adults that can function on their own. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 25, Representative... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118."

Speaker Manley: "Do you know how long you need?"

Butler: "At least 59 minutes."

Speaker Manley: "Fifty nine?"

Butler: "At least."

Speaker Manley: "Take 61."

Butler: "We may."

Speaker Manley: "All right. The Republicans will caucus in Room 118. The Democrats will not caucus. And will stand... the House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report, please."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 687, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1702, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1854; recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur to with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 38, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 254."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Willis on the Motion."
- Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In... I move that the posting requirements be waived on the following Bills and be heard in committee this week. In Jud Civil, Senate Bill 220; in Mental Health, Senate Bill 459; in Transportation: Vehicles & Safety, Senate Bill 1786; in Financial Institutions, Senate Bill 1813; in Judicial Crim Senate Bill 2023; and in Higher Education, Senate Joint Resolution 41."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Willis has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. On page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 25, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please roll that Bill back to Second Reading?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 25, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cassidy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Cassidy on the Amendment."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I... the... Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 25 contains the language of the Reproductive Health Act. And I ask that we adopt the Amendment and debate the Bill on Third."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Cassidy moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 on Senate Bill 25. All those in favor say

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Cassidy, Senate Bill 25. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 25, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Since Wade was decided in 1973, efforts to undermine reproductive rights have been constant. We have seen, in recent days and weeks, these attacks have become... have increased dramatically. They are focused and strategic and aimed at undermining our right to bodily autonomy and self-determination. This has peeked recently with now 6 states with limits that are essentially outright bans, with at least 20 cases in the pipeline to the Supreme Court, several of them in our circuit that could trigger challenges to our enjoined laws making... making the risk great to reproductive freedom in Illinois. The Reproductive Health Act repeals the Illinois Abortion Law of 1975 that is mostly enjoined based on federal consent decrees and injunctions. With the new Trump appointees to the Supreme Court and the federal courts across the country, we can no longer rely on bad law protected by federal injunctions. The RHA codifies our existing practices and treats abortion care just like any other health care because, quite frankly, that's what it is. It does this while responding to these attacks on reproductive

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

freedom. This means using the same medical standards, known as accepted standards of clinical practice, for abortion care that we use for other medical care including other types of reproductive care. It updates, codifies Federal Law and case law while creating protections in a post Roe world. grateful to colleagues who have brought concerns suggestions that are reflected in this Amendment to make our intention more clear and make the law stronger. Reproductive health is about the full spectrum of care. The acknowledgement of this fundamental right to access care whether it's preventative care, birth control, fertility treatment, maternity care... which as we've been reminded in recent days we are the only country with rising maternal mortality rates... menopause treatment, the whole spectrum. This is not just about abortion. Make no mistake, it doesn't end here. Our opponents have fought for most of my lifetime to impede access to care, and these efforts have the greatest impact on the most vulnerable populations, notably women of color and the poor. These are traditionally segments of the population without the ability to work around barriers of cost, time, and distance. I believe Illinois is better than that. And the Reproductive Health Act can help us to show that while affording critical protections for vulnerable populations. As attacks escalate around us, Illinois can respond with equal force to defend reproductive freedom. I ask for your support and look forward to your questions."

Speaker Manley: "Members, I'm going to impose a five minute timer but every person who wishes to speak will be recognized. You know I hold you all in the highest regard and I hope that we

59th Legislative Day

- can conduct our debate with respect and keep all that in mind. So, without further delay, the Chair recognizes Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Chair... Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
- Gabel: "Representative, if the Reproductive Health Act becomes law will women be able to have abortions until the end of their pregnancy with no regulations or standards in place?"
- Cassidy: "No, those claims are medically and factually incorrect. The original language of the Bill requires health care providers to provide care based on their professional judgment and training and consistent with accepted standards of clinical practice. This language is consistent with how Illinois generally regulates all medical care. As a result of discussions with several Members, language was added to clarify that abortion care will occur after a fetus is viable only if, in the professional judgment of the attending health care professional, the abortion is necessary to protect the life or the health of the patient."
- Gabel: "Under the Reproductive Health Act when can a doctor perform an abortion?"
- Cassidy: "If the doctor determines that the fetus is viable, the doctor can only provide an abortion if, in the professional judgment of the doctor, the abortion is necessary to protect the life or health of the patient. This is the current standard for viability. A doctor would be permitted to provide abortion care in accordance with their professional judgment and training and based on accepted standards of clinical

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

practice consistent with the scope of their profession. After receiving input from Members, we defined the health of the patient to include all factors which are relevant to the patient's health and well-being, including but not limited to, physical, emotional, psychological, and familial health and age. This definition comes straight from the U.S. Supreme Court precedent in *Doe v. Bolton*."

- Gabel: "Could you tell me what the definition of fetal viability is?"
- Cassidy: "Fetal viability means that in the professional judgment of the attending health care professional, based on the particular facts of the case, there is a significant likelihood of a fetuses sustained survival outside the uterus without the application of extraordinary medical measures."
- Gabel: "Where does the language used in the health of patient definition, including the phrase 'physical, emotional, physiological', come from?"
- Cassidy: "The phrase comes from the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in Doe v. Bolton. In that case the Supreme Court stated, 'We agree with the District Court... that the medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors—physical, emotional, physiological, familial, and the women's agerelevant to the well-being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health. This allows the attending physician the room he needs to make his best medical judgment. And it is room that operates for the benefit, not the disadvantage, of the pregnant woman.' It is also consistent with Illinois decisional law, which says that the life and health of the pregnant woman is the top priority. And that a woman does not

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

forfeit her right to make medical decisions to protect her own health when she becomes pregnant, even if her health care decision has a deleterious impact on the fetus in re Baby... Baby Boy Doe in Ray Baby Brown."

- Gabel: "Does the Reproductive Health Act undermine the Health Care Right of Conscience Act or impose obligations on religious hospitals or insurers that have a conscientious objection to providing reproductive care?"
- Cassidy: "No, the RHA does not change the protections afforded to health care providers under the Health Care Right of Conscience Act. The Illinois Health Care Right of Conscience Act protects health care providers and employers that seek to provide care in accordance with their religious and moral views. This includes being able to refuse to provide particular care to which they have a conscientious... a conscience objection, except in narrow circumstances, as long as they provide the patient with adequate information about the patient's legal treatment options. The protections of the Illinois Health Care Right of Conscience Act will continue to remain in place for any health care providers or institutions that have objections to providing abortion if this Bill becomes law. The Bill states that health care providers 'may' provide abortion care. It ... it does not say that they 'must' provide this care."
- Gabel: "Does the Reproductive Health Act require all health insurance policies, even those purchased by churches, other religious entities, and persons and employers with moral or religious objections to abortions, to cover abortion services?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "No. Our state's existing Health Care Right of Conscience Act already provides protections for those with moral or religious objections, including permitting insurance companies and other health care payers to opt out of coverage for any health care service to which they have a documented conscience-based objection. This is the same way that contraceptive coverage requirements are handled for entities with conscience-based objections. Regardless, the Bill was amended with language to clarify this point. I understand that some Members have received calls and letters from various institutions or companies claiming that their insurance providers are not asking whether the employer has a conscience objection to providing coverage for services such abortion. The Health Care Right of Conscience Act provides that any health care payer, including an employer paying for health care, has a right to opt out of the coverage mandate. A 'health care payer' is defined as a health maintenance organization, insurance company, management organization, or any other entity that pays for or arranges for the payment of any health care or medical care service, procedure, or product. The language covers any company purchasing insurance, not just those who are self-insured. For purposes of legislative intent, the language of Senate Bill 25, as amended by House Amendment 1, makes it abundantly clear that the intent of the language in this Bill is to require an insurance company to offer a health care product but not to interfere with the right of the entity purchasing the health care policy to refuse to provide coverage for abortion care."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gabel, your time has expired.

  Chair recognizes Representative Mussman, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Mussman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to dedicate my time to Robyn Gable to complete the line of questioning."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gabel for five minutes."
- Gabel: "Thank you. Why is it important for the Reproductive Health

  Act to include language stating that fertilized eggs,

  embryos, and fetuses do not have independent rights?"
- "This language reflects the current status of the law. Under Illinois law eggs, embryos, and fetuses do not have independent rights. In 1998, the Illinois Supreme Court held in Stallman v. Youngquist that a fertilized egg, embryo, or fetus cannot have independent legal rights or else a pregnant woman and her child would be cast as 'adversaries from the moment of conception until birth.' This would create untenable intrusions into every aspect of the day-to-day lives of pregnant women in our state. It would also undermine women's health by preventing health care professionals from making the decisions that they are... that they believe are best for their pregnant patients. With maternal mortality and morbidity still unacceptably high in our state, particularly for black women, it is crucial that our state... that our law states that the health of pregnant patients must be paramount. The Reproductive Health Act simply incorporates this long recognized principle so that women are supported in their ability to make the best decisions for themselves, their health and well-being throughout pregnancy."

59th Legislative Day

- Gabel: "The definitions of health of the patient means all factors that are relevant to the patient's health and well-being, including but not limited to physical, emotional, physiological, and familial health and age. Why that language?"
- Cassidy: "That is the specific legal phrase used by the Supreme Court in Doe v. Bolton. In that case the court stated, 'We agree with the District Court... that the medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors—physical, emotional, physiological, familial, and the women's age—relevant to the well-being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health. This allows the attending physician the room he needs to make his best medical judgment. And it is room that operates for the benefit, not the disadvantage, of the pregnant woman.' And that's from Doe v. Bolton. Using language that has already been vetted and approved by the U.S. Supreme Court is very important. This language is also cited as precedent in Colautti v. Franklin, which is 439 U.S. 379 and 390."
- Gabel: "Well, thank you for your answer to these questions... oh wait, sorry. I just have a couple more. Does the Reproductive Health Act change current law that allows a person to be convicted for harming an unborn fetus?"
- Cassidy: "No, it does not. The Bill does not change the current laws that allow for prosecution of third parties who commit criminal acts against a pregnant person or allow parents of the unborn who may want to bring a civil action under the Wrongful Death Act. These laws are based on the actions against the pregnant woman and the rights of the parent. None

59th Legislative Day

- of these laws establish or grant independent rights to fertilized eggs, embryos, or the unborn."
- Gabel: "Will the Reproductive Health Act now allow partial birth abortions to be performed in Illinois?"
- Cassidy: "No. The Federal Law banning partial birth abortion remains in place. The Federal Law prohibits partial birth abortion except where necessary to save the life of the mother, 18 U.S.C. 1531 upheld in *Gonzales v. Carhart*, 550 U.S. 124 from 2007. Although Illinois State Law appears to have a ban on partial birth abortion in the books, the Illinois Law is not in effect because it has already been blocked by a Federal Court in *Hope Clinic v. Ryan*."
- Gabel: "Does the Reproductive Health Act mean that health care professionals, other than doctors, will be able to perform procedural abortions?"
- Cassidy: "No. The RHA codifies current law under which only physicians may perform procedural abortions. Advanced practice clinicians, APCs, such as physician assistants may assist but may not independently perform an abortion procedure."
- Gabel: "Does the Bill change any of the current reporting requirements related to abortion services?"
- Cassidy: "No. The RHA does require abortion data to be reported to the Illinois Department of Public Health consistent with the current public health reporting practices in the state. The Department will continue to collect and publically report data it collects, including the number of abortions performed each year."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Gabel: "Well, thank you for your answer to these questions. I think you have made it abundantly clear that the purpose of this Bill is to codify what's currently in practice in Illinois and nothing more. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I would like to request a verification should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Manley: "Your verify... your request for verification has been acknowledged."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

"Thank you. This is, as everyone in the chamber knows, Bourne: one of the most important Bills we will discuss and debate this Session. And I'd like to, first of all, say that we have a lot of questions on our side of the aisle that we thought were not answered in committee and certainly some things that we would like to bring out in the debate for legislative intent of what the text of this Bill means. On be... on behalf of our Caucus I would... I would like to first say that I appreciate the opportunity to have Unlimited Debate and I hope that we are respectful in this debate because I think the importance of this rises to that level. My first question, I appreciate the previous questions but still I think some of the answers lack the specificity that we need to be putting this into our law. To be clear, do you have a definition of a fundamental right?"

Cassidy: "I do. I'm sorry. Is it possible to pause the timer on her?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "I don't think we're going to have a problem with the timer..."

Cassidy: "Okay, cool. Thanks."

Speaker Manley: "...today. Take your time."

Bourne: "I could ask my next question if you want to find that."

Cassidy: "That's fine."

- Bourne: "You mentioned previously that in our current statute, in our current practice I should say, that unborn babies have no independent rights and that this would codify our current practice. However, in our current statute there are protections for unborn babies who are harmed in the womb. How do you rectify those two differences in our statute?"
- Cassidy: "As I said earlier, these laws are based on the actions against the pregnant women and the rights of the parent, none of these laws establish or grant independent rights to fertilized eggs, embryos, or the unborn."
- Bourne: "So, your interpretation is that, in practice, if a baby is killed before they are born they have no independent rights outside of the fact that the mother was also harmed?"
- Cassidy: "The laws are based on the actions against the pregnant woman or the rights of the parent."
- Bourne: "Okay. In our current statute it does talk about unborn babies being harmed though, so there is a difference between the woman and the baby she's carrying, correct?"
- Cassidy: "These laws are based on the actions against the pregnant woman or the rights of the parent."
- Bourne: "Okay. Do you have the definition of a fundamental right?" Cassidy: "In the... in the Bill itself it is described as the

ability to make autonomous decisions about the individuals

59th Legislative Day

- own reproductive health. Other places this... this exists is freedom of religion."
- Bourne: "So, we're talking about... on our list of what a fundamental right is things like equality and freedom rise to this level. In this Bill is it your intention to make it also a fundamental right, which is subject to strict scrutiny as a legal standard, that you are making the right to an abortion rise to that exact same level?"
- Cassidy: "We are saying that this grants a person the fundamental right to make autonomous decisions about the individuals own reproductive health."
- Bourne: "Is there an age limit to a fundamental right?"
- Cassidy: "As I said earlier, the language reflects the current status of the law. Under current Illinois law, eggs, embryos, and fetuses do not have independent rights. I'm happy to reread the citation from Stallman..."
- Bourne: "Oh no, I'm talking about... do you have a fundamental right if you're eight? Do you have a fundamental right if you're 98? When does a fundamental right begin and when does it end? This includes equality, freedom, the others."
- Cassidy: "Rights apply post-birth. For example, freedom of religion is a right after birth. Voting rights happen long after a person is born. Voting is after 18."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne, your time has expired.

  Representative Swanson, would you like to yield your time?

  Representative Bourne for five minutes."
- Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, my question... so you would say a 12 year old have a fundamental right under this... if this were to pass, a 12 year old has a fundamental right to

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

an abortion? You just said, rights begin at birth, end at death."

Cassidy: "In Illinois... Illinois law has the Parental Notice of Abortion Act on the books currently."

Bourne: "Do you believe that a fundamental right, which is subject to strict scrutiny as a legal standard, would trump the Parental Notification Act that we have on the books?"

Cassidy: "Can you say that one more time?"

Bourne: "Sure. A 12 year old who is seeking to get an abortion under your Bill, today, would have a fundamental right to that? You've just talked about what a fundamental right means. It is subject to strict scrutiny. It rises above other things. Do you believe that under this statute if abortion were a fundamental right for anyone birth to death, as you just said, would that trump the Parental Notification Act that we already have?"

Cassidy: "This Bill does not impact the Parental Notification Act as it's written in our books currently. That said..."

Bourne: "So, I..."

Cassidy: "...that said, she has... she would have the right to carry the pregnancy to term, she would have the right to an abortion but the Parental Notification Act of... that's on our books is not impacted by the passage of the RHA."

Bourne: "I understand that nothing in the statute takes out anything from the Parental Notification Act. However, if she were seeking an abortion, her parents did not give consent, her right to..."

Cassidy: "We do not require consent under the Parental Notice of Abortion Act."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bourne: "What do we require?"

Cassidy: "Notification with a judicial bypass."

Bourne: "Do we... does she have to notify her parents under this?"

Cassidy: "This Bill does not change the Parental Notice of Abortion Act."

Bourne: "Under this Bill with the bypass, they can go to court if their parents do not..."

Cassidy: "This Bill does not impact that at all."

Bourne: "I know that it doesn't in statute. In practice, will they still... will a minor who is seeking an abortion still have to go to court if her parents object?"

Cassidy: "This Bill does not change the requirements under the Parental Notice of Abortion Act."

Bourne: "Okay. It is our interpretation that a fundamental right to an abortion will absolutely trump our Parental Consent Act, which requires a minor to go to court currently. That will not have to occur under this Bill, in practice. We've talked extensively about this Bill for the last few months but there are a few different definitions that we've seen recently, so I'd like to turn to those. If you could look at the definition of life and health of the mother and the changes that we are making in this Bill compared to what there was previously. Can you define, for me, anything that would be more expansive than what is specifically defined in the health of the patient? So, currently it says, in your Bill, 'Health of the patient means all factors that are relevant to the patient's health and well-being, included, but not limited to, physical, emotional, psychological, and familial

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

health and age.' Can you give me any examples of what but not limited to means?"

Cassidy: "This language is the specific legal phrase used by the Supreme Court in Doe v. Bolton. In that cast the court stated, 'We agree with the District Court that the medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors—physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the women's agerelevant to the well-being of the patient. All these factors may relate to health. This allows the attending physician the room he needs to make his best medical judgment. And it is room that operates for the benefit, not the disadvantage, of the pregnant woman.'"

Bourne: "Yes, this language showed up in 1973. If it's been applied since then, can you give me specific examples of what but not limited to means?"

Cassidy: "No."

Bourne: "We're putting this in statute. I think it's very important, for legislative intent, that we know what but not limited to means. Because I think..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne, excuse me. Representative Meier, do you wish to offer your time to Representative Bourne? Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "Thank you. Because there are many concerns that changing to this definition of the health of the patient is already overly broad. And not only is it overly broad in the specific factors that it gives, it opens it up to anything else. So, let's move to the specific factors. Could you define for me what familial health means?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "All of the factors are there, based on Supreme Court language, to allow a physician to make a decision within the accepted standards of clinical practice."

Bourne: "To give this a little bit of context, when we're talking about the health of the patient, this is what is allowable for a post-viability abortion these factors have to be met and they are overly broad. Could familial health mean anything outside of the mother and her baby? Could it mean her other children, her spouse, live in parents? What... how broad can that be?"

Cassidy: "A doctor in consultation with the patient..."

Bourne: "Do you think the doctor..."

Cassidy: "...based on the factors in front of the patient... in front of the physician, will make the decision based on the accepted standards of clinical care."

Bourne: "Do you think that the doctor would benefit from having legislative intent when they're looking at this statute to figure out what those factors should be? Should they be looking at the other children in the household? Should they be looking at the spouse's health? Should they be looking at any of these other factors? How broad do we intend for this to be?"

Cassidy: "A doctor will make a decision based on the accepted standards of medical care."

Bourne: "Could you give me any parameters that we're asking this doctor to make..."

Cassidy: "I am not a doctor..."

Bourne: "...this decision within?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "...doctors decide and doctors decide based on the accepted standards of clinical care."

Bourne: "Okay. Could you define for me what age would be... would be a factor for this? We're talking about..."

Cassidy: "That would depend on the accepted standards of medical care."

Bourne: "Okay. This definition is extremely broad for health of the patient. We are talking about... we heard in committee that current practice, when you are looking at whether or not you can perform a post-viability abortion, we heard that current practice, under the current statute that we have that would only be allowed if a patient is in the act of dying. This definition is much more broad than a patient being in the act of dying in order to justify a post-viability abortion. It doesn't say life and health, it says these factors, including but not limited to, physical, emotional, physiological, familial health... which we still have no idea how broad that is... and age. Age alone can be a determining factor. I'd like to move to the next definition that was changed in the most recent Amendment, which is viability. Could you explain the differences in what viability will mean now versus what it means under our current statute? Let me read what viability means now. Under our current law viability means, that stage of fetal development when, in the medical judgment... we leave medical judgment in our current definition... of the attending physician based on the particular facts of the case before him, there is reasonable likelihood of sustained survival of the fetus outside of the womb, with or without artificial support. Under this Bill that we are debating, fetal viability

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

means in the professional judgment of the attending health care professional, based on the particular facts of the case, there is a significant likelihood of a fetuses' sustained survival outside of the uterus without the application of extraordinary medical measures. Those seem very different to me. Can you tell me the intention behind that change?"

Cassidy: "Health care providers are... need to provide care based on their professional judgment and training and consistent with accepted standards of clinical practice. This is consistent with how Illinois generally regulates all medical care."

Bourne: "But the difference..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne, pardon me. Representative Bailey, would you like to give your time to Representative... thank you. Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "Thank you. But the difference here... we already have in our current statute that it has to be up to a physician's best judgment. That's in our statute now. Why the difference between 'with or without artificial support they are deemed viable' to 'without the application of extraordinary medical measures'?"

Cassidy: "The language recognizes the physician's judgment to assess and apply accepted standards of clinical practice."

Bourne: "Could you explain for me what an extraordinary medical measure could include?"

Cassidy: "I'm not a doctor."

Bourne: "We heard a few definitions in committee then, so I'll go... move to that. We heard in committee that having to fly a baby to a NICU unit could be considered extraordinary medical

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

measures. We heard that surgeries could be considered extraordinary medical measures. That means, in practice... now under our current law it says, 'with or without artificial support.' So, they could know that the baby has a hole in its heart, you could see that in the ultrasound before they're born, and they could still be considered viable because it would be with or without artificial support."

Cassidy: "If you'd like I have some definitions as well."

Bourne: "Okay. Go for it."

Cassidy: "Extraordinary treatment is, 'Treatment or care that does not offer a reasonable hope or benefit to the patient, or which cannot be accomplished without excessive pain, expense, or other great burden; extraordinary treatment is an ethical determination about rendering care depending on the patient's condition and prognosis.' That's the McGraw-Hill Concise Dictionary of Modern Medicine from 2002. From the Duhaime Law Dictionary, 'Extraordinary life-sustaining treatment is defined as any medical procedure or measure which, when administered to a terminally ill patient, will only prolong the process of dying when death is imminent, but excludes palliative care. Examples are ventilators to take over natural breathing or cardiopulmonary resuscitation to keep the heart beating where such treatment would only serve to postpone the moment of death. However, dialysis, resuscitation, blood transfusions, or tube feeding will not normally fall within the definition but... measures which could be considered ordinary in the case of a curable patient could be extraordinary in the context of a terminally ill patient.'"

Bourne: "Is that in the statute?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "Those are the definitions of extraordinary life sustaining treatment."

Bourne: "So, that is a different definition than the word we have in statute which is medical measures. Lifesaving treatment is very different than a medical measure. Many of us go and get medical measures done all of the time that are not lifesaving treatments. And part of that definition was without excessive burden. So again, to the definition... you just said you're not a doctor so I'll defer to the doctor's definition in committee, flying a baby to a NICU could be considered an extraordinary medical measure. A surgery could be determined to be an extraordinary medical measure. Both of those things you could determine via ultrasound before the baby is born. Under our current statute that could mean that they would be determined viable because they could still survive with or without artificial support. Under this new definition that means that if a baby is 36 weeks, has a hole in their heart, you know that they're going to need surgery, which by the doctor's definition in committee would be an extraordinary medical measure..."

Cassidy: "Actually, she said that wouldn't necessarily be but she would use her... the accepted standards of clinical care to make a determination, just as any doctor will."

Bourne: "Okay. Then let's go with the flying to a NICU example. You see that the baby is growth inhibited, you know that they will have to be flown to a NICU based on the geography in the state, that means that that baby could be 36, 37, 38 weeks in utero. You would know they have to be flown to a NICU, so that baby could be determined to never be viable until birth

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

under this definition. That is how much more expansive this definition is versus the definition that we currently have in statute."

Cassidy: "These are decisions doctors make all the time for all kinds of health care. We are not doctors."

Bourne: "But this broadens their ability to make that decision.

I'd like to move..."

Cassidy: "We... we cannot and should not be arguing hypotheticals.

Lawmakers are not doctors. Doctors need to use the accepted standards of clinical care to make their decisions, to make the best decision for the patients in front of them."

Bourne: "I think it's very important for this Body to know exactly how this will be happening, in practice, in abortion facilities across..."

Cassidy: "The language is clear..."

Bourne: "...the state."

Cassidy: "...it does not broaden what decisions a doctor can make."

Bourne: "It very much so does. It changes the definitions to be much more broad. I'd like to move to that... to the doctor's decision making..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne, pardon me. Representative Butler, would you like to offer your time to Representative Bourne?"

Butler: "I yield my time to Representative Bourne."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "I'd like to move to that doctor's decision making. Could you explain... I know we covered this in committee but I think it would be helpful for the Body. Could you explain what

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

information is reported on abortions that occur in this state? What information do we ask when an abortion is provided?"

Cassidy: "The RHA requires abortion data to be reported to the Illinois Department of Public Health consistent with current public health reporting practices in this state. The Department will continue to collect and publicly report the data it collects including the number of abortions performed each year."

Bourne: "Right. So, current..."

Cassidy: "Nothing will change in this Bill..."

Bourne: "Right."

Cassidy: "...from our current law."

Bourne: "Right. So, currently we do not ask a woman why she is receiving an abortion, moving forward we will not. Do we ask doctors why they approved a post-viability abortion?"

Cassidy: "Do we ask doctors why they decided how many heart bypasses were required?"

Bourne: "So the answer is, no. We do not ask doctors why they determined..."

Cassidy: "We ask... we require doctors to operate within the accepted standards of clinical care."

Bourne: "Okay. Do we ask why they determined..."

Cassidy: "The age... the number, the age of the mother, and viability age will still be reported. We will not and will never ask why."

Bourne: "The viability age is reported?"

Cassidy: "Under current law, yes."

Bourne: "So, we will... we know how many abortions happen at 22 weeks?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "Yes, we do."

Bourne: "Okay. And we will continue to do that?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Bourne: "Do we ask why a doctor determined that the baby was or was not viable?"

Cassidy: "Do we ask a doctor why he chose to do two bypasses instead of three? Do we ask a doctor why he chose a particular antibiotic over a different one?"

Bourne: "We are placing restrictions on their decision making ability."

Cassidy: "We restrict doctors to operating within the accepted standards of medical care."

Bourne: "So, if a woman going in for an abortion is at 26 weeks we will have no knowledge, as a Body, of whether or not these expansive new definitions of viability, we will have no idea how they are interpreting familial health. We will have no idea how they are interpreting age. We are leaving this..."

Cassidy: "We are requiring doctors to operate..."

Bourne: "...overly broad."

Cassidy: "...within accepted standards of medical care, just as we always have."

Bourne: "So..."

Cassidy: "Do we ask a doctor why they choose to deliver a baby before or after a due date? Nothing changes under current law."

Bourne: "Yes. But my question is, we are expanding this definition. I think it is important for Members of this Body to know how this definition is going to happen in practice.

And if we have no way of knowing how that is being

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

interpreted, how will we know if this is expanding it? We have no way of knowing if they're interpreting familial health to be that their uncle needs a kidney. Right? We have no way of knowing if they say three children is enough for your family, for your familial health, this abortion post-viability is okay."

Cassidy: "We are requiring doctors to operate under accepted standards of clinical care."

Bourne: "So, that could happen?"

Cassidy: "We require doctors to operate under accepted standards of medical care."

Bourne: "And we will have no way of knowing if the baby is never determined to be viable because via ultrasound they can tell that they will need to fly to a NICU. We will not know if that's why they were determined to not be viable."

Cassidy: "What you are saying is the current law. The hypotheticals you're proposing are the same for abortion or a kidney transplant."

Bourne: "That's not true because we have a different definition now."

Cassidy: "We don't know that now. It is between a woman and her doctor. It's that simple."

Bourne: "Okay. Moving on. The doctor that is making this determination is also the one who can be performing the abortion procedure, correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Bourne: "So, would it make sense that they have... if their practice is solely performing abortions does it make sense that they

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

would have an incentive to find a reason to perform an abortion..."

Cassidy: "We require the doctors..."

Bourne: "...with expansive..."

Cassidy: "...operate under accepted standards of clinical care."

Bourne: "Could you define accepted standards of medical care in this instance then?"

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne, excuse me. Your time has expired. Representative Murphy, do you wish to offer your time to Representative Bourne?"

Murphy: "I yield my time to Representative Bourne."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "Thank you. In this instance they have... their sole practice is performing abortions. A woman comes to them, they're kind of in the gray area. I'm not sure if you've reached viability, I'm not sure how we're going to handle this. What is the accepted standard of medical care for them to make that decision? Because these definitions seem overly broad. And I am certain that most doctors, if their incentive is to perform an abortion, would be able to find some kind of loophole here to figure that out. Oh and by the way, they don't have to report to anyone why they made the decision that they did."

Cassidy: "There are numerous standards and I leave that to the medical community's judgment."

Bourne: "So, as a Legislature we have no idea what that means.

Because you keep saying accepted standards..."

Cassidy: "Because we require doctors..."

Bourne: "...of medical practice."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Cassidy: "...who are regulated by that very principle of utilizing accepted standards of medical care, whether we're talking about abortion or any other health care."
- Bourne: "I'd like to talk briefly about... well actually, can you give me an example of what restrictions will still be in place on abortions after this law is passed? Can you give me an example?"
- Cassidy: "This Bill codifies our current practice in the State of Illinois."
- Bourne: "We heard from the doctor in committee that actually that's different. The standards for viability and the standard for a woman's health and safety have been changed. They have been broadened. It's an exemption so big you can drive a truck through it."

Cassidy: "All of the..."

Bourne: "Yet, you're saying that it's the same."

Cassidy: "Everything is in place now. And that's not what she said."

- Bourne: "No, that was my interpretation of her examples of what an extraordinary medical... medical procedure is and the familial health and age expansion of..."
- Cassidy: "I'm also going to guess that you're going to realize that you heard that we said that they had to conform to accepted standards of medical care."

Bourne: "Yes. Do you have a definition for that in this instance?"

Cassidy: "That is a doctor's decision making within the accepted standards of medical care."

Bourne: "Okay."

Cassidy: "I am not a doctor."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bourne: "Can you..."

Cassidy: "And neither are you."

Bourne: "Correct. Which is why I think it's important. Very few of us in this chamber have specific expertise as doctors in this area, which is why parsing through the language and talking about legislative intent is so important. Because we don't have this background and we need to know exactly what we are putting in our statutes."

Cassidy: "Nothing is changing under our current practice."

Bourne: "What oversight or standards are their going to be for abortion providers who will now not be licensed as ambulatory surgical treatment centers?"

Cassidy: "They aren't currently under those standards. That law was enjoined."

Bourne: "So how are they going to be licensed now?"

Cassidy: "Doctors are overseen, like all other licensed professionals, by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. It stays the same."

Bourne: "But the clinics and facilities, that's my question?"

Cassidy: "It stays the same. We don't change it. The licensing structure doesn't change."

Bourne: "Then could you explain to the Body how they're licensed currently?"

Cassidy: "That's not addressed in this Bill. The licensing structure doesn't change."

Bourne: "But the way they do it now, could you explain that?"

Cassidy: "The licensing structure doesn't change and it's not addressed in this Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bourne: "Okay. So there are no rights or criminal actions that can be taken... criminal or civil actions that can be taken if a woman chooses to have an abortion and the father does not believe that that should be the case? Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Nothing changes the criminal or civil law."

Bourne: "There's nothing that's changing under criminal or civil law if the mother seeks an abortion and the father does not agree with it?"

Cassidy: "That is also enjoined. Current practice."

Bourne: "Okay."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne, excuse me. Your time has expired. Representative Frese, do you wish to offer your time to Representative Bourne?"

Frese: "I do, Madam Chairman."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "There are a lot of provisions in this Bill that are being repealed and some of them have been enjoined, some of them have not. Why are we repealing the prohibition on sexselective abortions? To be clear, I know that it's been enjoined for criminal penalties for the physician, but do we not still have an interest in making sure that women are not choosing to abort their babies based on their gender?"

Cassidy: "Nothing about the RHA will change our current practice."

Bourne: "Why are we repealing that? Is it not important to this Body..."

Cassidy: "We are codifying current practice."

Bourne: "Could you give me some insight into why you're doing some of these things? Current practice doesn't..."

Cassidy: "Because we are codifying current practice."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bourne: "Current practice does not necessarily mean that that it the legislative intent of what is in the law. It does not mean that that..."

Cassidy: "The legislative intent today..."

Bourne: "...is what we..."

Cassidy: "...is to codify current practice."

Bourne: "It does not mean that that is what's in the best interest of the citizens of Illinois. And it does not mean that that is what the will of this Body is. So I'm asking you why would we take it out?"

Cassidy: "To codify current practice."

Bourne: "So, it's your belief that we should not prohibit sex selective abortions?"

Cassidy: "Say again?"

Bourne: "It is your belief that we should not prohibit sex selective abortions?"

Cassidy: "My intention, today, is to pass a Bill that codifies current practice."

Bourne: "So you are taking out the prohibition on sex-selective abortions? And you think that is the appropriate thing for the state to do?"

Cassidy: "I believe it is appropriate to codify current practice."

Bourne: "Okay. Could you give me a reason as to why you think this is not current practice? If a woman goes in, gets an ultrasound, they say, congratulations it's a boy. And then she says, I want an abortion, I don't want to have a boy. That is currently allowed?"

Cassidy: "We are codifying current practice."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bourne: "Okay. I was really hoping for some better debate here because I think the people of Illinois deserve to know why these provisions are being repealed. What is the intention? How do we want our laws to reflect our values in this state? Why take out any rights... or I should say, why are we repealing the section that parents are not liable for the expenses of the abortion if their child had it performed without their consent?"

Cassidy: "We are codifying current practice."

Bourne: "How is that current practice, Representative?"

Cassidy: "I believe that's one of the enjoined statutes, isn't it?"

Bourne: "That's not what our notes say. So, currently under statute a minor child goes, gets an abortion. Her parents, if they did not consent to that, cannot be held liable for the expenses of that abortion. Under this piece of legislation the parents could have to pay for the abortion their daughter had even though it happened without their consent?"

Cassidy: "Treating abortion care like other care. Not saying that they have to pay. We're removing the bar similar to any other health care."

Bourne: "So, you think it is appropriate for us, in statute, to allow parents to be held liable for the expenses of an abortion procedure that they objected to?"

Cassidy: "I am saying that this is treating abortion care like any other health care."

Bourne: "You're doing the same thing for the spouse. You think it is appropriate for a spouse to have to pay for an abortion that their spouse received against their wishes?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "The law is to allow a woman, in consultation with her physician, to make the decision. It's not appropriate for us to say they're also... that they're not."

Bourne: "No, my question is not who's making the decision. My question is, who's paying for it? The husband could have to pay for the wife's abortion even though he objected to it under this statute."

Cassidy: "This treats abortion like any other health care."

Bourne: "This is unbelievable."

Cassidy: "We're removing the barriers similar... similar to there being no barrier..."

Bourne: "You're removing the barriers..."

Cassidy: "...on who pays for a delivery."

Bourne: "You're removing the barriers by making someone else pay for it who objected to that person getting an abortion."

Cassidy: "We're treating this..."

Speaker Manley: "Excuse me, Representative Bourne..."

Cassidy: "...like any other health care procedure."

Speaker Manley: "Excuse me. Representative McDermed, would you like to offer your time to Representative Bourne?"

McDermed: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "Why are we removing the requirement for a coroner to investigate a maternal death due to an abortion?"

Cassidy: "They have the ability under the law to investigate."

Bourne: "They have the ability under your legislation, but under current statute they have the requirement. Why are we making..."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "We're retaining that ability. To my knowledge, there's no requirement for... that a coroner report for when a woman dies after giving birth."

Bourne: "This is... should we not require that if a woman dies during an abortion the coroner has to investigate? If this is about the health of the mother, why are we not requiring an investigation?"

Cassidy: "An investigation is allowed."

Bourne: "It's allowed but it is not required."

Cassidy: "This doesn't change current reporting requirements."

Bourne: "We're not talking about reporting requirements.

Currently, under statute, county coroners are required to investigate maternal deaths due to an abortion. If this law passes, that does not become a requirement, it is simply allowed."

Cassidy: "This treats abortion like any other health care. It doesn't bar it, it just doesn't require it. The same for deaths after a woman gives birth."

Bourne: "But we are taking the requirement out of statute."

Cassidy: "It treats abortion care like any other health care."

Bourne: "You are leaving the requirement for a death due to a sex crime, that a coroner investigates those deaths. If we're doing this the same as any other case, that it is simply allowed but not required, why strengthen one and take out the requirement for the other?"

Cassidy: "This treats abortion care like any other health care.

No other medical procedure requires an investigation. You're referring to a criminal action, this is not a criminal action."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bourne: "It could be."

Cassidy: "This treats abortion care like any other health care."

Bourne: "If a woman dies during an abortion there absolutely could have been a crime committed."

Cassidy: "And this treats abortion care like any other health care. No other medical procedure requires an investigation."

Bourne: "We have a coroner in the house who says that it is required for other medical procedures, yet, it is not for abortion."

Cassidy: "The coroner can investigate if the..."

Bourne: "Why take that out?"

Cassidy: "...police thought there was a crime. This treats abortion care like any other health care."

Bourne: "It's actually selecting it out, I would say. To the Bill. We hear a lot of really personal and emotional stories from the other side of the aisle on why this is so important to them. Whether or not this passes, abortion remains legal in Illinois. It remains legal, really, with broader legality than many, many other states where abortion is legal. This is a broad expansion. Not only does it repeal important provisions that put in statute what we value as a state, like protecting the women who die during an abortion. Like protecting the rights that if parents object to their child's abortion they don't have to pay for it. It takes out measures that we have legislated over the years because we think it's important to stand up for the people who are impacted. More than that, we are not requiring that this Legislature will ever know how this Bill is being interpreted. As I said earlier, we are talking about extensive changes in what it

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

means for a fetal to be viable and what it means for the health of the patient to determine post-viability abortions. This Bill will mean that if a baby requires extraordinary medical measures after they're born doctors could determine up to the fortieth week of pregnancy that that baby was never viable because it had to flown to the NICU after it was born. This Bill means that if the baby is viable a doctor can determine that the post-viable abortion can still take place based on a number of factors that include familial health and the age of the woman. Familial health, by the way, we still haven't gotten any kind of definition for. That could take on a broad range of applicability. This Bill will mean that for a woman at my stage in pregnancy, where the baby responds to his dad's voice as he reads him books at night, the woman could go to the facility, the baby is perfectly healthy, but if that woman says based on my familial health this is medically necessary, that is allowed. We are talking about the most expansive Bill we have seen in this state and across... one of the most expansive across the country. We already know we've got women coming to Illinois to have abortions because we are so expansive on this issue. That will continue. This Bill is not about keeping abortion legal in Illinois. This is about a massive expansion that will impact viable babies, and that is wrong. I would ask you all to please vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Moeller for five minutes."

Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I think we can all agree that this is an issue that people of good conscience can have differing opinions on. And that this is a Bill... this

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

is an issue that weighs heavily for people of all walks of life. But I think it's... it's incredibly important to clarify and make plain that this Bill does not expand or change in Illinois. This Bill practice characterized as extreme. This is a scare tactic that is being the opposition to rationalize and criminalizing access to abortion in our state, and reversing 40 years of access to women's reproductive health care in Illinois. This isn't about opposition to new practices, this is about opposition to a fundamental right to access to safe abortions in Illinois. All this Bill does is codify existing case law and maintain the status quo. We know that Roe v. Wade is in serious jeopardy of being overturned in our country. Just in the last few months we've had nine states essentially ban access to abortion, and many even in the cases of rape and incest. We know that Roe is going to fall. If we don't pass this Bill women in Illinois will no longer have access to abortion care. It will be incredibly difficult. And victims of rape and incest, women who live in low income communities, women who live in rural areas will find it nearly impossible to have access to reproductive health care in our state. The Representative's line of questioning makes it clear that we can't trust... the opposition doesn't trust women and it doesn't trust doctors or our medical professionals to make ethical, deliberate, and compassionate decisions when it comes to women's health care. And I find that offensive and disturbing. That a healthy woman, with a healthy child, after 23 weeks of pregnancy would make the decision to abort her child. That doesn't happen. And if this Bill passes, that

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

will continue to not happen. We need to trust women to take care of their own bodies. We need to trust women to make compassionate decisions about their families, their financial situation, the impact that a pregnancy and a child will have on their lives. We need to trust women that they will make the decisions that are right for themselves. We already do that. Let's continue to trust women in Illinois to make these decisions for themselves and their families. We know that in... there are cases where having to choose to terminate is the most compassionate decision. I've had this happen in my family where a... the fetus, the baby, had severe abnormalities. And to bring that child into the world would have been... would have created pain and misery and suffering for the child and for... and for the family. That was a decision made very deliberately and with a lot of angst and pain. But it was a decision that was left to my sister, her doctors, and our family. We need to keep that ability to make those decisions legal in Illinois. Please support this Bill."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ann Williams for five minutes."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. The decision of whether or not to bear a child is central to a woman's life, well-being, and dignity. When the government makes the decision for her, she is being treated as less than a full adult human being responsible for her own choices. Now those are the words of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, but I and many women, feel them to our very core. Today, rather than allowing the autonomy of women to hang in the balance, depending on the political whims and the latest appointment to the Supreme

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Court, we in Illinois are establishing an affirmative right for women to access safe and legal abortion. We are sending a clear message to women of Illinois that we value you and we value your identity and the ability to make your own choices and control your own destiny. Unfortunately, many states are going in the opposite direction. In 2019 alone we saw the following states enact bans or severe restrictions abortion. They include Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Ohio, Utah, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Missouri. A note, today it was reported that the last abortion clinic in Missouri will not be able to renew its license. The reality is that in these states abortion rates will rise. Global statistics show that the rate of abortion decreases when women have access to a full array of reproductive health care. The opposite happens when abortions are restricted and banned. Abortions are then driven underground and the women with the least resources are most at risk. The book, The Handmaid's Tale, portrays a dystopian world where women are treated like little more than wombs, vessels for giving birth. The handmaid's, who have stood vigil for months in the Illinois Legislature, symbolize the efforts to make abortion illegal and all reproductive health care obsolete and inaccessible to women. The wave of efforts to ban abortions sweeping the country are dangerous and deliberate and women are living in fear. We deserve to control our bodies and our lives. Later in pregnancy women deserve to be able to preserve their health and fertility and handle the devastating loss of a pregnancy in the best way for them, their families, in consultation with their doctors. Why do we, as politicians, feel in any

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

way qualified to make these very personal decisions for women and their families? Why are we even discussing what happens in the late stages of pregnancy? How to handle high risk pregnancies, miscarriages, et cetera? None of us have the medical training to do so or any experience in dealing with these complex medical issues. So why are we weighing in? Over the past several weeks we have watched the anti-choice extremists use inflammatory rhetoric designed to mislead regarding so many components of this Bill. The right of conscience, where abortions can be performed, who can perform abortions. This Bill only permits abortions within acceptable medical practice, as you heard our Sponsor say over and over again. And folks, the myth of the elect... the elective socalled late term abortion is just that. It is not based on the reality of obstetrical care. It does not reflect what happens later in pregnancy when things go terribly wrong with a wanted and planned pregnancy. The opponents who spoke against this Bill in committee have no medical experience, they're from religious organizations. They don't have the right to speak for me or millions of women in Illinois. And they certainly don't have the right to advise any of us on the way to handle our own health care. But that's exactly what's happening throughout the country. I truly believe it's a matter of when and not if Roe v. Wade is overturned. This Bill is in large part about that. It's about ensuring that Illinois women have access to safe and legal abortion. But this Bill is about so much more. It's about establishing an unequivocal foundational ability of women to control their bodies, their health care, and their lives. Don't' we want

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

that for our mothers, our wives, our sisters, and our daughters? I just can't imagine in... living in a world with anything less. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative DeLuca for five minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

DeLuca: "First, I want to acknowledge Representative Bourne. I thought you did a beautiful job, Representative, and I wish you all the best on your pregnancy. Representative Cassidy, some of this is redundant. These are the main concerns of some folks in my district. And although some of the questions may have been asked in some form or another, I want to ask the question. So first, in Section 1-20 under, 'Prohibited state actions; causes of action', where it states that, 'the state shall not: deny, restrict, interfere with, or discriminate against an individual's exercise of a fundamental right set forth in this Act, including individuals under state custody, control, or supervision.' Does this mean that the state will be unable to impose parental notification?"

Cassidy: "The Reproductive Health Act does not impact parental notification. That law remains on the books."

DeLuca: "Thank you. And under the definitions of health of the patient, which means all factors that are relevant to the patient's health and well-being, including, but not limited to, physical, emotional, psychological, and familial health and age, could a healthy woman with a viable pregnancy choose to terminate her pregnancy for any reason at any time?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Cassidy: "Reproductive Health Act does not change the... the current standard of practice. And doctors are required to adhere to accepted standards of clinical practice."
- DeLuca: "So, under Senate Bill 25 will it require the approval of a health care professional or a physician?"
- Cassidy: "A doctor would be permitted to provide abortion care in accordance with their professional judgment and training and based on accepted standards of clinical practice consistent with the scope of their profession. If the doctor determines that the fetus is viable, the doctor can only provide an abortion if, in the professional judgment of the doctor, the abortion is necessary to protect the life or health of the patient. This is the current standard for viability. The health of the patient means all factors which are relevant to the patient's health and well-being, including, but not limited to, physical, emotional, psychological, and familial health and age. And I believe you asked about who can perform as well, is that part of your question? Was that part... did..."

DeLuca: "First, let me go to this."

Cassidy: "Okay."

- DeLuca: "In regards to the facilities where abortions are performed, will Senate Bill 25 exempt regulatory requirements?"
- Cassidy: "Sorry, I have to go back. The provisions of the Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center Act that requires abortions to be performed in ambulatory surgical treatment centers, like many hospitals, have been blocked for decades pursuant to a consent decree entered in Ragsdale v. Turnock. Under the consent decree an abortion clinic is only subject

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

to regulation under the ASTC Act if the facility is primarily devoted to the performance of surgical procedures. Procedures performed in facilities that are not subject to ASTC licensure are regulated in accordance with various statutory and regulatory requirements governing medical care in Illinois as well as zoning, fire, and building codes. There's no reason to single out abortion when Illinois law already provides that all medical procedures are to be performed under circumstances to ensure maximum safety. In-clinic abortions are very safe. In terms of risk level they are similar to other gynecological procedures that take place in doctor's offices every day. And the same requirements that are in place now will still be in place after this."

- DeLuca: "Thank you. Does Senate Bill 25 mean that health care professionals other than doctors will be able to perform procedural or surgical abortions?"
- Cassidy: "No. The RHA current... codifies current law under which only physicians may perform procedural abortions. Advanced practice clinicians, APCs, such as physician assistants may assist but may not independently perform a procedural abortion."
- DeLuca: "Thank you. Does Senate Bill 25 require all health insurance policies, even those purchased by schools, churches, or religious entities and persons and organizations with moral religious objections..."
- Speaker Manley: "Excuse me, Representative DeLuca. Representative Thapedi, would you like to offer your time to Representative DeLuca? Representative DeLuca for five minutes."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

DeLuca: "...thank you... with moral religious objections to abortions to cover abortion services?"

Cassidy: "No. Our state's existing Health Care Right of Conscience Act already protects... provides protections for those with moral or religious exempt... objections, including permitting insurance companies and other health care payers to opt out of coverage for any health care service to which they have a documented conscience based objection. This is the same way that that contraceptive coverage requirements are handled for entities with conscience based objections. Regardless, the Bill does add language to clarify this point. I understand that some Members have received calls and letters from various institutions or companies claiming that their insurance providers are not asking whether the employer has a conscience objection to provide coverage for services such as abortion. It is my understanding and belief that the Health Care Right of Conscience Act provides that any health care payer, including a company paying for health care, has a right to opt out of the coverage mandate. A health care payer is defined as a Health Maintenance Organization, insurance company, management services organization, or any other entity that pays for or arranges for the payment of any health care or medical care procedure or product. The language covers any company purchasing insurance not just those who are self-insured. For purposes of legislative intent, I want to make it abundantly clear that the intent of the language in this Bill is to require an insurance company to offer a health care product. But the intent is not to interfere with the

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

right of the entity purchasing the product to refuse to provide coverage for abortion care."

DeLuca: "Thank you. These were the issues that I've heard most from my constituents so I wanted to ask these questions. I appreciate you taking the time to answer them. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Morgan for five minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Morgan: "Representative, just to clarify for the record are you a physician?"

Cassidy: "No, I am not."

Morgan: "To your knowledge, is there anybody in this entire chamber of the House of Representatives who is a physician?" Cassidy: "Not to my knowledge."

Morgan: "One of the other comments that was made by my colleague on the other side of the aisle is that we're all aware that individuals come to the State of Illinois regularly to seek reproductive health care. I was wondering... and especially coming from places like Missouri, Indiana, Alabama, Georgia... was wondering if you could help the Body understand why that might be."

Cassidy: "Well, we were just told that Missouri is closing their last clinic. That there... and we've spoken a great deal about the focused, strategic, and concerted effort across the country to restrict access to abortion. And the reality is people of means work around those restrictions. But people in

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Missouri without the ability to work around it, for them the right is gone. It's just gone."

Morgan: "Representative, would you say that's one of the most important underlying aspects of why we need to pass this legislation today?"

Cassidy: "Given what we have seen across the country and watching how... how determined the opposition is to take away my right to self-determination, my right to bodily autonomy, I think it's important that we, as a state, respond with equal force and vigor to defend that right to self-determination and bodily autonomy."

Morgan: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. For those of you who were in committee to hear this legislation, you heard me speak about my unyielding commitment to not just my spouse but also my daughter, as she grows up and becomes older, to make the health care decisions that are right for her and for them. I continue to stand in favor and in support of that commitment. We speak in this House Floor about a super-duper minority or super-duper majority. And in fact, if we look at my colleagues on the other side of the aisle we have a super, super, super, super majority of men. And I bring that up because when we talk about a super, super, super, super majority of men versus women it does not reflect the demographics of the State of Illinois. In fact, there are more women in the State of Illinois than men. But in this Body we have a super majority of men making decisions or potentially making decisions right now about the health and well-being of women on their behalf. And I reject that. I will not stand for that. I stand, as a man, in support of a

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

woman's right to choose. I stand in support of women, I stand in support of women's choice. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative West for five minutes."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Ever since the Reproductive Health Act was filed I've had numerous letters... I received numerous letters, e-mails, calls, and texts from people in support and opposition of the Bill. On top of that came a police escort from my office to the House Floor during advocacy day, four threats to my life if I supported this Bill, even worse still, a promise that my wife and I would have a cursed life, along with my future children, if I supported this Bill. My wife, my family. And what was sadly disturbing is that it's coming from my fellow brothers and sisters of the Christian faith. I'm State Representative West, a lawmaker from Rockford, Illinois and a preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Two offices, two callings that I am honored to hold and will never take lightly. I've been a minister since 2011 at my dad's church. I've been a Legislator since January. I stand firmly on the separation of church and state. A stance that is a biblical decree and a constitutional order. Mark 12:17 says, 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.' The First Amendment of the Constitution states that we shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. One thing I love about Jesus is that he gave us free will. He was crucified and rose again in three days so that we... for our sins so that we could choose to live for God. Choose. We have that free will. I go down

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

that road because I am gravely concerned with the ... with what transpired in Georgia, Alabama, Missouri, Ohio, Kentucky. Policies put in place that are putting chains on women. As you can see, I'm a black man. My ancestors had physical chains and laws that governed their bodies. We fought a civil war because we wanted to keep black bodies chained and enslaved. And now you're asking me, a black man, to put policy chains on a woman's body, on reproductive health. If you feel that this is wrong then you have that right. You honestly do. For my anti-reproductive health community, keep doing what you're doing. You have that right. That's the beauty of freedom. That's the beauty of choice. To my pro-reproductive health community, keep doing what you're doing. You have that right. That's the beauty of freedom. That's the beauty of choice. But now we're living in a time where government is trying to take away basic freedoms, personal choice. And that worries me more than the threats to my life or the promised curses on my life. I'll handle those. I know how to pray against those. At this time, I've decided to trust women to do what's best for themselves. Women, I trust you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Gong-Gershowitz." Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

There have been and there will be many opinions and conjecture on this issue and while we are all entitled to our own opinions, we are not entitled to our own facts. So, I want to make something very clear for the record. Under our constitutional framework, at the federal and state level, there are two sources of law, statutory and common law as developed by the courts. It is my understanding that the

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

primary difference between the Reproductive Health Act as originally filed and this version is language with respect to abortions later in pregnancy, post-viability. Is the intent of this version of the Reproductive Health Act to codify common law standards developed under *Roe v. Wade* which reflects the framework we live under now?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

"To the Bill. The substance of this Bill has Gong-Gershowitz: been out there for months and there has been no shortage of incendiary rhetoric and misinformation disseminated by those who intend to strip women of their rights under Roe v. Wade. No woman I have ever known, at any point in my life, decides to terminate a healthy pregnancy moments before birth as opponents of choice would have us believe. In rare cases where a woman chooses an abortion later in pregnancy it's because something has gone tragically wrong. And she is faced with a choice that only her and her doctor are qualified to make, not government and not the 118 Members of this Body. This isn't about what I believe, it's about whether women have agency over their own lives to decide what they believe. I trust women to own the self-determination over what happens to their bodies and their lives. To my mother, to my nieces Jennifer, Samantha, Zoe, and Olivia, to my colleagues, to my sisters, to my friends, I trust you. This isn't about challenging anyone's religious convictions. This is about our power to know our own minds, our God, our bodies, our choice. And I for one do not need anyone in this room to make that for me. To the women throughout history who have been

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

devalued, dismissed, and discounted, this is our moment to say that we will not go back. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons for five minutes."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. First and foremost, this Bill has gone through many changes to make sure that people understand what the Bill entails. And as my colleague here on my aisle have expressed, this is a Bill that really hits at the heart of individual choice. African American women were not always able to make decisions about their bodies or their babies in this country. And quality health care has stood afar for us for many, many generations. I wanted to share just a little bit about why I respect Representative Flowers who's been working on black women and black women maternal health. I want to share some of the facts, as my colleague just mentioned we don't get to pick them we just have to repeat what they actually are. Quality patient-centered reproductive health care is critical to improving maternal health and addressing the reproductive health disparities that black women face, including higher rates of unintended pregnancies and restricted access to abortions. Researchers attribute these disparities to a number of factors, including disparities in access to high quality health care generally and family planning services specifically. Indeed, women with unintended pregnancies are at high risk or increased risk for maternal mortality and morbidity, maternal depression, experiencing violence during pregnancy, infant mortality, birth defects, low weight and pre-term birth. Where we don't have access to

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

reproductive health and choice we see that reproductive oppression, similar to the oppression we experienced during and post-slavery experiences. Black women are more likely to report having been pressured to see a clinician who gives them bad advice around contraceptive methods. We are in support today. I stand in support of this Bill, Senate Bill 25, so that we can for sure make sure it's clear that we have complete agency and we have discretion as to what is in the best interests of black women and their families. I have experienced this... what we are acting out today... in my personal life. And I have had... had to help young women who live in other states get access to real reproductive health in our state because in states that they reside in they don't have choice. Today is truly about choice. It's about privacy. It's about the right to determine. And we should stand together against the agencies or others who want to make the decisions for us. We reject that ideology. And I stand in support of this action by my colleague Representative Cassidy. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brady for five minutes."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 I had no intention whatsoever to speak on this Bill today.

And I'm not going to speak to it as a father of two children,
 one who is actually 18 years old today, my son, Tom. And I'm
 not going to speak to religious motions, whatever your opinion

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

is is your opinion. But I heard a lot of discussion from Representative about we're codifying existing law, we're codifying existing law. And also a lot of discussion of the problems that occur, the abortions in the back alleys, in the back streets, of what goes on today is the reason why we have to have some of these changes for safety, for health. I don't know about all that. And it's been pointed out, the Representatives have both talked today and done their jobs. It's been said that the Representative is not a doctor, Representative Bourne's not a doctor, I'm not a doctor, no doctor here. But I am former coroner. And from technicality I have a concern of something, Representative. And I'm concerned because I didn't get a clarified answer when the question was posed to you. On page 50 of your Bill in Section(b), line 11, stricken from that Bill is the ability of the county coroner to be notified of maternal or fetal death due to abortion. I'd simply like a clarification. Am I wrong that that's being stricken from page 50 of your legislation?"

Cassidy: "We are treating abortions like any other health care. Abortion is not a crime, there's no restriction on the ability to do an investigation, it's taking away the requirement. According to the County Code, governing the duty of county coroners, death during or after a medical procedure does not trigger a coroner investigation, except for in the case of abortion. We are treating abortions like any other health care."

Brady: "Is anesthesia used in an abortion?"

Cassidy: "We are treating abortions like any other health care."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Brady: "My question was, is anesthesia used in abortions?"

Cassidy: "Not being a doctor, I can't speak to that. Death during or after a medical procedure does not trigger a coroner investigation, except in the case of abortion. We are treating abortion like any other health care."

Brady: "Representative, to page 50 of your Bill, line 11, Section(b), strickened is the notification clause of maternal or fetal death due to abortion..."

Cassidy: "We are treating abortions..."

Brady: "...to the county coroner..."

Cassidy: "...like any other health care."

Brady: "No, it's... we're not... you're not doing it with that language."

Cassidy: "Yes, actually we are."

Brady: "We're not codify... we're not... Representative, we're not codifying existing law. What you've done is you've done in and changed current law in Chapter 31 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes as it pertains to the coroner's notification of deaths in this state."

Cassidy: "We are treating abortions like any other health care."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Tarver for five minutes."

Tarver: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Tarver: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "I guess I had to think about it."

Tarver: "Madam Chair... Madam Chair, I stand in support of Kelly and this Bill. I think you remember a few weeks ago, April 10

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

I had my six-year-old daughter here, you were in the Chair at that time as well. And when I think about my job as a father of a six year old, my job is to tell her what's best for her. My job is to make decisions for her related to her body. That's my job now. My job as a father also is to raise her to be independent, to think for herself, and to allow her to make decisions for herself and her body. That's my job as a father. And not even to necessarily like every decision she makes but to support those decisions. You know, every moment that I'm down here I miss my daughter. I really do. I missed her last night, I didn't make home to see her. I'll be going back tomorrow as I do every week to see her. And I feel as though I need to justify my time when I'm down here because when I go home I take her to school in the morning, she asks me, you know, daddy what are you doing in Springfield? What is your job? And I explained to her, my job is to make laws or at least to help make laws and policies and things like that. And I really can't figure out how the hell I go home and explain to her that I supported something that takes us backwards. I just... I don't... I really can't wrap my mind around how I would do that. And to... to look her in the eyes and tell her that I'm doing something that is going to strip away her ability to make decisions for herself, at the same time that I raise her to be smart and independent and make decisions for herself. So, I only stand up in support of commonsense Bills, right? And run my mouth a little bit. This is one of those Bills. I'm happy to support it. I'm happy to support it not only for, you know, for my daughter but for my sisters, cousins, your daughters, and every woman in America, quite

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

frankly, not just in Illinois. I think it's time that we, as men, take a step back, realize we don't know everything and allow women to make decisions for themselves. The same way we've always had the ability to make decisions for ourselves. So, I thank you for bringing this forward. I support you and I would just urge everyone to press your green button. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz for five minutes."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Cassidy, if *Roe* is overturned and Senate Bill 25 does not pass abortions would still be legal, correct?"

Cassidy: "If Roe is overturned abortion would still technically be legal in Illinois but become... but could become increasingly hard to access because of restrictions that are currently enjoined and may no longer be. Even if injunctions are not lifted, the uncertainty about access is also very harmful to patients and providers."

Feigenholtz: "To the Bill. I'm not sure how many people here ever heard of... there's so many new young people here... or knew Dr. Quentin Young. He was a well-respected physician, he opened many health clinics in the City of Chicago. He was the de facto public health authority. He was beloved and he worked at Cook County Hospital where he did a residency rotation. He was a health care legend that we lost in 2016. He had done an interview with the *Chicago Sun Times* awhile back about what it was like as a resident in 1948 doing this rotation in OB

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

in the septic unit of Cook County Hospital. This was a time when abortions were a criminal offense. In his interview Dr. Young would describe the women who were very, very desperate to have an abortion and attempted to do these procedures themselves. And how they used whatever was available to do Paintbrushes, pencils, knitting needles. He perforated vaginas, uteruses, untreatable infections, and women who hemorrhaged to death. Women were in comas, he said, they had raging fevers and most of the time the physicians who were on this rotation had to finish what back alley butchers began. Some women paid for abortions, illegal abortions. And they would go to hotels and these butchers would put them on tables and just leave them there because performing this was a crime. And it just illustrated the grim vulnerability of these women, the grim vulnerability associated with abortion when it was criminal. He said as a young intern I was responsible for completing the septic abortions to save them from death. The volume was so large I think I did at least 20 a day. Many of these women, the ones who survived became infertile. Many died. The one that sticks out in my mind the most was a woman who was hemorrhaging to death and died. It made me the saddest because she had seven children at home who became orphans. Young summed it up, in 1948, by saying that abortion is not a modern development, every civilization had it. The fact is, they will take place. The question physicians were faced with, in 1948, is that if it does take place, how do we make it safe?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Representative Feigenholtz, excuse me one moment.

Representative Conroy, do you wish to offer your time to

Representative Feigenholtz?"

Conroy: "Yes, please."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Feigenholtz for five minutes."

Feigenholtz: "Friends, I have never seen a happy abortion. This is a source of great concern, not just for women, but for doctors and for their families. These are not frivolous decisions, they're full of thought and contradiction. Some of the remarks I've heard from my friends across the side of the aisle, who feel as strongly and as passionately as I do about this, I have to say that it is clear that you are opposed to safe, legal abortion. Some of the things you are asking are nothing more than a smoke screen to complete the right wing agenda of the leader of the free world, Donald Trump. He is on an agenda, admittedly, to send women back to those back alley abortions and back to those septic units. My mother was a doctor and she was an Orthodox Jew. She put herself through medical school. She was one of four women who graduated medical school in 1932. When the abortion debate became public and elevated in 1973 after Roe I asked her if she would ever perform or has she ever performed an abortion. She was silent. She told me that this is so private it is something she would never discuss and that she respects the decisions that her patients make. And she took the Hippocratic Oath to do just that. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are no women and there are no doctors who are enthusiasts of abortion. As my colleague said earlier, let's trust women, let's trust doctors. At a time when this country is under attack by a movement that

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

wants to send women back... set women back decades, Illinois is poised to be the beacon, the state that wants to protect women from the horrors of the past. Please, please for the child... for the children of Curtis Tarver, and for the children and the nieces of Jen Gong-Gershowitz, and for future generations of all the daughters of this state, let's protect them and vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I yield my time to Representative Bourne."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bourne for five minutes."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Heard a lot of debate on what this Bill does and doesn't do, just wanted to clarify what's in this Bill that we are voting on. There's been a lot of conversation about not being doctors. Under this Bill you don't have to be a doctor to report... to perform an abortion either. There's been a lot of conversation about what happens if abortion is made illegal. There is nothing that we are voting on today, or that we will be voting on, that will make abortion illegal in Illinois. Currently, if there is a viable pregnancy and the life or health of the mother is in danger abortion is legal. You don't need this Bill. Instead that definition is vastly expanded in this Bill. In Illinois if you are carrying a baby that is not ever going to be viable, abortion is legal in Illinois. You don't need this Bill. What this Bill does do, we heard something earlier that said there is no woman who chooses an abortion with a healthy baby late term. The Guttmacher Institute, which some of you may know, which is the preeminent, pro-choice research institute, actually says that's not the case. In a survey of

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

272 women who had late term abortions, they acknowledge... it data suggests that most women seeking terminations are not doing so for the reasons of fetal anomaly or life endangerment. So, what are we doing with this Bill? this Bill is allowing third Voting on trimester post-viability abortions to happen outside of the strict life and health of the mother. And we are opening up viability to mean that some babies would not be determined to be viable until they took a breath. This is not about keeping abortion legal in Illinois. This is about a vast expansion of what is allowed. Please, for the viable babies who are waiting to be born, vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Kifowit for five minutes."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Kifowit: "We just had a statement about what the Bill does or doesn't do. What I have heard in debate is... is that the Bill, in and of itself, is stating what Illinois doesn't do already because it's enjoined by the courts and therefore, in essence, supports the status quo. Is this correct or not?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Kifowit: "And also, because these are enjoined and they're not enforced and we're providing the status quo, do you believe there will be a significant shift in viewpoint or ideology if this Bill goes into effect?"

Cassidy: "I'm not sure I follow?"

Kifowit: "Do you think extreme actions will all of the sudden
appear and start becoming norm if this Bill passes?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "I believe that we are at risk, currently, as these cases come down of those injunctions being lifted and those extreme barriers becoming effective, if that's what you're asking."

Kifowit: "So, the court. But if this Bill becomes a law, individuals won't all of the sudden start seeking, as was said, to take into account babies that want to be born. All of the sudden there will be a swell of behavior that's not happening today?"

Cassidy: "Agreed."

Kifowit: "So, to the Bill. And just to be clear, I don't speak much on this floor and this Bill does cause me angst to some degree because I believe abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. It is a utopian view that no one would have an unintended pregnancy, and this is just not reality. We have situations of domestic violence, we have an example of a forced pregnancy on a 12 year old that was given today. And the rhetoric compelled me to speak in favor of this Bill because I... as an individual who grew up in a troublesome household of divorced parents that were constantly fighting, was able, as a 16 year old, to take matters in my own hands and engage in my own family planning. And get protection from my own doctor without any interference from my parents who were busy fighting each other in divorce court than taking care of their children. I was able to have my two children. And I know that any woman who does have a pregnancy that is healthy would not consider doing what was extraordinarily stated on the other side, is completely unrationale and technically false. I was able to plan my children. I was able to plan my family. And that's what this Bill is about. I

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

cannot pretend to know what it's like to be raped, abused, a pregnant 12-year-old, or to live in a situation that these occurrences happen. I cannot pretend to know what it's like to have an unintended pregnancy because I was able to get the services that I needed to make sure that I had my family at the time I wanted to. I believe that we do need to strive to reduce unintended pregnancies, to bolster family planning, and to give options to individuals so that they don't find themselves in a situation of having to choose and having to make this choice. Because again, I do believe that abortions should be safe, legal, and rare. And we as a society should strive to ensure that people have reproductive health care so that they can have the children that they want. I think that some of the arguments that I've heard today border on the line of being ridiculous. Of... of expounding upon and really, as was previously said, disrespecting doctors, disrespecting women, and overall being disrespectful to making sure that we have comprehensive reproductive health. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mason for five minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mason: "Thank you. Those of you who have come to know me know that I am first and foremost a mom, a mom who loves her babies even though they're 19 and 14 already. They are and always will be my babies. And I'm grateful every single day for them. And so incredibly blessed. I stand here, today, as a mom and a woman in support of the Reproductive Health Act because I believe, and the vast majority of my constituents who have

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

been contacting me throughout the Session about it, believe that a woman has a right to bodily autonomy. A woman has a right to control her own body. And a woman has the right to work with her own medical providers and make decisions for her own body that are right for her based on acceptable standards of clinical practice. My own mother had five children, she grew up in a pre-Roe v. Wade era. And she always told me the story of laying in the emergency room with a gallbladder issue when a young woman was brought into the bed next to her. My mother described listening to the doctors and the police that accompanied her berate, and scream at her, and treat her like a hardened criminal because she had broken the law by trying to abort her baby with a coat hanger. My mother then listened to the woman hemorrhage and die right next to her. My mother always told me that she didn't know if she herself could ever have an abortion and that was her choice. But she realized at that moment that women will continue to fight for the right for their bodily autonomy, and that no woman should ever die as a result of it. And I ask this Body, should Roe v. Wade be overturned? Are you all ready and willing to make women felons for fighting their... for their own reproductive freedom? Are you willing to lock up women for that? I think of that. I also think about my work as a long-time advocate for domestic violence. And I see very regularly rape and pregnancy as a common tactic used by abusers to control their partners and make them vulnerable and dependent. And I ask you, are we now going to literally assist these abusers by giving them the power not only to forcibly impregnate but then to carry the child of their

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

rapist? I think of my dear friends, a couple who desperately wanted a baby and late in term learned that the baby would not survive more than a few hours or days at most outside the womb. They made the very painful and difficult decision that hurts them to this day to end that pregnancy, which really means inducing labor and holding that baby until she passed surrounded by their love. They had to make that gut-wrenching, heartbreaking decision. I am disgusted by the propaganda that is out there suggesting that any woman late in her pregnancy or even after giving birth as I've heard from some and then to decide, I just don't want this child and simply end its life. It's disgusting and it's insulting to women. It's insulting to me. And it's insulting to the doctors who have taken that Hippocratic Oath and vowed not to harm viable babies. To suggest otherwise is wrong. But it is up to the health care provider and not Legislators to determine when that viability exists. And to that suggestion from across the aisle that a provider that would find a loophole for financial gain is reprehensible. It is absolutely reprehensible. Do we ask heart surgeons if they're making their medical decisions based on the money that they'll make as a result of that procedure? Do we ask podiatrists the same? We do not. And I don't suggest we start questioning all physicians about whether their decisions are financially motivated. This Bill does not expand or change laws in Illinois. And the propaganda that's been out there is just not true. It is time that we stand up for the women of Illinois and tell them that we trust them. Thank you."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Our final speaker on this... in this debate will be Representative Welch for five minutes."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. I rise, today, as a Member of the Illinois House. A Member who came to this Body committed to treat every Illinois resident with dignity, with respect, and equality. But I am also a man, a son, a husband, and a father. In fact, my little fiveyear-old daughter is truly the joy of my life. For me, the RHA says to my wife and my daughter that they are equal. Not just in the confines of my family. The RHA makes it clear that my wife and my daughter are equal in the eyes of the law. That their health care should be treated just as that, health care. Today, we have a chance to send that message to women all across Illinois. To end the use of women's health care as a political football and respect the decisions about women's health care that should be made between women and their doctors. As I speak, I am conscience of the reality that I am a man participating in this discussion. But... and this matters because it is men all across this country right now who are actively participating in this discussion. All across the United States from Georgia and Alabama to Ohio, our neighbors in Missouri and Utah, men are passing harsh laws that subject women and their physicians to criminal penalties. Criminal penalties. Think about that men. We go to our doctors all the time and the decisions we make we don't face criminal penalties. But Alabama says a woman could face a felony charge for making a health decision, for seeking and providing health care. As a man and a Legislator who makes policy, I reject that view. And today, I rise to stand with

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

women in support of the RHA. I will not, here today or here ever, tell a woman what she can or cannot do with her body. That is not my place or any man in this room. I have heard so much in this debate over the last few months about our process used here and the nature of this Bill. But I have some questions for those who raised these issues. If you object to the process used here, have you objected to the rush in these other states to adopt abortion bans? These bans are simply vehicles to get a case to the Supreme Court, we all know that. Their one goal is to overturn Roe v. Wade. Have you objected to that process? And if you think that this Bill goes too far, who do you want to send to prison when women seek health care? The new Georgia law would criminalize women who even travel outside the state to seek an abortion. Is that really what we want here in Illinois? Is that truly what we want in Illinois? This is not the legacy that I want to leave for my daughter. The Georgia law..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative, you've run out of time but please bring your remarks to a close."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Georgia law is not the type of law that I want for my wife. And this is not the type of law that I want for women in Illinois. I stand here today and I proudly support the Reproductive Health Right... Reproductive Health Act. And I urge all of my colleagues, especially the men in this room, to join me in voting to treat health care as health care for everyone in Illinois, men and women. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Cassidy to close."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Cassidy: "Thank you. And thank you to all of my colleagues who have worked so hard to get us to this day, for your input, your encouragement, your tough questions and, to colleagues on the other side of the aisle, for your passionate and heartfelt support of your position. Today, I stand up for all of the people impacted by the concerted efforts to take away our right to self-determination. To my male colleagues who today talked about not believing that it's a man's business to say what a woman should do with her body, what I say is it's also not my business to tell you what to do with your body. I want us all to have that right to selfdetermination. And that is what the RHA will do. To our neighbors in Illinois who hear the news around the country and worry that this war on women is coming to Illinois, I say not on my watch. To the people in Missouri, and Alabama, and Georgia, and Kentucky, and Mississippi, and Ohio, I say not on my watch. My colleagues, the fierce freshmen women, I love you ladies to the moon and back. You are ... not going to say the word. My sisters in the trenches for decades, I love you. To Representative Ammons, for speaking the truth about the reality of who's really harmed. I am here with you and I'm not letting up. And to Representative Flowers, for your lifelong dedication and fierce advocacy I am your partner in the fight to fight maternal mortality and disparate impacts in the community. I will always be your partner in that fight. To my boys, who quite frankly wouldn't be here without access to true reproductive health care, because what that means is not just abortion... and you all heard me talk about my abortion... but it means that I had access to contraception, I

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

had access to fertility care, I had access to that abortion that saved my life and preserved my fertility. I had access to excellent maternity care, including determining how to give birth. And now, being a woman of a certain age, I have access to care to help manage the symptoms of menopause. Reproductive health care is comprehensive. I thank my nieces for using that care to bring the next generation of our family. I thank my four sisters for ensuring that I grew up safe in our chaotic home, fully aware of my own power and my ability to be self-determined. And finally, I thank my late mother who truly lived life on her own terms, determined that her four daughters and her two sons... could do so as well and that her two sons would respect that for their sisters and their future spouses. Today, Illinois says we are better than this war on women. Illinois says, we trust women. Please join me in saying that loud and clear, we trust women. Vote 'ave'." Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Bourne has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 25 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting in 'favor', 50 voting 'against', and 4 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in their affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:

Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

Representative Arroyo; Representative Buckner;

Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy;

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Representative Connor; Representative Conroy; Representative Costa Howard; Representative Crespo; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Representative Edly-Allen; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Representative Hernandez, B.; Representative Hernandez, L.; Representative Representative Lilly; Representative Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mason; Representative Mayfield; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Moylan; Representative Representative Ortiz; Representative Mussman; Representative Ramirez; Representative Rita; Representative Robinson; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Stuart; Representative Tarver; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Villa; Representative Villanueva; Representative Walker; Representative Welch; Representative West; Representative Williams, Representative Williams, J.; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bourne. On this question, there are 64 voting in 'favor', 50 voting 'against', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Meeting immediately is Appropriations-Human Services in Room 413, the Executive Committee in Room 118, Judiciary Civil Room D-1, Revenue & Finance Room 122, Labor & Commerce in Room 114, Personnel & Pensions in Room 115, Public Utilities in C-1. Meeting in one-half hour is Health Care Licenses in Room 115 and Human Services in D-1."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Scherer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Scherer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."
- Scherer: "Thank you. Today, I have my granddaughter here with me, her name is Sadie Meek and she is our honorary Page for the day. So, she's here from Decatur and she may sit in this chair someday, you never know."
- Speaker Manley: "Hi, Sadie. Chair recognizes Representative Evans.

  For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Evans: "Just a quick point of personal privilege, please." Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."
- Evans: "Just behalf... on behalf of myself and all of the southland Legislators, we have a strong black woman in the gallery who's truly a champion for women's rights and so many other things. She's the Commissioner of the 6th District, Donna Miller. She's somewhere up there. So, how are you doing Donna? Give her a round of applause. 6th District Cook County Commissioner and advocate."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to know... clarification what the plan is for the rest of the day. Is it committees and then done or is it committees and then we're coming back?"
- Speaker Manley: "Well, I was just about to announce something. You jumped the gun."
- Batinick: "Great minds think alike."
- Speaker Manley: "The House will be in recess to the Call of the Chair."
- Clerk Hollman: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will reconvene in five minutes. Please report to the House Floor. The House will reconvene in five minutes."
- Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1244. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1719; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 97. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1507. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 39; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1464, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1932. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 534. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2884, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 37. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 651. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 659. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3065."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Frese is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Manley: "The Journal will so reflect your request.

Proceeding to the Order of House Bills on Third Reading...

excuse me, Senate Bills. On page 4 of the Calendar, under

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Third Readings, we have House Bill... excuse me, Senate Bill 90, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move that Bill back to Second so we can adopt an Amendment."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 90, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time previous day.

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

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech on the Amendment."

Didech: "Floor Amendment 2 corrects a drafting error. I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Batinick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Batinick: "I'll... I'll wait until Third Reading. I'm sorry."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Okay. Representative Didech moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 90. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 90, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you. Senate Bill 90 creates a process for the dissolution of drainage districts by resolution or ordinance of the municipalities and counties in which the district is located. Drainage districts are small units of local

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

government that have the power to construct and maintain drains or levies within the boundaries of the district. Currently drainage districts may be dissolved by a court or petitioned by landowners or a petition of the district commissioners. This creates an additional mechanism for dissolution that allows the overlapping counties and municipalities to initiate the process. I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick. This being on the Order of Short Debate."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I certainly tend to trust Senator McConchie Bills but I wanted to read something here that you could... you could talk to. It says, creates an additional process... an additional process to dissolve drainage districts and provides that the district can be dissolved and its duties absorbed by a municipality if the municipality counts for 75 percent of the drainage districts territory. So I guess my question is, is that sentence can be read a couple of different ways. Does it mean that there's more work to dissolve the drainage district or is this a process that makes it easier?"

Didech: "This makes it easier. So currently there are a few different ways to start the process. One would be petitioned by landowners, two would be a petition to a court by an individual, or three would be by an initiative of the commissioners of the district itself. This creates a fourth mechanism to initiate that process, which would be by the

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- overlapping municipalities and counties. It doesn't eliminate the possibility of those other ways to initiate it, it's just a fourth way to start the same process."
- Batinick: "Okay. And I... I see kind of split roll call here. Why was the Farm Bureau opposed?"
- Didech: "My analysis is that they're neutral. But... so that is my understanding is that they are neutral on the Bill."
- Batinick: "Okay. With the Amendment, they're neutral? 'Cause it looked like... as I'm looking at the 'no' votes looks like it was a downstate thing where some of the downstaters were voting 'no'. Is that the correct?"
- Didech: "My understanding is that that is why the Amendment limited it to some of the more suburban counties. So now this Bill only applies to DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will Counties."
- Batinick: "Okay. Appreciate it. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Halpin, we have already had... we're on Short Debate. So, we've had a person in favor... I'm not sure if... I couldn't tell if Representative Batinick felt like he was in favor... you're... are you in favor? No? Don't be tricky."
- Batinick: "I'm... I would request because I honestly did not know if I was for or against it. I'm trying to vet it for my Members who are on their way here still. So, if we wouldn't mind for this Bill going to Standard Debate so we could have just maybe one or two more people ask questions, I'd appreciate it, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Manley: "Certainly. We'll do that. Representative Halpin."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I... I am opposed to the Bill. It just... this is another area where we're having the county which may not have the best interests of the drainage district at heart and just try to reduce a level of government that they think is unneeded. But as we're seeing record flooding in my neck of the woods among the... also along the rest of the Midwest I think it's important that these drainage districts stay in place and are governed by the people that have the best experience in governing them. So, please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech to close."

Didech: "Thank you. I think this is a commonsense measure that will reduce overlapping units of governments. This Bill is limited to counties that are in the suburban area and that are willing to take on these drainage responsibilities. I... I think we very rarely see units of local government take upon responsibilities that they're unable to fulfill. Most of these counties have storm water management commissions, they take the issue of flooding very seriously. I think especially with our status of high property taxes and over 7 thousand units of local government in our state this is a commonsense measure that will reduce property taxes and will not reduce the quality of services provided to our constituents. So, I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 90 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? Scherer, Sommer. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting in 'favor',

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

25 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to Senate Bill 161, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 161, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This would create the Worker Protection Unit within the Illinois Attorney General's Office. It also would create the Workers Protection Task Force. This is initiative of Attorney General Kwame Raoul. He actually made this promise on the... in a speech the day of the swearing in. That he would provide for and would work to pass a law that gives the Attorney General the ability to enforce and investigate violations of Prevailing Wage Act, the Employee Classification Act, the Minimum Wage Law, Day and Temporary Labor Services, and Wage Payment and Collection Act. It also, as I indicated, would create the Workers Protection Task Force, which would facilitate the working together between State's Attorney's Offices and various other law enforcement agencies concerning the protection of worker's rights. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "This is on Short Debate. And the Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Leader Hoffman, this is a measure we saw it in a different variation a couple of years ago that we didn't agree

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

on at the time. There have been some changes... important changes made since then that I have met with the Attorney General's Office and worked with staff to understand the reason, I just want to put a couple things on the record if you would, please."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler: "The..."

Hoffman: "Who's that next to you?"

Wheeler: "I have my... my senior advisor here, Ava Janner Wheeler, who is here for another part of the week here. She loves coming down and seeing all of her friends here. So, thanks for being so welcoming to her. Thank you, Jay."

Hoffman: "Welcome to Springfield. Listen to your dad."

Wheeler: "That's some really good advice. It'll be the best advice you ever get from Jay Hoffman. Who I do consider a good friend. Jay, let's go back to the Bill for a moment. The... the intention of this Worker Protection Unit, with respect to the Attorney General being able to do enforcement in these different Acts has to do with the fact that they aren't currently given the authority under those Acts to actually... to prosecute violators. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Well they currently... they will get a referral from the Department of Labor and then they basically are the Department of Labor's lawyer who do... and they do the... they'll be the Department of Labor lawyer in the action. However, this Bill clarifies that they AG has the power and duty to investigate and enforce the employment matters. It still has to be referred from the Department of Labor, however, they have an independent ability to do it as well."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Wheeler: "That's my understanding as well. And I... I guess in the context of where things are currently, the Attorney General's Office has been using the False Claims Act or the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act to prosecute things that really belong under these specific Acts. So, this is more appropriate. It's kind of like closing a loophole that they were excluded from originally when the Acts were put in place. Is that a fair characterization?"

Hoffman: "Yes, that's my understanding."

Wheeler: "And to the businesses perspective who think that, and I was under this impression as well, that this would be two people coming up for the same violation. That already could be the case under two different Acts. But now we're... by folding these together into the authority for the AG to be able to use these attacks as they exist, only one entity would really be coming to prosecute the business who may be violating that or may be under investigation for those things. Would you say that's a fair characterization as well?"

Hoffman: "Yes. The Department of Labor would still be tasked with investigating and enforcing cases. However, they could then... now in... now under this, under these case... these types of cases they could forward them to the Attorney General's Office who could provide the enforcement and investigation."

Wheeler: "And finally, just to... to put it on the record this is not meant to be a Worker Protection Unit that can run all across the state looking for violators and trying to chase down people who that the Attorney General may feel is... are out of line and taking advantage of a new authority here. This is not the purpose of this Act. Is that correct?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Hoffman: "No. It's my understanding that the Attorney General's Office wants the broader authority to look at the big picture items as well as the task force to make sure that the State's Attorneys and the Attorney Generals are working together for the enforcement of these... for enforcement of violations of this Act. I don't believe... or I know that it's not their intent to do the Department of Labor's work."
- Wheeler: "Thank you. And to this task force you just mentioned, this task force is actually meant, from my understanding, to be more a coordination effort between the different elements of State Government that already exist to make sure that we're using our resources intelligently and trying to get to the bad actors as quickly as possible?"
- Hoffman: "That's my understanding as well. And to coordinate with local law enforcement and local State's Attorneys."
- Wheeler: "Perfect. Thank you. To the Bill. This is a measure that I opposed vehemently just a couple of years ago when it was in a different format. Since then, important element of the Attorney General no longer having the authority to prosecute criminally, that's been taken out. And I've gotten assurances from the Attorney General himself that the purpose of this measure is to improve enforcement of these Acts, not to doubly enforce or doubly investigate companies who are trying to a good job and do the right thing. This is not meant to be something that's going to hurt companies who make a simple, honest mistake but rather to take... go after the bad actors who are taking advantage of people that we all want to see prosecuted. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman to close."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Hoffman: "Thank you. As I indicated, this is an initiative of Attorney General Kwame Raoul. I think it would be a shot in the arm for protections of workers' rights. I ask for a favorable roll call."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 161 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 99 voting in 'favor', 16
  voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill,
  having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
  passed. Representative Wilhour, do you have a question?"
- Wilhour: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I would just want the record to reflect that I intended to be a 'yes' on SB90."
- Speaker Manley: "The record will so reflect your request. Senate Bill 658, Representative... Leader Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please roll the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 658, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 are offered by Representative Davis. Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Davis on the Amendment."
- Davis: "Well, Madam Chair, what I think with regard to the Amendments... and I'm just trying to make sure I do this appropriately... is... this is... sorry, make sure I get it here. You said Amendment #2, correct?"
- Speaker Manley: "Correct. We're on Floor Amendment #2."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Davis: "With regard to Floor Amendment #2 this was a replacement of the Bill that was negotiated between the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations and the Land Surveyors Association that starts to better explain the relationship between the two. I think with regard to reimbursement what Floor Amendment #2 changes the 'may' to a 'shall' so that those members will be reimbursed for their expenses. I'd be more than... I would like to adopt the Amendment."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Davis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 658. All in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Davis on Floor Amendment 3."
- Davis: "Thank you, again. Thank you, again, Madam Chair. With regard to Floor Amendment #3 this corrects a mistake. Unfortunately, it was made by Floor Amendment #2 with regard to written recommendations from the board regarding applicant qualifications, curriculum content, professional conduct, disciplinary actions, and adoption of rules and to consult with the board or other matters regarding... regarding the Act. In the hearing section this restores a provision, again a provision cut by two that the secretary notify the board with a detailed explanation any time he or she issues a decision that deviates from a board recommendation. I ask for adoption of the Amendment."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Representative Davis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 658. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 658, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, again, Madam Chair. Essentially, the Floor Amendments that were just described essentially make up the bulk of the content for the piece of legislation. This language clarifies, again, the communication between the advisory board and the department when the secretary makes the decision contrary to a recommendation of the board, including the expenses that shall be reimbursed for the board members. This is agreed language between IDPFR and Professional Land Surveyors organization. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "A reminder, we are on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Mazzochi: "Is there a reason why we're newly creating misdemeanor and for a second offense a felony conviction as... as penalties for violating this Act?"

Davis: "Would you repeat your question?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Mazzochi: "Yeah. As I read one of the Amendments, one of the things..."

Davis: "Which... which Amendment?"

Mazzochi: "Amendment #2."

Davis: "Floor Amendment #2?"

Mazzochi: "Yep."

Davis: "Okay. And your question is?"

Mazzochi: "Yeah, is there a reason why some of the... in some of the new language that I'm seeing here we're saying that if you misrepresent yourself as a surveyor that can be a misdemeanor or a felony for a second offense?"

Davis: "Apparently, it's a standard being added to all of their practice Acts."

Mazzochi: "Okay. I mean, do we... do you... I mean do you feel comfortable saying that violating some of these license Acts, particularly surveying, is something that should rise to the level of a felony as opposed to civil penalties?"

Davis: "Apparently we..."

Mazzochi: "I mean, it's an enhancement."

Davis: "...apparently we've had no objection from their association with regard to these types of efforts. And I think, if I'm not mistaken, you're an attorney? I think there are penalties exist for people representing themselves as attorneys who are not really attorneys. And again, this is something that I believe they're adding to all of their professional practice Acts as well. And to my knowledge, with any other Acts none of those associations that they're in communication with have offered any objection to it as well. Now, unless they've said

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

to you they're objecting, they certainly haven't said it to me."

Mazzochi: "Right. Well, I... I just saw this Amendment for the first time today and I actually read it. And I just know that when it comes to assessing criminal penalties for what are essentially civil matters we usually tend to not do those types of penalty enhancements. But thank you very much for answering my question."

Speaker Manley: "Representative... Leader Davis to close."

Davis: "I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 658 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 116 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1127, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1127, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1127 amends the Aeronautics Act by requiring all airports under the jurisdiction of the Aeronautics Department of the Illinois Department of Transportation to fly the veteran missing in action or the MIA flag. These flags are allowed to be flown at the same staff as the American Flag."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1127 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who... Brady, Ugaste. Brady. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1134, Representative Bristow. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1134, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1134 deals with foreclosure cases where the defendant is served with notice of the action through a newspaper. The Bill requires that the plaintiff or their attorney publish the action in the local newspaper. Currently the law requires that this notice and publication be handled by the Clerk of the Court. The Bill is only for the notice that a foreclosure proceeding has commenced. The Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Press Association. In more rural areas there have been issues with local newspapers receiving payment. Foreclosure attorneys and newspapers agree that the process would go more smoothly if the foreclosure attorneys could deal with the newspaper directly rather than going through the clerk. The legislation has no opponent... no opposition. And I'm open to questions. And would appreciate your support."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1134 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gordon-Booth. Lilly. Robinson. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1166, Representative Ramirez. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. One moment. So, Senate Bill 1166 is pretty much a cleanup Bill. It removes language from several Professional Licensing Laws that require a person to be a U.S. citizen or swear to become a U.S. citizen in order to be able to acquire that professional license. Last year we passed a similar law... a similar Bill that removes the licensing requirements in many areas, these were included. Which is why I'm introducing this Bill. The Bill removes citizenship requirements in Illinois plumbing, water well and pump installation, Illinois Horse Meat Act, Liquor Control Act, and Safety Deposit. Federally it has been found unconstitutional to require a citizenship requirement in these levels of ... in these types of professional licensing. And this Bill will allow us to be able to live up to our Federal Law. Most states don't require licensing therefore this Bill will allow for people who don't... who are

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

not citizens to be able to apply for licensing in these six areas. I welcome any questions and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This matter being on Short Debate, Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Representative, you and I talked about this Bill in committee."

Ramirez: "We did."

Wheeler: "And we had some questions there, I'd like to make sure they're on the record here today as well."

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "One of those questions has to do with, first of all a... you said there's a Supreme Court ruling at some point in the past that mentioned that you couldn't make... for instance for lawyers... citizenship requirements for that licensure. Is that something that we said in committee?"

Ramirez: "We did talk about that, correct."

Wheeler: "And I think we also mentioned that... or I had asked the question about, if we change the requirement that's in our statute now for some of these different licensures that currently require either U.S. citizenship or some attestation to pursuing citizenship those were... were things that we're taking out of this... of our statute because they don't apply based on that Supreme Court ruling. Is that a fair assessment of what we said in committee?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "So, what this does not do, however, is open the door for what some people might be concerned about of having maybe

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

undocumented people here being able to apply for licensure and be licensed by the State of Illinois. To my... to my recollection this... this statute or this Bill does not open the door for that part of it. Is that correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct. So, to the extent of the law if the person is not allowed because of their status to be able to obtain the license and work in that field they will not be able to through this Bill, that is correct."

Wheeler: "Okay. So, to turn that around for a moment then, what we're trying to do with this Bill then is for people who are here legally, they have a work visa, they have a Green Card, they have some element of being here under our process, they are not U.S. citizens yet but if they... and they haven't made an application for U.S. citizenship they can still go to work by getting licensed under our process in the State of Illinois? So they could actually begin earning and working here under those licensure Acts. Is that also correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct. And so, with licensing right there... we would be removing the... we would be removing the citizenship requirement but it doesn't take away from the fact that they would have to have whatever level of experience, the education, and any other background checks that would be required for the licensing."

Wheeler: "Right. They still have to be able to do the job."

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "Right now they are prevented from applying for licensure because they're not yet U.S. citizens in some cases."

Ramirez: "Correct."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Wheeler: "And that's what you're trying to... to... I guess remedy with your Bill is that part of it. So, people could actually go to work, get licensed, as long as they've been trained and have the proper experience based on our requirements we already have. None of those are being waived. At the same time, all we're doing is giving more people that opportunity because we're taking away a restriction that according to the Supreme Court that shouldn't exist anyway."

Ramirez: "That is correct, Representative Wheeler. So, this Bill does not change other requirements to obtain a license, such as education, experience, or character or change a person's employment eligibility as set by Federal Law. That is correct."

Wheeler: "Thank you. One second. Okay. Can you talk to me real quick about... there's one question that we did not talk about in committee hearing. I'm looking at, actually the first paragraph under Section 5-725, there's a whole new licensure language here. And in the fourth line it just says that no department may deny an occupational or professional license based solely on the applicants citizenship status or immigration status. That is in line with what we were just talking about, is that not correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "Okay. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, when we walked into committee... to the Bill. We walked into committee that morning I was... I was not certain of how I would support that Bill. After our discussions and the answers from the Sponsor, research from our abled staff, I believe this is a good Bill

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

and we should support it so more people can go to work in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ramirez to close... you're requesting Standard Debate?"

Wheeler: "Yes, please."

Speaker Manley: "Well, no one has their lights on. That's better.

Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Skillicorn: "I just want to go through line by line of this Amendment here and it's just to clarify. It is... the title is gone here but it's only the first Amendment, right?"

Ramirez: "I don't have an Amendment. This a Senate Bill."

Skillicorn: "You see, I think I saw SC 1 when I hit other text? Yes, so I'm seeing SCA 1. That's okay... that's what we're going to go to 'cause that's what we're doing here. So, line 10 on this, I specifically see 'applicant citizenship status'. Okay, I understand that. 'Or immigration status.' So, I understand someone may not be a citizen, might have a work permit, might have a Green Card or something. But I see here on line 10, specifically says, 'or immigration status'. What is the intent for that?"

Ramirez: "So, that would mean that if the person is a Green Card holder, if the person is someone that is working towards their Green Card... so this is... the licensing piece... so there's... well let me separate this. And I think we talked about this in committee. And, Representative, you weren't in committee but we were just discussing that constitutionally we have... we

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

have made it clear that requiring a citizenship for a... for a number of licensing requirements or licensing Acts is unconstitutional. However, in order to be able to receive the license one must be able to obtain the license with certain requirements such as education, experience, character, and one must be able to... be able to do that to the extent of the Federal Law. That would require that the individual would have to be able to have status to be able to practice that license in the state that they're requesting. And so, that is what I... that is my understanding of my legislation."

Skillicorn: "And I understand that, too. And, you know, part of it here... you know, so going to line 9, 'based solely on the applicant's citizen status', hey I agree with that. Someone's got a work permit, they should be able to get a professional license. I agree with that. The problem is... and I won't get stuck on this... but the 'or immigration status'. That... we don't need to have that 'or' in there. But I'll go on to page 3. Page 3, lines 14, 15, and 16 what is crossed out is 'applicant submitted evidence that he or she is a citizen of the United States or has declared their intention to become a citizen'. Why is that crossed out?"

Ramirez: "Because it's unconstitutional. So, let me tell you. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that licensing laws requiring applicants to a U.S. citizen or to pledge to become a U.S. citizen is presumed unconstitutional with limited exception. Example, police. That is Sugarman v. Dougall 413 U.S. 534 (sic-634) (1973). And if I had my glasses I could read you more of the numbers. And also Nyquist v. Mauclet, I think. Again, I don't have my glasses. So, it's already been said

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

that's its unconstitutional. This is why I'm telling you it's a cleanup Bill, most states don't have that. And currently, IDFPR licenses individuals regardless of their citizenship or immigration status and that is... and they're all neutral on this Bill."

Skillicorn: "So, I mean... I've done my homework and research here. Supreme Court talks about citizenship, immigration status. And they're two different things. And they're two very distinct different things and important things. The fact that IDFPR is on it doesn't matter. I know the State of Illinois doesn't check these things and that's why it's our job to check these things. So, I just want to furthermore repeat that immigration status is left in this Bill. It's left in this Bill for a reason. And it is beyond what the court has ruled. I advocate a strong 'no' vote because this is clearly an opening door to give licenses to people that, one, have broken the law and, two, are not qualified to work in the United States. Even if they get this license they can't work because they don't have a work permit or a Green Card. Thank you very much. I advocate a 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi." Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. So, if we can start this... the Section that's being amended is the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. So, exactly... are any law enforcement officers or people who engage in law enforcement activities encompassed by the scope of the Civil Administrative Code?"

Ramirez: "Not for this Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Mazzochi: "Well, what do you mean not for this Bill?"

Ramirez: "So... give me one moment. So, this Bill is only applying for six areas of licensing. The Illinois Plumbing Act, the Water Well and Pump, Illinois Home Meat Act, the Liquor Control Act, and the Safety Deposit License Act. Those are the five areas."

Mazzochi: "Okay. For the Liquor Control Act though are there an... is there an... in the context of any of these licenses, is there anyone who would have adjudicatory authority in any type of legal proceeding?"

Ramirez: "Can you be a little more specific?"

Mazzochi: "Yeah. What... what I'm... because I know that the Supreme Court has said that you are allowed to make citizenship requirements, for example, for judges, for law enforcement type activities. So, what I'm trying to get at is, is anything within the scope of what you're seeking to encompass... in these new sections that you're amending is it going to encompass any type of law enforcement, or taxing power, or other type of adjudicatory activities?"

Ramirez: "It is my understanding that it is not."

Mazzochi: "Okay. And if a court were to try to construe this later you are in agreement that to the extent that anybody might inadvertently be covered for any law enforcement, administrative enforcement, adjudicatory roles that that would or... or taxation power that that would not be covered within the scope of this Amendment?"

Ramirez: "It would not be covered under this one. And let me just remind you that this is only for six specific areas of licensing. And in order for the licensing to happen the

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

individual who is going in for the licensing would have to... who would have to suffice every other requirement that's already been set forth in order to be able to obtain the license."

Mazzochi: "No, I... I understand. I just know that sometimes when you get a license that empowers you to be able to make certain types of adjudicatory decisions, it allows you to make enforcement type decisions. So, I'm just trying to make sure that that type of activity is carved out from within the scope of the Bill."

Ramirez: "No, I appreciate your concern. But it is my understanding that it is... it does not."

Mazzochi: "That that type of activity is not covered?"

Ramirez: "Give me one moment."

Mazzochi: "Okav."

Ramirez: "Representative, I think the… I don't know every single position of licensing for the Liquor Control Act, which is what I think you are concerned with."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Ramirez: "But it is my understanding, and after looking at all of the review, that there won't be any issues with their licensing if, in fact, they get a licensing and then they're... I mean, cause... well actually let me step back. Tell me, what is your concern? What's... give me scenario. What... what you're concerned about when someone goes in and doesn't have... and is not a citizen and applies for a liquor licensing?"

Mazzochi: "I think that there's a difference between... it's not a question of applying for a liquor license, it's a question of whether someone actually has the ability to either engage in

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

administrative fact findings, if someone has the ability and authority to levy any taxes, or it's whether someone would have the ability or authority to otherwise engage in law enforcement, investigatory type activity, or other types of adjudicatory activity. As long as you commit that it's your understanding for legislative intent purposes that that type of activity is not within the scope of this then I can move on and go to my next section."

Ramirez: "Representative that is not my intention with this Bill."

Mazzochi: "Okay."

Ramirez: "And I just... I think that's to the extent of what I can say to you."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. And then when it comes to page 2, item 7 just to be clear we are not changing the requirement that no person shall qualify to hold a license? Now I understand that they have to be a legal citizen of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence. Now, does that mean that they have actually attained permanent resident status or are you trying to include within that for example... well, let me just ask that question first. They're... they're a legal resident of the United States."

Ramirez: "It says, 'lawfully admitted for permanent U.S. residence'. So, this is someone that is a Green Card holder but not a citizen."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, they are an actual existing legal... as you understand..."

Ramirez: "Well, natural would... yeah."

Mazzochi: "...they are an actual legal resident of the United States?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Ramirez: "Well, naturalized would assume that you... usually when you say naturalized as a citizen, right? So, we're talking about a legal resident who has a Green Card. They are... they are legally able to be in this country and they are applying for a license. And that is what we're saying that constitutionally..."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Yep. I..."

Ramirez: "...we are not requiring that."

Mazzochi: "That's fine. I just wanted to make sure that that this person is an actual legal resident within the United States possessing a Green Card, which means they've actually gone through that vetting process."

Ramirez: "I know. And, Representative, we've gone on and on about citizenship all week and I just want to make sure that I get to the intent of your question because I also want to make sure that it doesn't become something that is about... talking about people being illegal or not or citizens or not. Because I mean, I think that the information within the Bill is pretty clear."

Mazzochi: "Well, the question that I have is is that I think that to the extent this Bill is being represented as trying to have Illinois law conform with Illinois Supreme Court precedent. Illinois Supreme... I'm sorry with U.S. Supreme Court precedent. That precedent has been... I think is sufficiently clear that there's some areas where we are allowed to say, licensing is limited to U.S. citizens. There are other areas where we have to also open that to legal residents within the United States. And if you've got a different case, let me know. But my understanding is that

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

there is no U.S. Supreme Court requirement that says we have to give licenses to people who are illegally in the United States. That's all I'm trying to get clarity on."

Ramirez: "I hear you. And what I... what I mentioned to the Representative previous, I want to make sure that I'm clear on what this is not doing, right? Because we're saying that we're not going to impede people from applying for the license if they're not a citizen. But what we're not doing is we're not changing other requirements to obtain a license, such as the education, such as experience, character, or a person's employment eligibility as set by Federal Law. We're not doing that with this Bill. And I want to make sure..."

Mazzochi: "No, no, no... I understand..."

Ramirez: "...that I'm very clear."

Mazzochi: "...I'm just trying to focus on the citizenship related issues."

Ramirez: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "So, I just want to be clear that to your knowledge there's no U.S. Supreme Court decision that says this state has to give licenses to people who are in the United States illegally? And that's not what this Bill is trying to do?"

Ramirez: "That is correct, Representative."

Mazzochi: "All right. Thank you very much."

Ramirez: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Jones."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Jones: "Representative, this is a good Bill. And how did you come about this Bill?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Ramirez: "This Bill was brought to me by a number of advocates who have been working on ensuring that we have equitable access to employment for people and they're not limited by their citizenship requirement."
- Jones: "So, Representative, looking at the proponents and opponents there are no opponents to this Bill at the time, correct?"
- Ramirez: "That is correct."
- Jones: "But I notice you have almost 70 cosponsors on this Bill, Representative. Congratulations."
- Ramirez: "Thank you, Representative Jones."
- Jones: "And... and I know you worked hard on this Bill, Representative. And I see that you have one of my... my name is on this Bill."
- Ramirez: "That is correct, Representative. That happened while I was very sick."
- Jones: "And when did you talk to me about this Bill, Representative?"
- Ramirez: "You and I had a very long conversation about it during caucus, Representative."
- Jones: "Now, Representative, you were asked about you know the question of citizenship in the Constitution. This Bill also addressed... in the previous Bill it took away the issues of citizenship and the pre-requisites for a pharmacist and teacher... teachers' licenses, correct?"
- Ramirez: "That is correct."
- Jones: "So, why is it important in this Bill to make sure that what you're trying to do gets done and it's not impacting citizenship at all?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Ramirez: "I want to make sure that we're able to be consistent with what other states are doing in limiting requirements that are not constitutional and ensuring that we're expanding the ability for individuals who have the requirements, have the education, have the experience, and are able to by Federal Law be licensed and work in these areas to have the opportunity to work. We all want an Illinois that is equitable, an Illinois where people are able to get the kind of job that is going to move them from poverty to wealth creation and middle class. I believe that removing these kinds of barriers that are not constitutional is one step forward to that direction."
- Jones: "Thank you, Representative. And to the Bill. Representative Ramirez has not only presented this Body with a great Bill but she's presented us with a Bill that makes not only good sense but allows an opportunity for residents in all of our districts to make sure that they achieve the American Dream. And I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Villa, we've had three Members rise in support of the Bill. And we're on Short Debate. Thank you. Excuse me that was Standard Debate but we appreciate it. Leader Harris for an announcement."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Carroll is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Manley: "The record will reflect your request.

  Representative Ramirez to close."
- Ramirez: "We have been talking all week about how important the State of Illinois is to all of us and how we want to make sure that people are able to go from poverty to wealth

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

creation and hopefully to the middle class that we all hope for. I believe this is a good Bill. And as Representative Wheeler said, this is about creating jobs and allowing people to have the adequate licensing necessary to be able to boost the State of Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1166 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 80 voting in 'favor', 36 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1213, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please roll this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1213, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stuart, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart on the Amendment."
- Stuart: "Thank you. House Amendment 1 is simply a cleanup Amendment. It clarifies the process for what happens after a successful evaluation appeal. The language leaves the decision making on that next step to the collective bargaining process."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1213. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair,

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1213, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1213 has to do with unsatisfactory ratings for teachers. And the Amendment that I spoke about earlier has actually brought CPS, the Chicago Teachers Union, and IFT all in agreement on this Bill. It basically just provides that a school district shall, in good faith cooperation with the teachers or through the good faith bargaining with the exclusive bargaining representative of the teachers, develop and implement an appeals process for summative unsatisfactory ratings. The joint committee that will be made up of management and union representatives determines the criteria for successful appeals. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. You know, we have... I believe we still have some opposition but more importantly, you know, this is collectively bargained. We have tenure teachers, there's lots of protections for teachers. My wife's a teacher, my mother-in-law is a retired teacher, my sister-in-law is a retired teacher. And this is certainly not one of the things that they ever thought that they needed was added protection.

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

It's protect... it's... this is handled through collective bargain already. I do not want to weaken the ability to remove unsatisfactory teachers from the classroom. I certainly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart to close."

Stuart: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1213 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 82 voting in 'favor', 32 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1214, Representative Villa. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1214, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Villa."

Villa: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1214 requires the Department of Public Health to ensure that those who draw blood from children and adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities are trained at least once every three years in the most current method of drawing blood from children and adults with developmental and intellectual disabilities. This Bill, with the Amendment, takes out the blood centers from... from this requirement. I am happy to answer questions and encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. And the Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Mazzochi: "I'm sorry, my speaker light was on for the prior one.

Sorry about that."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1214 pass?' All voting in favor vote 'aye'; 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. With 116 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1244, Representative Greenwood. I'm sorry. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1321, Representative Halpin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1429, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1429, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1429 is designed to ensure that no one is denied access to justice by threats or intimidation by opposing council, an abuser, a former employer, or anyone else by providing that evidence of a person's immigration status is not admissible in any civil proceeding unless it is essential to prove an element of a claim. Access to justice is a basic principle, the rule of law. People need to be able to access the courts and legal processes or the law cannot enforce people's rights and responsibilities. Meaningful access requires that we address the systemic barriers faced by different members of the community. Senate Bill 1429, as passed by the Senate, is modeled after the Civil Rape Shield

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Law that outlines a similar procedure to determine admissibility of evidence that is otherwise inadmissible by requiring a party to file a written motion at least 14 days before trial specifically describing the evidence and stating the purpose for which it is offered. Like the Civil Rape Shield Law this Bill requires an in-camera hearing to weigh the probative value of the evidence to determine its admissibility. I know of no known opponents. I'm happy to ask… answer any questions and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. And the Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill actually was extensively debated and opposed by many in connection with the committee hearing. One of the things in particular that was of concern for this is that if you are a parent and you believe that your child's other parent is a flight risk and may abscond with your child overseas because of their immigration status, this Bill prevents you from being able to even put that issue or any evidence to that affect into play in a family court dispute. There's a lot of work that still needs to be done on this Bill. It's very broad, it's very overreaching. And it actually privileges people who are illegal immigrant... illegal residents in the United States over American citizens and it's going to put children's lives at risk. So for that reason, we ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Costa Howard this Bill is on Short Debate. And we've had one in favor and one opposed. Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Gong-Gershowitz: "For most of my career I've represented trafficking victims, unaccompanied immigrant children sold like cattle, victims of domestic violence and sexual harassment. In far too many cases predators and abusers threaten victims into silence using immigration status as a weapon. And it goes something like this, if you file a claim, if you testify against me I will call immigration and you will never see your children again. A person's immigration status should never be used as a weapon to intimidate witnesses or deter someone from righting a wrong through our courts. Yet there's ample evidence that that is exactly what is happening. The result is that more victims will remain in the shadows and more immigrants will be vulnerable to abuse. think it's important to remember that if someone's immigration status is essential information the judge has the opportunity to consider it and if it's probative value outweighs its prejudice it comes in. This is also true in any family court proceeding. If that information is essential to determining the best interests of a child the judge can examine it in-camera and it can come in if its probative value outweighs its prejudice. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1429 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 69 voting in 'favor', 47 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1514, Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of

59th Legislative Day

- the record. Senate Bill 1702, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please move this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gabel, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gabel on the Amendment."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This... the language on the Amendment just adds telemedicine to the... to the language in this Section so an evaluation can be made in a timely manner."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gabel moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1702. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "This Bill makes a small change to part of the Mental Health Act. What it says is that if... if a patient has to be in restraints that it adds advanced practice psychiatric nurses to the list of providers who can make that decision."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1702 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; 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.

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1857, Leader Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2050 Representative Edly-Allen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2120, Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please... please return this Bill to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2120, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Kifowit, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moylan on the Amendment."

Moylan: "Yeah, this... the Amendment just extends the sunset for one year and eliminates pot from our language."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moylan moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2120. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2120, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moylan."

Moylan: "Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair. This is just a cleanup Bill and I... with no opposition. And I ask for an 'aye' vote.

Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Can you expound just a little bit more?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Moylan: "Yeah, like I said this is been all approved. It's from the Capital Development Board and it's just cleanup language."
- Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will Representative Caulkins yield? Will Representative Moylan yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Batinick: "Representative, yeah, give us a little bit more than that. It seems like they're doing a little bit more than a cleanup Bill but can you expand on that just a tiny bit here?"
- Moylan: "Well, I will explain what they explained to me and that's what they said. But I'll try to expound..."

Batinick: "That's how they explained the Bill to you?"

Moylan: "Yes."

Batinick: "When did they do that?"

- Moylan: "It extends the sunset for use of single prime contracts from December 31, 2020 to December 31... from '19 to '20.

  Removes the requirement that single..."
- Batinick: "Okay. What is a single prime design-bid-build contract?"
- Moylan: "Yeah. That's one contractor, single design. After a certain price it increases. It explains it in the Bill. On the current contract the construction contracts exceeding \$250 thousand agencies may use a single prime method of construction delivery. For contracts of 5 million more or less the CDB may not use single prime of more than 50 spent the total on their projects for each calendar year."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Batinick: "Can you tell me why it removes the requirement that CBD's research and review includes the use of solar energy systems?"

Moylan: "No, I cannot tell you right now."

Batinick: "Okay. Anything else you want to share about the Bill, Representative?"

Moylan: "Pardon me?"

Batinick: "Anything else you wanted to share about the Bill, Representative?"

Moylan: "Yes, I would... I would like an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for kind of answering some of my questions."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons, do you rise in support or opposition to the Bill?"

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "Well, I need to know if you're rising in opposition or in support."

Ammons: "Well, I can't say I'm in opposition yet but I do have a question about this Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Please continue."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, if this Bill extends the sunset... I see that it expired December 31, 2017, the use of a single prime, does that exclude the minority participation process for CDB?"

Moylan: "No, not at all."

Ammons: "And... so we would not be concerned about, although we need to reform this process because currently they are not doing very well with minority vendors. But under this

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

provision it would not exclude participation of minority requirements on the 20 percent on the contracts?"

Moylan: "That's correct."

Ammons: "Okay. I just wanted to verify that. And thank you for answering the questions."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Thank you. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote. This is just cleanup language. Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2120 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. 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 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting
'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received
a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
Bill 1236, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read
the Bill. Mr. Clerk, will you please move this Bill back to
Second Reading for an Amendment?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Yingling."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling on Amendment 2."

Yingling: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Floor Amendment #2 unifies the Bill's language with the States Officials and Employees Ethics Acts."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1236. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling on the Amendment."
- Yingling: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment #3 just clarifies some language for existing ordinances."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1236. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling."
- Yingling: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Senate Bill 1236 is a county government reform Bill that is designed to curb a number of questionable practices in county government around the state. There are four basic provisions to the Bill. First, the Bill provides... prohibits double dipping by an elected official attempting to collect both a pension and a salary from both a local unit and IMRF at the same time. Officials who are receiving IMRF benefits would be prohibited from receiving their salary if those pension benefits were for the same

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

elected office. They do have the option to defer their pension instead. Second, the Bill allows newly elected officials to receive a transitional audit of financial affairs to the office being assumed so that the newly elected official is able to be aware of any past improprieties and have a transparent view into the affairs of the office being assumed. Third, the Bill requires financial disclosures of insider contracts those between a vendor and a family member of specified county officials and allows improper contracts of over \$30 thousand to be terminated. Finally, the Bill provides procedures for a board elected county chairman to be removed with or without cause by a four-fifths vote of the board. It also provides procedures for removal and replacement of certain forest preserve county board... forest preserve board officers. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Batinick, do you rise..."

Batinick: "Madam Speaker, we may have to go just three, three, and three Standard Debate if... if that's okay with you?"

Speaker Manley: "Standard Debate is okay. Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I'd like to commend you on your choice of chief-co's. And let's get into the... the meat of the... you said there's four or five main provisions? How many?"

Yingling: "There are four main provisions."

Batinick: "Okay. So, I had some crosstalk going on. Let's... let's talk with the main first one. I'll let you sign that form.

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Okay. So, would this Bill... a version of this Bill came up previously and there was a big issue because we had situations where if you were collecting any kind of IMRF pension you could not serve on a board and collect the pension as well. So, let's say you were a police officer in a small town or worked at a park district and you were retired and decided to run for county board. The way the Bill was written previously you could not do that, correct? Tell me... tell me if that's fixed and what changes are made to fix that."

Yingling: "Correct. So, that was a different Bill. In this Bill, it just says that if you are currently holding an elected office you cannot collect a pension for that same elected office at the same time."

Batinick: "Okay. So, if I'm a county board member and I get a pension for being a county board member 'cause of some of the quirks in law I can't collect a pension for the exact same job that I'm still doing?"

Yingling: "Correct. In this scenario you would not be able to collect a salary for that position. But this does provide the individual the ability to defer their pension."

Batinick: "Okay. So, if you're a police chief, collect your pension, you can join the county board, you're all good there, right?"

Yingling: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So, the next... the next provision I think it talks about the three-fifths vote to remove a chairman of a county board. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "It's four-fifths."

Batinick: "Four-fifths?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Yingling: "Wait, hold on."

Batinick: "You know what, my eyes are going, Sir. It was correct in the notes, it was not my notes it was my eyes. So, four-fifths so that's... the removed chair would retain their office as a regular county board member I believe?"

Yingling: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So, what are the next two significant changes that you're doing here? Looks like you're doing something with the forest district board."

Yingling: "Right. So, they... the... on that last point you just brought up that same principle would apply with the forest preserve chairperson. By four-fifths vote that forest preserve chair preserve chairperson could be removed if they are selected internally from within that forest preserve board."

Batinick: "Okay. Tell us what you're doing with vendors seeking contracting in excess of \$30 thousand?"

Yingling: "Right. So, what we're trying to do is make sure that there is transparency in contract bidding. And you probably have heard me talk about this before, in my home county we experienced a very serious situation with millions of dollars in no-bid contracts being given out to family members of county employees. So, this goes to address that to make sure that there is a system in place for full disclosure."

Batinick: "Okay. While you're talking about your county, I want to clarify this is statewide though, correct?"

Yingling: "This is statewide."

Batinick: "This is not like we had before were it was a Lake County issue. Okay. And I think this is the last issue,

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

provides for transitional audits for new county officials. Is that point four?"

Yingling: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Describe what a transitional audit is? That's actually a new term to me, Representative."

Yingling: "Sure. So, it provides an opportunity for a newly elected official to have an audit conducted of their elected office. So, really you're looking more at countywide elected officials. And it's to make sure that the… that there is no misconduct that has taken place before in the past. It's to protect the outgoing elected official, to protect the incoming elected official…"

Batinick: "Okay."

Yingling: "...and most importantly to protect the taxpayers."

Batinick: "So... so, when there's a transition between members of an office it allows for a transitional office... audit, kind of sets the marker for the new person coming in. If it's clean moving forward something can't be messed up in there."

Yingling: "Correct."

Batinick: "But it also allows to see that... that the outgoing person left the finances in good order. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "Correct."

Batinick: "Is that a financial audit or is that a performance audit or both?"

Yingling: "It's a financial audit."

Batinick: "Just a financial audit. Okay. Thank you for your questions, Representative. I think I'm going to listen to some fascinating debate the rest of the way."

Yingling: "Thank you."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Representative Brady, do you rise in support or in opposition?"

Brady: "With a question on the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "So, I have a dilemma. It's hard to find out... when we're on Standard Debate I can only do three and three. And so, it would help me..."

Brady: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "...if you could let me know perhaps if you were leaning one way or the other?"

Brady: "What I'm... what I'm leaning towards right now is towards you to help you. And I would tell you that in committee when I asked this question I'm not sure I got a clear understanding. And so, I would tell you that if the question is answered favorably for me then I would be for it."

Speaker Manley: "Will you smile my way if..."

Brady: "If it's against me, I'm a 'nay'."

Speaker Manley: "...you feel it's favorable?"

Brady: "Yes. I can assure you of one thing, I will be short."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Representative, quickly... in... when we're in committee... and there may be an Amendment to change this... I put a scenario out that if I were to go back as county coroner on a temporary basis, someone resigns, somebody retired, whatever the case may be, just to fill out a term. This would allow me, if I understand it correctly, that there would be no salary that could be paid to me because I was in the office before. Is that correct? Or that I'd have to defer any type of payment... pension with IMRF?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Yingling: "So, if you were collecting an IMRF pension for your...
you were previously the coroner, correct, Representative?"
Brady: "That's correct."

Yingling: "So, if you are... let's say you start collecting a pension for your previous role as coroner and then you get elected to the position or you get appointed back to that position you would have one of two choices. You could either refrain from taking a salary or you could defer your pension payments until you were no longer in office."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "I'm going to make a leap here. We've had now three people in favor, is any of the other... Representative Welter, I'm assuming you're in favor because you're on the Bill. Skillicorn, I'm assuming you're in favor just because I kind of know you. And so, there are nobody... there is nobody in opposition waiting to speak. And so, I will go to Representative Yingling to close."

Yingling: "Thank you very much. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1236 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer. McCombie. Spain. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting in 'favor', 13 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1739, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please put this Bill on Second Reading for an Amendment."

59th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Willis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Willis on the Amendment."
- "Thank you. On the Amendment. This has been... first off, Willis: I want to thank Leader Davis for allowing me to put this Amendment on to his Bill. This is an Amendment that is agreed upon through the Hospital Association and the Health Care Facilities Board. Several months ago, I came... or about a month ago I came before this Body requesting help to save a hospital in my district because of some legislation we had put through a number of years ago that allowed an unscrupulous hospital owner to come through and possibly close my hospital in my district without going through proper channels. Since then I've been able to work with Leader Davis, the Hospital Care Facilities Board, and the Illinois Hospital Association. And we have agreed upon language so that no other hospitals, no other communities will go through this same upset that I did, along with Representative Welch, in our district. This does a couple of things. It calls for a certificate of need permit process for all hospital transfers. It does put in an ability for a new owner to close certain services, one every six months. No more than that. And it also puts in and codifies language that allows the Health Care Facilities Board to consider litigation that may be pending to delay their decision for six months. As I stated, this was something that

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

we were able to get all bodies together on. It is agreed upon.

And I request adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Demmer, would you like to debate the Bill on Third? Okay. Representative Willis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1739. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Let me, again, reiterate the work of Leader Willis in helping to craft the Amendment that was adopted to the Bill. So in addition to what she has with regard to the Amendment, the underlying Bill would allow for the board to elect a vice-chair who can act in place of a chair when the chair is not available. It codifies the current practice of staffing... staff issuing advisory opinions regarding whether a permit is required or not, which is a current practice of the staff and this codifies that. And thirdly, it clarifies that written reviews or findings of the board staff means those findings set forth in the... are the same findings set forth in the state board staff report that we are again asking that happens. So with that, in addition to what was just previously said with regard to the Amendment, I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates he will."

Demmer: "Representative Davis, I appreciate the... the purpose of the underlying Bill here. My questions are really about the Amendments that Representative Willis recently added to this. I just want to clarify a few things about how this Bill, that was an initiative that she brought on behalf of her communities, how it's made its way into this final Bill here today. So my first question is, does this Bill allow for the Governor to reverse a decision of the Health Facilities and Services Review Board?"

Davis: "It does not."

Demmer: "Okay. So, that provision has been removed."

Davis: "Yes."

Demmer: "Does this Bill allow for a hospital to reduce, to close a specific service line without going through the full certificate of need process?"

Davis: "They must go through the... they can... they have the ability to close a service, one every six months."

Demmer: "Okay. I... I appreciate that. If... if a second service should become necessary to close during that six months, what is the option for the hospital at that point?"

Davis: "They would have to go through the CON process, the full process."

Demmer: "Okay. So, what is the process for a hospital that seeks to close entirely under this Bill?"

Davis: "It... it has to go through the entire full permit process."

Demmer: "Okay."

Davis: "There is not shortcut, for lack of a better word."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Demmer: "Okay. Thank you for that. And to the ... to the Bill. I appreciate the changes that have been made from the first time we heard a Bill that was designed for a similar purpose on this. We know that there a number of issues and concerns around the specific certificate of need process that we have in place here in Illinois. However, I think it's important that we ensure that the function of the board remains intact. I believe this Bill does that. It doesn't have the concern that many people on this side of the aisle had before about giving the Governor the authority to reverse a decision of that board. We still have a process in place for a hospital to be able to make a certain number of closures, not present significant hurd... barriers for them to do so. But retain some of the checks and balances that the Health Facilities and Services Review Board has. I encourage folks to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you Representative Demmer for acknowledging some of the changes that have been made. Again, thank you to Leader Willis for her efforts to work on the Amendment side that we adopted. And with that, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1739 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received

59th Legislative Day

- a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2019: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 39, Floor Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 534, and Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 1932."
- Speaker Manley: "Proceeding to Bills... Senate Bills on Second Reading, page 6. Senate Bill 62, Representative Costa Howard.

  Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 62, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

  Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 62, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Costa Howard."
- Costa Howard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 62 amends the Mechanics Lien Demand and Referral Pilot Program, clarifying the definition of an expired lien, declaring the second year... the two year, excuse me, period from the completion date of the contract shall be increased to the extent that an automatic stay under the Bankruptcy Code stays the suit. And providing that when a completion date is not specified that the completion date shall be the date of recording the mechanics lien. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House... excuse me, Senate Bill 62 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote

59th Legislative Day

- 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harper, Mazzochi, Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 104, Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 104, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lilly."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly on the Amendment."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment basically changes the date from 7... from 10 days to 12 days. Twelve business days."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 104. In the opinion of the Chair... excuse me. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 104, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, again, Madam Speaker. This is prompt payment for our contractors who help build our Illinois. We're making

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

sure that our small subcontractors are being paid in a timely manner so that the business of the State of Illinois will not send our partners, our small business, out of business because we're not paying them in a timely manner. It's a negotiated Bill. We... we had a good conversation in reference to how we can do things better and we have more work to do on this issue in our state. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Halbrook: "Yeah. Thank you. So, Representative, there's quite a bit of debate and there was some opposition to the Bill. Can you... can you just speak to the nature of the opposition and why they were opposed?"

Lilly: "Pretty much they are concerned with how they are being paid from the state which makes it difficult for them to pay their subcontractors."

Halbrook: "And... and so what was the past practice? It was how
 many days?"

Lilly: "The past practice was 15 days and we were able to talk through it and get to 12 days."

Halbrook: "Okay. Twelve business days or twelve calendar days?"

Lilly: "Ten business days. Thank you."

Halbrook: "Ten... ten business days. Is there another exception that it could be either that or another date or not? So many calendar dates?"

Lilly: "I'm sorry, repeat."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Halbrook: "So, I thought there was an either/or that it had to be in 10 business days or a certain number of calendar days?"
- Lilly: "Yes, you are correct. It's either 10 business days or 15 calendar days, whichever one is lesser."

Lilly: "It did."

Halbrook: "All right. Thank you."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 104 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting
  is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
  Have all voted who wish? Butler, Mazzochi, Welter. Mr. Clerk,
  please take the record. With 101 voting in 'favor', 14
  'opposed', 0 'present', this Bill, having received a
  Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 456,
  Leader Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 456, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Crespo on the Amendment."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Floor
  Amendment #1 shortens the time that the Children's Advocacy
  Center team has to conduct an initial forensic interview from
  30 days to 50 calendar days."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Crespo moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 456. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 requires school districts to review every two years their existing policies and procedures concerning sexual abuse. It also requires that the State Board of Education makes available DCFS information to the school boards on a regular basis. It also provides an alternative hearing procedures if a student is under the age of 18. And provides guidelines on how school districts can share information... employee information with other school districts."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Crespo moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 456. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 456, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the House. Just some background information on the genesis of this Bill. Back in 2017 the *Chicago Tribune* conducted an investigation regarding sexual abuse at the Chicago Public Schools. And it was titled, Chicago Schools Fail To Protect Students From Sexual Assault

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Leaving Lasting Damage. Among some of the findings of the investigation we had that at Black Magnet Elementary a substitute teacher sent a 14 year old girl obscene texts and kissed her. At Simeon Career Academy a young track star was raped 40 times, I repeat 40 times, by a coach. It also found that teachers and principals failed to alert child welfare investigators or police when students reported abuse. This is an... despite the fact that a state mandated reporter law is in place. It also found that school employees subjected student victims to repeated interrogations. It also found that ineffective background checks exposed students to educators with criminal convictions. It also found that CPS does not track child abuse by its... by its employees in a consistent or formal manner. It showed that little or no support for victims of sexual abuse who were bullied because of their abuse. It also found that there was a conflict of interest with CPS's legal department. CPS's legal department both investigated allegations of sexual abuse and also defended the school district when victims sued. CPS's legal department was found to cut deals with problem educators to get them to resign. Lack of data makes it hard to determine the scope of the problem. But the Tribune investigation shows the number of sexual assault and abuses of children in schools has not declined in recent years despite a drop in overall enrollment. I chaired the Education Elementary & Curriculums Policy last year... Committee and we had a subject matter in Chicago that lasted over six hours. We heard testimony from 2 young ladies that were victims of sexual abuse at CPS. I wanted to thank Tamara Reed and Morgan Aranda for testifying in committee.

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

And here is what Senate Bill 456 does. It incorporates several House and Senate Bills, provides that the Children's Advocacy Centers will be responsible for conducting the initial interview when there is an allegation of sexual abuse. Would require that in the event a school district needs to interview a student victim of sexual abuse that the child shall... should have a child advocate present. It creates the Make Sexual Abuse Fully Extinct Task Force to address issues concerning the sexual abuse of students in school related settings. Also calls for immediate suspension of educator licenses for individuals convicted of sex crimes. Calls for protecting victims from intimidation and re-traumatizing by providing alternative, out of court hearing procedures. Calls for protecting whistle blowers who warn school districts about an abusers past. Removes the limit of how far back a school district can go to search for a history of abuse by a perspective employee. Several Members contributed to... to this effort. I want to thanks Representatives Reick and McSweeney for their contributions throughout the summer. And with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'll speak directly to the Bill.

Representative Crespo did a pretty good job right now of explaining all of the things that are going into this Bill that I think that the most important... one of the most important things that needs to come out what we do here today with this Bill is to recognize the fact that we've just really begun the process of cleaning up what we found to be systemic problems, not only in the Chicago Public School system with

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

regard to sexual abuse, but, you know, frankly statewide there are... there are problems. But the steps that we're taking with this Bill, I believe, will go a long way toward remedying a problem that we found that existed for decades. And I will say parenthetically that with the kind of rancor maybe we've had on the floor the last several days, the division, the partisanship, this is a Bill that is done the way Bills should be done. We came together as a committee in Chicago with these hearings, partisan differences were thrown aside and we threw ourselves into the job of making this as good a Bill as we possibly we could in order to help the school children of Illinois avoid sexual abuse. I want to thank Representative Crespo for his leadership on this. And I strongly, strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Crespo: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Number one, again, I want to thank all... all those Members that contributed to this Bill, spent hours and hours in committee. I want to take a moment David Johnson (sic-Jackson), Jennifer Smith and thank Richards, and Gary Marx, and Juan Perez, reporters for the Chicago Tribune for... for reporting on this and staying on top of the issue. But most importantly, I want to thank Tamara Reed and Morgan Aranda for testifying in committee. If you're listening, Tamara and Morgan, I want you to know that your voices were heard and your courage made a huge difference. Finally, it was a sad chapter in the history of Chicago. I sure hope and pray that the new mayor, Mayor Lightfoot, remains vigilant and holds the Chicago School Board of Education and the CPS's superintendent accountable if they

Speaker Manley: "Representative Crespo to close."

59th Legislative Day

- fail the children that we all represent. And with that, I'll ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 456 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting
  'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having
  received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
  passed. Senate Bill 516, Representative Rita. Out of the
  record. Senate Bill 527, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk,
  please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 527, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Walsh."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh on the Amendment."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the General Assembly.

  Floor Amendment #2 is a cap on the amount that would be paid out through the tax fund on the underlying Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions and move for its adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 527. 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. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 527, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, again. Senate Bill 527 amends the Property Tax Code that allows an amount paid to Will County Treasurer to compensate taxing districts for the loss of revenue on property owned by the states for the purpose of developing a third airport in Peotone. It's based on current year... the Bill would base it on current year tax assessments, which they're currently based on 2002 property tax assessment. The Bill also extends the sunset... sunset date for compensation from December of 2020 to December 2030. And then the Amendment capped any amount paid to Will County for that property at 600 thousand. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill that's been out for a few years and this is the year that we got it passed. There is a sunset coming up on this effort to somewhat reimburse Will County local governments for the loss of tax revenue due to property being purchased by IDOT on behalf of the State of Illinois for an airport, which for better or for worse, no matter what your opinion is, still isn't built and really isn't going to be built in the near term future. So, we want to make provisions for our local governments to try... so that they can keep on going until such time as any airport replaces the lost tax dollars with all sorts of new tax revenue. This is really important to that area of Will County that's... that's very strongly impacted by IDOT's ownership of

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

such a large footprint. And I would like your support for
this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 527 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 92 voting in 'favor', 20 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1221, Leader Harris. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1257, Representative Zalewski. Please... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This... thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a combination for non-for-profits that had transportation and fringe benefits taken away from them under the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This restores them. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This matter is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Batinick: "Can you just give me a little bit... I was... I was hoping to hear exactly what was taken away and what we're replacing?"

Zalewski: "So it's my understanding, Mark, that under the Jobs Act the deductibility of fringe benefits and parking benefits and transportation benefits for non-for-profit employees was taken away. We make up that loss in a cost neutral way under House Bill 1257... or Senate Bill 1257 at the state level."

Batinick: "Do you know... how do we do that? I'm curious 'cause this sounds fascinating. Cost neutral way."

Zalewski: "It... we just decouple."

Batinick: "Okay."

Zalewski: "And my understanding is the decoupling from the... from the federal rule..."

Batinick: "From the federal..."

Zalewski: "...doesn't cost us any money."

Batinick: "I got it, I understand what we're doing here. Okay.

Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1257 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1377, Representative Jones. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

Speaker Manley: "Representative Jones on the Amendment."

Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor... House Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It's agreed upon language between the Illinois Life and Health Insurance Guaranteed Fund. It basically asked that all companies, Illinois domestic stop companies be licensed in Illinois and the same states where they have policy. And it also allows the current law, which requires that the company be licensed in Illinois. And this Bill seeks... or the Amendment seeks to correct the problem that required that not only these companies be licensed in the same state but they also hold a license in the State of Illinois. Be happy to answer any questions on Third Reading."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Jones moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1377. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I explained that this Bill seeks to make sure that any insurance company that's offering policies in different states that they also be

59th Legislative Day

- licensed in Illinois. This is agreed upon language. There's no opposition to the Bill. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1377 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1456, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski on the Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to adopt House Floor Amendment #2, it clarifies that it's for... it removes the underlying exemption for airport and waste disposal."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1456. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As amended, the Bill provides that property owned by a municipality that's not subject... that doesn't deal with airport and waste disposal can be used for non tax exempt purposes... or shall... that is used for non tax exempt purposes shall be subject to the same property taxes for the period of time as the non exempt purpose. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill... excuse me, Senate Bill 1456 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harper. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1557, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please... out of the record. Senate Bill 1573, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1602, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1602, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

  Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1602, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill is the work product of the Illinois Secretary of State and the Illinois Manufactured Housing Association. SB1602 amends the laws related to the

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

licensing of manufactured home dealers, specifically changes the definition of community based manufactured home dealer and the licensing threshold for these dealers. It also addresses the record keeping requirements for manufactured home dealers as well. I urge a 'aye' vote. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. And the Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, this says this allows a community-based manufactured home dealer to buy, trade, or sell no more than two manufactured homes per calendar year that are located within the community. Is this a decrease of what they can do now? Or is this an increase of what they can do now?"

Smith: "I believe it's an increase."

Batinick: "Okay. So right now, a community-based manufactured home dealer cannot sell any... sell, trade, or buy any manufactured homes?"

Smith: "Well, this Bill is designed to allow for community-based dealers to sell up to two new homes per year, which will be located on leased land within their community setting. It also allows for one office to serve multiple communities, which are under the same ownership within a 50 mile radius of the main office as a supplemental location."

Batinick: "Describe... what is a community-based manufactured home dealer?"

Smith: "The community-based operator home dealer... I have to get back to you on that, Mr. Batinick."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Batinick: "I hate to do this to you, is there any way you can get back to me at... we'll wait for a vote to get back to me. I'm just confused with what we're doing here. I mean, I'm shocked that you're not... that we actually have such a low limit on what a community-based home dealer can do. Just two homes per year seems..."

Smith: "They... currently community-based dealers cannot sell manufactured homes on behalf of a manufacturer. If a community based dealer wanted to bring in a new manufactured home to sell at the community, the dealer would need to purchase the home from the manufacturer and then resell it to the buyer."

Batinick: "There we go. Now I understand it."

Smith: "This is..."

Batinick: "Okay."

Smith: "...streamlining the process."

Batinick: "So... and I was confused because I... if a community-based manufactured home dealer could only sell two per year and they can sell none now, I was wondering what they sell. So, the... the meat of this Bill is they're going to act as... instead of buying something from the manufacturer and then selling it, they're going to let the manufacturer put two on their lots and sell it for the manufacturer without taking ownership of those homes, correct?"

Smith: "That is correct."

Batinick: "I... I'm sorry, Representative, I was really confused by this Bill. You clarified it for me. I appreciate that."

Smith: "Anytime."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Smith to close."

Smith: "I urge a 'aye' vote."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1602 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1609, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1609, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Slaughter."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Slaughter on the Amendment."
- Slaughter: "Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is pertaining to pretrial incarceration. House Floor Amendment #1 makes a minor technical edit that I'd like to explain on Third Reading."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Slaughter moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1609. All those in favor say 'aye'; 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 Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1609, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Slaughter."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1609 reduces financial obligations of those who are incarcerated pretrial and are assessed a fine upon conviction by providing a \$30 per day credit for each day of pretrial incarceration. The Amendment limits the application of the credit to court fines only, not court assessments. The Amendment was filed in response to concerns from the State's Attorneys Association that increased time served credits would result in decrease funding for programs like the Child Advocacy Centers while relying on court... which rely on court assessments for their funding. I do want to be clear here, the State's Attorneys are still opposed but we've worked with them. They know what Senator Sims and I are trying to do here. And the Amendment made this a little bit more amendable. The current fine credit amount of \$5 per day was enacted in 1965... we're in 2019... and does not reflect fine credit parity with today's inflation dollars of approximately \$40 per day. We're not going the 40, which we probably should, we're going to go to 30. With that, Madam Speaker, I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This matter is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Representative Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative Slaughter, I just wanted to clarify a few things with my questions. So this is an amount that's deducted from a fine someone receives after they're convicted or receive court supervision. Is that accurate?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Windhorst: "And that is different than the credit people get against their bail under bail reform, correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "This \$30 a day was... is currently 5... \$5, is that right?"

Slaughter: "That's correct, Representative."

Windhorst: "And we're... you're moving it up with this Bill to \$30?"

Slaughter: "Right. We're moving it from 5 to 30 dollars that's correct."

Windhorst: "And... and the Amendment you made is to remove assessments away from the fine, is that... am I understanding that correctly?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "So, to the Bill. You know, the... I would agree that there needs to be an increase from the \$5 a day that hasn't changed in some time. I, however, myself cannot support increasing the amount from \$5 to 30. I do appreciate the Sponsor of the Bill making the changes to eliminate the assessment. I think that is a good change. And I will be voting 'no', however. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Slaughter to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1609 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Crespo, DeLuca, Didech, Evans, Flowers, Harris, Hurley, Skillicorn, Villa, Walker. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting in 'favor', 52 voting 'against', 0 voting

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1669, Representative Andrade. Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1669, 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 Andrade."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Andrade on the Amendment."
- Andrade: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I move to accept Floor Amendment 1. Floor Amendment 1 adds... keeps the language of the underlying Bill and adds a special instant scratch-off for 'End of Alzheimer's Begins With Me' scratch-off game, identical to House Bill 2673 of the 101st General Assembly."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Andrade moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1669. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1669, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Andrade."
- Andrade: "Yes, the... the other part of the Bill is the... is to provide... is another scratch-off. It also will have a sunset date. It's seeking to provide grants to schools to increase STEAM programming in low-income schools. And that revenue

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

from the game is deposited into the School STEAM Grant Program Fund to grants... to grants to low-income schools. If there's any questions, if not I would respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1669 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Halbrook, McDermed, Miller. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting in 'favor', 3 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1684, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Burke."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke on the Amendment."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge... or ask for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. It is an extension of the Architects Regulatory Act. The architects and the department did a lot of work coming up with some cleanup language and some modernization language. I know of no opponents. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Burke moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1684. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke."

Burke: "I think I covered everything on the adoption of the Amendment. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Just a little bit more please, Representative. I... Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Would you just explain it a little bit more? I just got a bunch of whoa, whoa, whoa's on my side. I'm good with the Bill."

Burke: "It... it's an extension of the sunset for the architects and like any sunset they go in with the department and try and hash out some boiler plate and some changes. I don't know if everybody wants a page and line. I don't think it's anything monumental."

Batinick: "Do you have good chief co-sponsors on this Bill?"

Burke: "Do I have... I have Leader Durkin."

Batinick: "Excellent."

Burke: "Who is I guess is an architecture..."

Batinick: "Thank you."

Burke: "...buff."

Batinick: "Thank you for that. I appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stava-Murray, do you rise in support of opposition?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Stava-Murray: "I have a clarifying question."

Speaker Manley: "Proceed."

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

Burke: "Yes, she will."

Stava-Murray: "Okay."

Speaker Manley: "She'll... she will."

Stava-Murray: "It has noted on our analysis that AFSCME may have potential concerns with this language, is that something that was cleared up?"

Burke: "They... they do not. That was cleared up. There was some... some misunderstanding of what the Bill did and the advocates have worked with AFSCME and they are not opposed."

Stava-Murray: "Okay. Cool. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Burke to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1684 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hammond, McCombie, Skillicorn.
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1758, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1758, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch on the Amendment."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment is an Amendment that was brought to me by the Secretary of State's Office but reincorporates provisions from the original Bill. I would ask for adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1758. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1758, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch."

- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1758, as amended, is an initiative of the Illinois Secretary of State making various changes to the Illinois Securities Law of 1953, intended to help the Department protect investors. I'm not aware of any opposition to this Bill, which came out of the Senate unanimously. It also does some cleanup act... cleanup on payday loans. I would ask for approval. I'm not aware of any opposition to any parts of the Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1758 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting
  'opposed', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
  received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

passed. Senate Bill 1780, Representative Tarver. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1780, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Tarver."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Tarver on the Amendment."

Tarver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a gut and replace Amendment, a Bill that aims to prevent or at least prohibit, curtail discrimination against individuals on the basis of having an arrest, not a conviction but an arrest. It defines exactly what an arrest record is. And it is a product of a lot of negotiation with both the realtors and the Illinois Department of Human Rights. I think it's a very solid Bill that allows people better access to housing. And I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Tarver moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1780. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1780, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Same thing. This is a Bill that aims to eliminate or at least curtail discrimination on the basis of an arrest record in real estate transactions. It's the product of a lot of

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

negotiations with both the realtors, Illinois Department of Human Rights. They're both in support of the Bill. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. And the Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, you mentioned a couple of groups that were part of the negotiations. Are they neutral or in support of the Bill?"

Tarver: "My understanding they're in support of the Bill, including Amendment 3."

Batinick: "Okay. We had the Central Illinois Rental Property Professionals, the Chicago Creative Investors Association, Illinois Rental Property Association. Those are all proponents now. Is that correct?"

Tarver: "No, what I said was the REALTORS Association."

Batinick: "Okay."

Tarver: "Illinois REALTORS Association. And then the Illinois Department of Human Rights are both supportive of the Bill."

Batinick: "Okay."

Tarver: "In addition to the..."

Batinick: "So, there's still... there's still some opposition to the Bill?"

Tarver: "Presumably, yes."

Batinick: "Okay. And then I just want to the… read the synopsis to you. It amends the Illinois Human Rights Act, provides that it is a civil rights violation for a person engaging in a real estate transaction to refuse because of an arrest

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

record. I want to clarify this for... for people on my side. So just... if you're arrested for something but not convicted that's where you make it a civil rights violation, correct?"

Tarver: "Let me know if this helps. I'm looking at the definition of arrest record in the Bill. An arrest record means an arrest not leading to a conviction, a juvenile record, or a criminal history record information in order to expunge, seal, or impounded under Section 5.2 of the Criminal Identification Act. So, yes, it is an arrest that is not in a conviction."

Batinick: "Yeah. I'm trying to... you're getting technical on me, which actually I do appreciate. I'm actually trying to bring it down a little bit..."

Tarver: "Okay."

Batinick: "...to the main intent of the Bill."

Tarver: "Go for it."

Batinick: "The main intent of the Bill is you're... you're leaving it where you can refuse to rent to somebody for convictions, correct? But you just don't... you just don't want somebody who might be arrested and was innocent, presumably, right? Or found innocent to have an arrest record for something they weren't convicted for stop them from being able to rent property, correct?"

Tarver: "Yes, that's in the latter. But technically, I guess, you asked about someone who has a conviction. Someone who has had a record expunged, or sealed, or so on and so on presumably would have had a conviction at some point and has been then expunged and sealed. So, the aim is for the individual who has been arrested and not convicted to not be... not to

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

discriminate on the basis of that, a juvenile record, or something that's been expunged or sealed."

Batinick: "Okay. I mean, it would be... if something was expunged or sealed they likely wouldn't even know about it I would presume?"

Tarver: "Should not but if for some reason they do, then it would not be something that you can base a decision not to… for real estate transactions."

Batinick: "Okay. And... and does it bring it to a higher level that it's a civil rights violation as just a standard violation?"

Tarver: "I'm not sure I understand the, does it bring it to a
 higher level? It being?"

Batinick: "Okay. Representative, I think I... I think you answered enough questions for me to clarify it for my side of the aisle."

Tarver: "Okay."

Batinick: "So, I very much appreciate your indulgence."

Tarver: "Sure. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Tarver to close."

Tarver: "Press the green button."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1780 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting in 'favor', 32 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 179... Senate Bill 1798, Representative Edly-Allen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1798, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1798, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Edly-Allen."

Edly-Allen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I'm presenting Senate Bill 1798. This Bill came to me from Senate Sponsor Rose... Senator Rose and requires school districts to create, maintain, and implement an age appropriate policy on sexual harassment. Illinois has made great strides over the years to strengthen anti-bullying policies. It's a great step in the right direction ensuring that schools have a sexual harassment policy on the books is the next logical step. And this will help ensure that all of our students can learn in a safe environment and in a culture of respect. This Bill does not mandate any specific policies or dictate how schools develop or implement these policies. We leave that up to local control. Whatever policies are adopted on the topic of sexual harassment must be posted online, which I think is very reasonable in ensuring that we're not placing a burden on school districts. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes

Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Batinick: "Representative, I just wanted to... a couple of quick questions here. Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance is opposed. Did they speak to you about their opposition?"
- Edly-Allen: "Yes, they did. Their opposition is they claim that we don't need this policy, that we already have policies in place. And my position is that we need to have a uniform policy for all school districts to have uniform sexual harassment policies that are updated, maintained, and implemented."

Batinick: "Okay."

Edly-Allen: "Not just established."

- Batinick: "Well what is the... when... when it comes to age appropriate, is that up to the school district to decide what they determine is age appropriate, or is that going to be decided by JCAR, or is it more defined within the Bill?"
- Edly-Allen: "The age appropriateness means, defined as age... it's a... what the school thinks... deems appropriate for... for example someone in first grade."
- Batinick: "Right. So... okay. So, there'll be a slightly different policy for each grade, I presume, then?"
- Edly-Allen: "Exactly. It's up to the school district."
- Batinick: "Okay. And... did... back to the School Management Alliance, did they give you any indication of what they thought the...

  I'm just curious what the overall cost would be?"
- Edly-Allen: "I'm sorry, can you repeat your question, Sir?"
- Batinick: "Did they give you any idea of what... do we have any projected cost?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Edly-Allen: "Again, this is up to the school district. Could be whatever they deem is necessary to provide adequate sexual harassment policies."

Batinick: "Well if we're giving them a mandate, I wouldn't say it's up to them to determine... so basically we have no idea of cost?"

Edly-Allen: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. Thank you for the answers to questions."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Edly-Allen to close."

Edly-Allen: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1798 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting in 'favor', 9 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1847, Representative Mah. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. SB1847 provides that when a permit is required under the Environmental Protection Act to

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

construct a new facility the Illinois EPA must provide notice to the State Senator and State Representative of the district where the construction is to occur in addition to providing a notice to the public on its website, in a format that is searchable by zip code. Furthermore, the Bill provides that IEPA must adopt rules to implement this Bill within six months. I am happy to answer any questions and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "This is probably one of the most unusual things I've ever seen in... in committee notes. It says, the Sponsor would not commit to running the Bill as passed committee or bringing an agreed Amendment back for the committee approval, yet it passed unanimously in committee. So what was the... what was the issue in committee?"

Mah: "There was an Amendment that I had thought of adding but decided to run the Bill without the Amendment in the end."

Batinick: "Okay. And what was... what was that idea and why was there consternation about the Bill?"

Mah: "I just decided to run the Bill as written by the Senate Sponsor."

Batinick: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mah to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1847 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

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 101 voting in 'favor', 11 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1854, Representative Mason. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Mason."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mason on Floor Amendment 2."

Mason: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, we have filed an Amendment 3 that we would like to pass and not Amendment 2."

Speaker Manley: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1899, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1899, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1899, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment represents the agreed Bill process between business and labor regarding unemployment insurance. What it does is it extends the deadline for what we would call speedbump for an additional

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- two years to 2022. Again, this is an agreement between business and labor."
- Speaker Manley: "A reminder, this Bill is on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Leader Wehrli."
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Hoffman, I just want to say thank you for working collaboratively on this. This is something that makes it easier on all of us and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman to close."
- Hoffman: "I would just also like to thank the Leader Wehrli. This was actually done in a bipartisan fashion. And any upcoming Amendments regarding unemployment insurance will be done through the agreed Bill process."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1899 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? McCombie. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'against', and 1... excuse me, 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1901, Representative Bennett. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1901, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Bennett."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Bennett on the Floor Amendment."
- Bennett: "Hello, Madam Speaker. Would like to adopt the Amendment and then speak more about it on Third... Third Reading, please."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Could you explain the Amendment a little bit?"

Bennett: "Absolutely. The Bill includes cleanup language from the State Board of Education as well as an initiative of McLean County Unit School District #5 to provide a cheaper mechanism to purchase fuel. And we'll get... we'll get some more here."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bennett moves to the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1901. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1901, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The cleanup language for this does two things. One, it moves language regarding the fee for a paraprofessional license to the right section of the Educator Licensure Article of the School Code. The second thing it does is, with regard to the Alternative Educator Licensure Program, an individual must pass the State Board of Education's Teacher Performance Assessment no later than the end of the first semester of the student's second year residency. And that changed rather than before entering the second residency year, so more of a timing than anything. I move for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1901 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Have all voted who wish? Walker, Villa, Unes, Tarver, McCombie, Halbrook. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting in 'favor', 21 voting 'against', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 534, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, can you please roll this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 534, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch on Floor Amendment 1."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 534 is substantially similar to the underlying Bill but it adds some additional changes to strengthen the Bill. I would ask for adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 534. And those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch on Amendment 2."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 534 is a technical Amendment, just changing the effective date from an immediate to January 1, 2020."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 534. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 534, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 534, as amended, is an initiative of the Illinois AFL-CIO. It was a heavily negotiated Bill with the Senate and the Senate Black Caucus. We have been working to create a Bureau on Apprenticeship Programs within the Department of Labor and an Advisory Board for Diversity in Active Apprenticeship Programs. We've also requiring that the Department of Central Management Services conduct a new social scientific disparity study that measures the impact of discrimination on minorities and women business owners in Illinois. This study would be completed by December 1, 2020. Our goal is to increase women and minorities in apprenticeship programs both union and nonunion. We're trying to, you know, focus on adding diversity all across business in this state and unions and non unions are a part of that. So, we would ask for approval of Senate Bill 534."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes

Leader Durkin."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Durkin: "Representative Welch, in the Amendment... in its amended form, do you still maintain that a violation under this Act would constitute a Class 1 felony?"
- Welch: "So, it is my understanding that current law, falsification of records and documentation is a Class 2 felony, this does not change that. That would... I'm sorry. It does increase it to a Class 1 felony."
- Durkin: "Aw, Chris. Do you... what are we doing? This is wrong. A Class 1 felony? That's what we charge people with who sexually assault people. That is what we charge people with residential burglaries. Why are we putting these people who violated... I'm not saying it... I'm saying Class 2 is wrong but, my gosh, Chris. Is it probationable or nonprobationable?"
- Welch: "Leader, I understand what you're saying but we are creating a program to help minorities and women owned businesses get contracts."

Durkin: "That's fine."

Welch: "And people abuse..."

Durkin: "We're not about making criminals..."

Welch: "...they create false documentation..."

Durkin: "...of business people."

Welch: "...to get around the law."

Durkin: "Chris. Chris. Chris. Chris. Chris. Chris, you know better. You're a lawyer. I'm a lawyer. You didn't answer my question. Is this a nonprobationable or probationable Class 1 felony?"

Welch: "Give me a moment. It does not change what a Class 1 felony is, Leader."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Durkin: "Well, there's two... there's two types of Class 1 felonies, two sentencing structures. Some are probationable and some are nonprobationable. Meaning, a first time conviction they are immediately sent to the Illinois Department of Corrections for a minimum of four years. So I'm willing to wait, but I think it's important for this Body to understand if they're going to vote for a Bill that's going to put someone in the same category as a rapist, home invader, and I can go down the list. Chris, you and I know this is not the right type of penalty for this violation."

Welch: "We... we are talking about someone who intentionally falsifies documents to get access to millions of dollars in state contracts..."

Durkin: "They can charge them with theft..."

Welch: "...that should go to women and minorities."

Durkin: "...but the fact is under this it's not a... this is not...

we're not... there is a theft statute which deals with that.

There's a theft statute that deals with people who steal from government entities. But for purposes of this particular Bill, saying that we are going to characterize them as felons like we do with every other hardened criminal that is charged with this is just wrong. Chris, this is... Chris, I'm talking to you as a lawyer to lawyer. And you know that."

Welch: "I... I think lawyer..."

Durkin: "And I think, Chris, you know that..."

Welch: "I would advise my client..."

Durkin: "...now that I'm asking these questions that..."

Welch: "...I would advise my clients and you would, too, to follow the law."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Durkin: "I would tell them that is garbage and I would... I would be the biggest waste of time in the criminal justice system to have any... and any court is going to say, why the hell is this crap in front of me?"

Welch: "I... I disagree."

Durkin: "This is a bad penalty. I'm not saying that... the goals of the Bill are very laudable. They are honorable. But to suggest that we have to turn this into a felonious situation and particularly moving it to a Class 1 felony is not the right thing to do. I'm going to stop there."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 534 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; 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... Feigenholtz, Walker.
Please take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting
in 'favor', 45 voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. This
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Representative Butler for an announcement."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Brady is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Manley: "The Journal will reflect your request. House Bill 97, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 97, a Bill for an Act concerning courts.

The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative

Ammons."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons on the Floor Amendment."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to adopt Floor
Amendment 1 and Floor Amendment 2 if it's showing Floor
Amendment 2 also?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, the status of Floor Amendment 2?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 was filed today and has been referred to the Rules Committee."

Ammons: "We'll move with Floor Amendment 1. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Ammons: "Floor Amendment 1 makes Champaign County its own circuit for the sole purpose of electing its own judges. Currently there are no women of color, no men of color, not black, not Latino, and no Democratic judges elected in Champaign County. This motion will make Champaign County its own circuit. And I move for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 97. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, please hold that Bill on Second. Senate Bill 1918, Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "One second, Madam Speaker. One second."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Take your time."

Andrade: "Senate Bill 1918 is an initiative of the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. There's an... do I have an Amendment on there? No. Senate Bill 1918 is an initiative of the Governor's Office and Management and Budget... Budgeting for Results Commission. It consolidates the Sex Offender Registration Fund, the Sex Offender Investigation Fund, and murder, and combines various funds into one. It also creates... there is one other... one other part of the Bill. Instead of sending the money to the General Revenue Fund it now sends the money... keeps the money in the Illinois State Police Fund. If no questions, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1918 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi. Hammond. Unes. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1934, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment provides that new requirements that a non resident purchaser of a salvaged vehicle must comply with

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

in order to purchase a salvaged vehicle at auction in Illinois. There was no opposition to this. And the Amendment also combined two Bills regarding the auto salvage industry regulations into one, they were Senate Bill 1862 and Senate Bill 1934. Senate Bill 1934 makes commonsense updates relating to the crushing of vehicles by unlicensed operators. And the Bill also requires licenses... licensees to provide the State of Illinois with the NMVTIS number. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1934. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Chair... or Madam Speaker. I basically described the Bill on Second Reading. And I just ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "A reminder, this Bill is on Short Debate.

Representative Ammons, do you rise in support or in opposition? Representative Keicher, do you rise in opposition or in support?"

Keicher: "Potential opposition but seeking clarity."

Speaker Manley: "Go right ahead."

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

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Keicher: "Okay. Representative Hoffman, I'm reading here that is says, provides that no person... person shall engage in the act of dismantling, a few other things, altering a vehicle into another form using machinery or equipment unless licensed to do so and only from a fixed location identified on the license issued by the Secretary of State. If I could get... get a little bit of clarity of that? I know that there are a lot of folks in my district who work on classic cars and they take parts off of old cars and put them back together with new ones. They modify street rods in their garage. There's a whole underground program of these classic car enthusiasts who are buying and swapping as a hobby. And this reads, no person shall engage without license. So what I'm reading here is that we would be asking for these car enthusiasts who are in each of our small towns all summer long to seek licensure from the Secretary of State's Office. Can you provide some clarity please?"

Hoffman: "No. That... that's not the case. What this deals with is auto recyclers, junk yards, and salvage yards."

Keicher: "Help me understand the language though. It says,
 provides 'no person shall engage in the act of'. A person, it
 doesn't indicate a business, it doesn't indicate an operating
 entity."

Hoffman: "That's not the intent. And what... Madam Speaker... Madam Speaker... Madam Speaker, if I could just come back to this Bill. Staff is trying to get an answer and it's taking longer than it should. So..."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Keicher: "Yeah, this is a big area of concern I think for all of us..."

Hoffman: "And I'll get the answer."

Keicher: "...if it was unintended."

Hoffman: "That's not the intent..."

Keicher: "Yeah."

Hoffman: "...and I don't believe that's what the Bill does. But I want to make sure I can reference the Bill properly and we'll come back to it. Okay?"

Keicher: "Because if we go forward, if I could just add, I think
 it would be great if it did deal with businesses and repair
 facilities. But if we're talking these mom and pop hobbyists
 I think we're asking for a lot of trouble."

Hoffman: "It doesn't. And I think under the..."

Keicher: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "...under the proper sections. I'll be able to answer that.

Thank you. Take it out of the record."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. The Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you. Just a point of personal privilege. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Ammons: "I just wanted to acknowledge in the gallery, right above here, a visitor from my home community in Urbana, Township Supervisor Mr. Wayne Williams is in the gallery. And we want to welcome him to Springfield, along with one of my good friends who's an attorney in Champaign County, Mr. Matt Duco, who is also in the gallery here just watching our proceedings. And we wanted to welcome them to Springfield."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

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

Andrade: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Andrade: "I have a great esteem and respect for my colleague who just passed a Bill, but we just passed a felony 1 Bill. And I just keep voting for all these Bills. This has to go two ways. If... if I would have said in front of the Judiciary Committee that the criminal just needs to follow the law, I would have been hanged. I have Bills in the Judiciary Committee that I was willing to bring down to misdemeanors and they still... the Bills will not be heard. So, this has to go two ways. I mean, we just can't be passing all these Bills, just people choose Bills that they want to pass that create penalties. It's been going on, and on, and on. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Senate Bill 2027, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2027, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Ammons."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons on the Amendment."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is a bipartisan Amendment for the Mohomet Aquifer, which would allow us to study the area right over the district that is just west of me in the Village of Mahomet for the environmental hazard that happened under people's gas and there was a gas leak. And I move its adoption."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2027. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2027, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This initiative came out of the Mahomet Aquifer Task Force, which was a bipartisan task force including local governments. We are simply moving this Bill so that we can enact the measures from the task force to study the Mahomet Aquifer and the provisions from the people's gas leak. And I so move... ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2027 pass?'
All in those favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bennett, Crespo, McDermed, Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2090, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning

elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill, Senate Bill 2090, is an initiative of our great Lieutenant Governor Juliana Stratton, the ACLU, and a group of young organizers called the Chicago Votes. Most of you may remember this Bill from last Session, it passed out of both chambers with bipartisan support but Governor... the then Governor Rauner did Amendatory Veto. We have brought the Bill back with some cleanup on it. This is a project that's going on currently in eight counties. We are trying to make sure that pretrial detainees, people who have not been convicted of anything... their only crime at the time is that they cannot afford bond to be out of jail. We want to make sure they have a right to vote. And that's what Senate Bill 2090 does. It ensures their right to vote. It makes sure that if they are convicted and end up in DOC upon release they are educated on when their rights are restored and how to get registered to vote. This is about ensuring access to voting statewide. Very important piece of legislation, heavily advocated by our Lieutenant Governor. I'm not aware of any opposition to the Bill. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote in favor of Senate Bill 2090."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is currently on Short Debate.

Representative Batinick, would you prefer something different?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Batinick: "We'll go with Standard Debate. We won't ask for anything..."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. And are you rising in support or opposition?"

Batinick: "You may by surprised but I am rising in opposition." Speaker Manley: "Please continue."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, the... the individuals that you're referring to that find themselves pretrial in jail, they have the same voting rights as everybody else, they haven't been convicted of everything. They have the same ability to vote absentee like everybody else, correct?"

Welch: "That... that is correct."

Batinick: "Already under the law, correct?"

Welch: "That is correct. But... what this Bill does is it requires the Election Authority, someone in the county jail, to make sure that they have access to an application to vote by mail. They have to at least make sure each person has access to an application to vote by mail."

Batinick: "Well, I think it does a little bit more than that. My...

my understanding is that in Cook County it makes jails a
polling location, Representative?"

Welch: "Say that again?"

Batinick: "My understanding is is that it makes certain counties a... where a polling location is required to be put in those situation... in those areas."

Welch: "Counties over 3 million. And we know that's one county and that one county supports this."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Batinick: "Right, I understand that. Are you aware of any other..." Welch: "They're already..."

Batinick: "...area where we seek out people to make that they're able to vote beyond what... I mean, they can already talk to people, they can order an absentee ballot. There's... there's... you know, people at a hospital are they all able to vote? Are there areas where we... where we seek out people to make it easier for them to vote?"

Welch: "We are constantly finding ways to get information to potential voters. If you have additional places we should go and make sure people have access to voting, open to those recommendations and open to filing that Bill. What we should be doing is ensuring that everyone has an equal access to voting."

Batinick: "Right. I guess... I find it strange that this... this is the group of people that we're going to seek out first to do something unique and start with. I'm going to bring a line of questioning that I actually brought against the Lieutenant Governor last year. Let's say there's an individual that's driving under the influence and blows a red light and puts four people in the hospital. That individual is put into the Cook County jail, those four individuals... those four other individuals are sent to a hospital. You're sending one to a voting location and you're sending four to the hospital where they can't vote. How is that equitable?"

Welch: "Well, I don't agree with your statement. Because those
 four in the hospital certainly have a right to vote by mail."
Batinick: "Right. They have the right to vote by mail but we're
 not doing anything special for those. We're making the county

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

jail a polling location. We're not making the hospital a polling location. I just find it..."

Welch: "Let's work together..."

Batinick: "...I just find it astounding..."

Welch: "...let's work together and file that Bill."

Batinick: "It's going to be a long list. It is going an absolutely long list of... of areas that you're going to have to go to. We have made voting incredibly easy. For this to be... we'll call it a pilot program, for this to be the first place where you're going to make... go beyond being beyond of making it easier. That people who find themselves in the county... in the county jail that that's where we're going to make a polling location instead of all the other polling locations is just astounding to me. I mean it is pushing the limits of creative ways to find certain populations to vote. And that would not be the direction that I would go."

Welch: "Well, we're talking about people who the system has worked against all of their lives. And they're probably in jail because the system worked against them and they couldn't afford bond to get out. If they had bond and they were out, this wouldn't even be an issue. So, I have no problem with starting with this population who a system has been against and put them behind the eight ball their entire lives."

Batinick: "Well you mentioned working with... with me on hospitals, do you want to pull the Bill out of the record and make polling locations out of hospitals in counties over 3 million?"

Welch: "No, we can do that in 2020."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Batinick: "I'm going to go to the Bill. I mean, we have made it incredibly easy to... for people to vote. People in jail have the ability to vote right now. We are literally taking our county jail and turning it into a polling location while we're ignoring hospitals, we're ignoring nursing homes, we're ignoring all sorts of situations. Somebody may be called out of state because of a family emergency. If I have a relative in Florida and it's near or at voting day and I get called out of state, are you going to make my relatives house out of state a polling location? No. There's all kinds of circumstances that people find themselves in where they can't vote. We literally have weeks to vote right now. This is... this is not a good Bill. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Thank you. Chris, I just want to make sure it's clear and I know you mentioned it, these are pretrial detainees. These are people who have not been convicted, that are either, you know, awaiting trial or... they're pretrial detainees, correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Butler: "Okay. Can you give me a specific example where a pretrial detainee has been denied the right to vote?"

Welch: "I cannot give you a specific while standing here but what I can tell you is that seven... seven counties, actually eight now, because Champaign County just went online in the last primary, where this is already happening. And although I can't

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

give you a specific example, I'm hoping that I don't ever give you a specific example because we... it should be applauded that we're making it easier for people to vote."

- Butler: "This... you are correct. There are eight counties that have made this, the county that we're standing in right now. My friend, Don Gray, has enacted this in Sangamon County on his own without the State Legislature mandating it. And again, can you give me a specific example of someone who's been denied the right to vote because they are a pretrial detainee?"
- Welch: "I can't, Representative. But I can tell you many of them don't even know they have the right to vote. When I'm knocking on doors and talking to people, many of them who have been in the system didn't even know they had the right to vote. And what we're doing is, number one, educating them and number two, we're providing them with access if indeed they want to cast that vote."
- Butler: "Well, I... you know, unfortunately Representative Batinick took many of my arguments away from me because he's such a good Floor Leader on us here but... you know, this idea that we're mandating counties, 102 counties to carry out a program that people are not even having an issue with today... as Representative Batinick said, we can vote for 40 days before the election here in Illinois. We have... we have expanded voting opportunities greatly in the State of Illinois. And yet, we are allowing pretrial detainees to have a special carve out on how to vote that is not available to other people who may be, as Representative Batinick gave the good example, in the hospital or incapacitated in another way. And I know

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

what your response to me will be, why don't you introduce a Bill. Well guess what? I've introduced a lot of election Bills here in this General Assembly over my four years and almost all of them get bottled up in the Rules Committee. And it's because the majority does a very good job of only running majority Bills when it comes to elections. So, I have a nice little Bill that would get rid of the loophole here in Sangamon County that allows all of us to actually fundraise on election... on Session nights in January. That's been bottled up for quite a long time and that ... we had that nice little thing last year where you guys all voted ... well I forget what it is. When you voted all our Bills down when you popped them out of committee. And so, while I appreciate the idea that we might introduce a Bill, I think this is the wrong way. I really do. To allow a special carve out for people who are pretrial detainees when they currently have the right to vote, there's nothing stopping them from voting. There's nothing stopping them from being educated on voting just like everyone else is educated on the right to vote. It is a basic right in the United States. I... I understand your passion on this issue. I understand Lieutenant Governor's passion on this issue when she was in this Body last year. I just think it is the wrong path forward. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Willis, do you rise in support or opposition?"

Willis: "I rise in support, please."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Willis: "To the Bill. One of the previous speakers brought up a concern about people that were in hospitals and nursing homes

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

would not have the same rights or the ability to vote as someone that is incarcerated waiting... actually detained, not necessarily incarcerated, detained waiting for their court appearance. I actually have a number of senior living centers, nursing homes in my district and one of them has petitioned to have a voting place right there on the premises. The other one does not. And I purposely make a point of working through that to make sure that all of those residents have the ability to exercise their right to vote. That is something that I think all of us should try to do in our areas and our districts. We also was... heard that well everybody has 40 days beforehand to early vote and they can do that. Well unfortunately, some of these detainees are held longer than 40 days. And so, they may not have had a chance to early vote. We also know that, unfortunately, while Sangamon County is very good about making sure that their detainees are aware of their rights to vote, there are other counties and other jails that are not as good and as transparent with their detainees. We need to make sure that they have the same rights. They are proven... they are innocent until proven guilty. Therefore, they have the right to exercise that right to vote. This is what this is doing. The concern that Cook County is going to be a polling location, the only people that should be concerned about that is the Cook County Jail and they are totally on board with this. They accept this responsibility. They obviously feel that this is important to do for their detainees. I cannot see why we're questioning and why we're concerned about somebody that is willing and able to go and

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

supply these rights to their detainees. I strongly urge this entire Body to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi, do you rise in opposition or in support?"

Guzzardi: "Support."

Speaker Manley: "Please continue."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Guzzardi: "Representative Welch, there's been some talk about the ability of people to exercise this fundamental right of voting. So, I want to ask you a couple of questions in this area. Do you have a sense of roughly how long the early voting period is in Cook County?"

Welch: "Forty days, I believe, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Okay. My understanding is it varies from election to election but it's between two weeks, four weeks, maybe sometimes a little longer. Would it surprise you to learn that the average duration of stay in the Cook County Jail is longer than the entirety of the early voting period?"

Welch: "That does not surprise me."

Guzzardi: "And, Representative, you and I know an awful lot of people who spent an awful lot of time in Cook County Jail helping the people who are being detained there to vote, isn't that right?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Guzzardi: "To the Bill. A right is only so good as your ability to exercise it. Talking about voting is a fundamental right and these people who are being detained pretrial haven't been convicted of an offense, therefore, they should be able to

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

exercise that right. And speakers who have opposed the Bill have said, well they should be educated about their rights, they should be able to do it on their own. The process of trying to procure an absentee ballot while incarcerated is unbelievably difficult. And as I just said, people spend hundreds and hundreds of hours volunteering in these facilities trying to get these guys the ability to vote. It should not be that hard to exercise this basic right. I believe very firmly that providing the ability for people to vote inside of Cook County Jail is a way to allow those folks who have not yet been convicted of an offense to access their basic right to participate in our democracy. And I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bryant, do you rise in opposition or support?"

Bryant: "Well at the moment I'm in opposition but maybe you can swing me."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative, do you believe that a person has a constitutional right to vote? I mean, that's what I'm hearing you say."

Welch: "I do believe they have a fundamental right to vote, yes."

Bryant: "Constitutional right? Fundamental, constitutional, using them interchangeably? They have a constitutional right to vote?"

Welch: "Yes."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Bryant: "Okay. So, I'm going to take from that you support expanding that right, not prohibiting it, not infringing upon it?"

Welch: "Ask me the question again."

Bryant: "I'm asking, do you support a person's constitutional right to vote and don't want that infringed upon or inhibited in any way? That's... that... I believe that's what you're saying?"

Welch: "Well, I do believe that reasonable regulation in areas is good. What we're saying here..."

Bryant: "Just not in this one?"

Welch: "...what we're saying here is someone who is a pretrial detainee who hasn't been convicted of anything, they should have access to voting. That is a reasonable regulation that government should get involved in. And I think we should..."

Bryant: "And government shouldn't..."

Welch: "...support that."

Bryant: "...and government should not infringe upon that?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Bryant: "Okay. So, in... in this situation, 'cause I heard a lot of... I heard a lot of Bills come through where we talk about being concerned about a correctional officer not treating someone right, not taking care of that person's rights. So in this case, whoever works at that jail, whoever the employee is has to make sure that the person gets the application, fills the application out, gets it sent in, correct?"

Welch: "Well, the Election Authority has the discretion to determine how they would make sure the person is informed.

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

And whoever that person that is charged with that would have to carry it out."

Bryant: "So... so, in your scenario someone from the Election Authority would go to the jail, vote that person..."

Welch: "The county jail is a ... "

Bryant: "...or persons?"

Welch: "...the county jail, for purposes of this Bill, is an Election Authority. And so, someone..."

Bryant: "The county jail itself? So, any employee of the county jail would be authorized then to do that?"

Welch: "Correct."

Bryant: "Okay. So, they are in custodial care of that individual?"

Welch: "Yes."

Bryant: "Okay. What... what keeps that person then... because we've... we've heard that individuals accused in here before. What... what keeps that person from telling that individual how to vote or demanding that they vote a certain way or threatening them if they don't vote a certain way? How... how do we ensure that that does not happen?"

Welch: "Well, there were three additional provisions added to this particular Bill that was not in the Lieutenant Governor's Bill last year. And one of those was a nonpartisan poll watcher at the location to make sure everything is... is being done properly."

Bryant: "So, in... in that scenario then it... would they be there then for the entire 40 days of voting?"

Welch: "Yes."

Bryant: "So, you're going to have someone sitting there for 40 days assuring that no... three shifts a day for those whole 40

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

days making sure that no one is influenced... unduly influenced to vote in a particular direction? Because they are in custodial care and there is that possibility."

Welch: "A... if the polling place is open, the nonpartisan poll watcher is there."

Bryant: "Can other people go in then and vote at that polling place? Could I go in and vote there if I wanted to?"

Welch: "No."

Bryant: "So, only those people who are incarcerated at that time can?"

Welch: "Correct."

Bryant: "Okay. You haven't convinced me. But thank you for answering the questions..."

Welch: "I... I didn't think I would."

Bryant: "And, Madam Speaker, should this receive the requisite number of votes I'd ask for a verification."

Speaker Manley: "We've had three speakers in favor, three opposed.

Representative Bryant has asked for a verification. All

Members are to be in their chairs and to vote their own
switches. The question is, 'Shall... excuse me, Representative
Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, we've had an interesting couple of days here. And we've dealt with some tough issues. This isn't one that I thought would be a Bill that I would consider was a tough issue. We're talking about educating someone on their right to vote. We're talking about providing access to voting. We actually heard people on the other side of the aisle stand up here tonight and complain about Democrats making it easier for people to vote. I can't

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

believe, in 2019, we're complaining about making it easier for people to vote. Okay, we started with pretrial detainees. If you got some other ideas, let's talk about it. But we should be embracing educating and providing access to voting. I can't believe we asked for a verification on a Bill like this. Because we're fighting, educating, and providing access to voting. This is a Bill that several groups have worked hard on for years, people who are actually in the trenches in these jails talking to people and finding out why they're there. But they can't get out of jail just because they can't afford the bond, people that haven't been convicted of anything, they have a right to vote. Let them vote. What are you afraid of? That they're not going to vote for Republicans? Let the people vote. They might actually vote for you. They might. But we have to give them that right. By supporting this initiative we are applauding the hard work of the young organizers who are out there every day at Chicago Votes, they do a great job on this issue. I want to commend the ACLU of Illinois, the Asian Americans Advancing Justice Chicago, the Business and Professional People for the Public Interest, the Cabrini Green Legal Aid, Change Peoria, Chicago Appleseed Fund for Justice, the Chicago Bar Association, the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners, the Chicago Books to Women in Prison, Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, Chicago Community Bond Fund, Chicago Council for Lawyers, Chicago Jobs Council, Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, the Chicago Urban League, Chicago Votes... did I say them, Dre? Common Cause Illinois, Community Renewal Society... there's a lot of great organizations here... Equality Illinois, Faith in

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Place, Heartland Alliance... there's a lot more... Illinois Chapter of the Sierra Club, Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, the Illinois Environmental Council, Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Public Interest Indivisible Illinois, Research Group, John Association, the League of Women Voters of Chicago, the League of Women Voters of Cook County, the League of Women Voters of Illinois, the Legal Council for Health Justice, Local 881 UFCW, the Backbone Films LSC, National Rainbow PUSH Coalition, the Northside Action and Resistance, Sergeant Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, Solidarity Sundays, Uptown People's Law Center, and the Western Front Resistance. This Bill... this Bill has a strong coalition of grassroots organizations behind it because they support educating and access to voting. You know this Bill had 797 proponents. Seven hundred and ninety-seven proponents, but because it's dinnertime, I'm going to ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Bryant has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2090 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 69 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read those names voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:

Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Representative Arroyo; Representative Bristow; Representative Buckner."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Representative Welch."

Speaker Manley: "Do you wish to withdraw your request for verification?"

Bryant: "I do, but I do appreciate his willingness to read the witnesses. Sometimes we don't get that."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you very much. On this question, there are 69 votes in the… voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Representative Welch, I believe you have now replaced Leader Willis as chair of the verification caucus. Congratulations."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ann Williams, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Williams: "Just a quick moment to acknowledge your hard work on a really long day, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Thank you. You guys make it very pleasant. Thank you. Moving on... you thought you were going to get me to say, 'and now' but I'm not. Moving on, Senate Bill 2090... excuse me... yes, I wouldn't want to go through that

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

again. Senate Bill 2052, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2052 is the blight Bill that many of you have heard about. This is an initiative of the Illinois Housing Development Authority that will help Illinois communities revitalize abandoned properties throughout our state. Make no... make no mistake about it, blight is a serious concern in certain areas. And as many of you know, our local governments are struggling to keep... to keep property taxes low while securing affective budgets to pay for basic services. At the heart of the issue is the growing number of abandoned properties that have stopped contributing to the tax base. Unfortunately, many of these properties fall into long term permanent vacancies and deteriorate slowly until they are demolished with taxpayer dollars. To address this issue, last year IHDA convened the Illinois Community Revitalization Task Force. The Illinois Municipal League, the Homebuilders Association of Illinois, the Metropolitan Mayor's Caucus, Habitat for Humanity... thank you Madam, Speaker... the Habitat

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

for Humanity, the Cook County Land Bank, the City of Rockford, the Associated Firefighters of Illinois, the City of Aurora, the South Suburban Land Bank, and a host of many land and property attorneys were all at the table on this Bill. IHDA asked for tailored low impact changes to the law and Senate Bill 2052 is the result of those discussions. What the Bill does is help municipalities identify and control abandoned properties before they become uninhabitable and reach demolition status. What we're trying to do here is work with municipalities to ensure that we get to these properties before they're in demolition status. Senate Bill 2052 makes a minor tweak to the definition standards for what considered abandonment by the courts. Currently, to declare a property abandoned the court needs evidence that the property contains a building that is dangerous and unsafe. This standard undercuts the statutes policy goal in two ways. First, the current abandonment standards rules out vacant lots which are often unmaintained and contribute neighborhood blight. Secondly, dangerous and unsafe is the same standard required to seek an order of demolition. By requiring municipalities to provide evidence to support demolition the abandonment standard overlooks abandoned properties that are vacant and deteriorating but could still be saved. Senate Bill 2052 changes the evidentiary standard from a building that is dangerous and unsafe to property that impairs public health, safety, or welfare. The goal of the impairment language is to intercept abandoned properties before they require demolition and changing the word 'buildings' to 'properties' helps us pull in the unmaintained

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

vacant lots that often contribute to blight. The Illinois Community Revitalization Task Force wanted to slightly lower the standard for abandonment because it believes that it will help clarify and expedite the judicial determination of The Bill also provides abandonment. language municipalities to give a property to counties and land banks through... through intergovernmental agreements. It's important to note that the Bill's also strengthening and expanding due process for property owners in these cases by requiring municipalities to post notice on a property for 15 days before filing a demolition case. Senate Bill 2052 does not change the process for seeking a declaration of abandonment or any rights given to owners, banks, tax buyers, or others interested parties. Under the current law, all interested parties are served with a petition for abandonment and given numerous chances to step forward and claim the property. This will not change under Senate Bill 2052. Under the current law if the owner claims the property, the abandonment petition is... is terminated. If a bank or taxpayer wants to claim the property and restore it, the court gives them this option. This will not change under Senate Bill 2052. This is a great Bill to address our blight issues. There are no known opponents to the Bill. This Bill was well vetted and put forth by the hard working Illinois Community Revitalization Task Force. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. And the Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "I request Standard Debate."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

- Speaker Manley: "I had a feeling. Standard Debate is requested.

  Please proceed."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Mazzochi: "Representative, were you able to resolve the concerns that Representative Mayfield..."
- Speaker Manley: "Members, it's getting hard to hear in the chamber.

  Both the Sponsor has asked for a little bit of consideration.

  Thank you. Please proceed. Thank you."
- Mazzochi: "Were you able to resolve the concerns that Representative Mayfield raised at the... in the Judicial Civil Committee?"
- Slaughter: "I've had various conversations with Representative Mayfield. It's been a pleasure to serve with her, I really honor her respect for this process in regards to the Bill. She's here... we can... I think she will have some questions for me but I'd like to answer the question in that manner. We... again, this is the result of a task force that has definitely vetted this Bill out. A lot of the questions that she's asked, and this is all due respect, are not pertaining to this Bill. But I believe we have a great Bill here and again, respect Representative Mayfield's concerns."
- Mazzochi: "Right. Well, I ask that because the whole reason why this Bill actually moved out of committee procedurally is because you made affirmative representations that you would reach agreement with regard to her concerns and those... my understanding is that that agreement was not reached. Additionally... to the Bill. I had additional concerns about this. Number one, one of the reasons why we have the taking

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

process that we do and we have the property tax records that because that is actually written into the Constitution of the State of Illinois. That two year procedure that this Bill is designed to circumvent is written into the Constitution. So, procedurally I don't think it's even appropriate to try to say that we can actually side-step the Constitution and the... the procedural protections that are placed in there through this statutory legislation. And I think on a good day it's probably unenforceable. Second, it also loosens the standards for when a municipality can take your property. They can take it, if they declare it's vacant you don't have the rights to go back and try to keep your property. And by the way, right now some of the liens that a municipality can manage to get in connection with tax liens, with tax sales, under this Bill, those liens... and the right to get the money back at the municipality level through a taxpayer redemption those liens can actually be extinguished. Where are the municipalities going to come up with the supplemental revenue when you allow for this process of extinguishing some of these liens as you have it in here? This is essentially a property tax increase in disquise because the amount levied is going to be the same but the source of the tax revenue is going to be extinguished under some of the procedures that are set forth in here. The fiscal impact of this has not been established. It... there's no way that we're going to be able to actually make up all the funds lost. And fundamentally, the ... the process that you have for even giving notice about this does not give sufficient notice to the property owner, does not give sufficient notice to

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

property owners heirs. You are taking away people's property without appropriate due process and protections that we currently have in law. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mayfield. Do you rise in support or against this Bill?"

Mayfield: "In strong opposition. And thank you, Representative Mazzochi, for addressing some of those concerns."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

"Representative, in committee, on more than one occasion, you made the assertion that you would work to address my concerns. In committee, before the Bill passed out, I spent an hour on the phone with the attorney that you directed me to who failed to show up in committee to go over every single thing that was wrong with this Bill. I helped you get it out of committee with your commitment, you did not keep your commitment. After the Bill passed out of committee you came to both myself and to Representative Jones and you said you would not move this Bill until you resolved our concerns. I know you never spoke to Representative Jones. I do know that after that you asked me to again meet with the Department and meet with the attorney. I sat down with them, I gave them a long list of everything that was wrong with this Bill. I gave them language for an Amendment that they said that they would do. They never filed the Amendment. I filed the Amendment and then you asked me to meet with the young lady from staff that is standing next to you now that is talking in your ear. I gave her all of the information

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

that I gave to the attorney and to the departments. And I told her everything that was wrong with the Bill. And my own Democratic staff told you to ignore me because I was the only one standing up in opposition of the Bill and in support of taxpayers. I have a problem with that. I have a problem with you moving this Bill after you gave your word. I have a problem with several elements in this Bill. That Amendment that I offered provided protections, that Representative Mazzochi mentioned, for the taxpayer. I would like to address some of those protections. I would like to know why you did not consider the Amendment. Let's start there. I asked a question. Why did you not..."

Slaughter: "Can you repeat the question, Representative?"

Mayfield: "...address... okay. So you're going to ignore me? Is that... okay. I should be used to that..."

Slaughter: "No. Repeat the question, Representative."

Mayfield: "...from you, right? I should be used to that. Why did you ignore the Amendment? As of last Thursday, you told me that we would do an Amendment. Here we are on Tuesday and there's still not an Amendment."

Slaughter: "Representative, I didn't tell you that we would do an Amendment."

Mayfield: "Wait a minute, I..."

Slaughter: "I didn't promise..."

Mayfield: "...I got your text..."

Slaughter: "...I didn't promise... what I promised to do..."

Mayfield: "...I got your text."

Slaughter: "...was to continue to work with you on the Bill."

Mayfield: "Okay. But you..."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Slaughter: "In all due respect, a lot of your concerns... actually all of your concerns don't pertain to the Bill."

Mayfield: "Every last one of my concerns pertain to the Bill.

Would you like me to point them out to you?"

Slaughter: "Please."

Mayfield: "Okay. Let's start with the very first one. Who does the Bill apply?"

Slaughter: "Who does the... abandoned properties."

Mayfield: "Okay. Across the state?"

Slaughter: "Across the state, that's correct, Representative."

Mayfield: "Across the state. In cities, villages, Home Rule and non-Home Rule?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Mayfield: "Okay. I just want to... I'm yielding up to these. Are there any exemptions in the Bill?"

Slaughter: "There's no exemptions in the Bill, Representative."

Mayfield: "There's no exemptions in the Bill? So, this Bill includes people whose property are on well water, who do not receive a water bill?"

Slaughter: "No, Representative. This does not apply to those."

Mayfield: "Oh, no, no. You just said there were not exclusions to the Bill. So, people who live... who are on well water and do not receive a water bill, their property can be taken because you lessened the threshold to such a point that all they have to do is have two years of delinquent taxes. Is that or is that not correct?"

Slaughter: "That's the current status. Ladies and Gentlemen, this does not pertain to the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Mayfield: "Wait a minute, yes, it does. I just asked you a question, were there any exemptions in this Bill? And you said, no. Your three criteria that you outlined was two years of delinquent property, one year of no water..."

Slaughter: "Which is still current, Representative."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Slaughter: "That's in current law."

Mayfield: "No, it is not. You've changed it. If you look on your number two, you added delinquent properties. You've said or there's no water, that's your number two. Or that there was a life \*REVIEW\* event."

Slaughter: "This is all in current statute."

Mayfield: "No, it is not. No, it is not. And the person next to you knows it is not in current statute because you added it in this Bill. So, a person whose home is on well water that does not pay a water bill, the threshold is so low that all they need is two years of delinquent property for the city, municipality to go in and to take their home. You put this forward. You asked me what was wrong with it and I'm going to go through everything that is wrong with it. People that are on well water, let's start there. And then we're going to move to the farm properties that you can take as well. So, let's start with the well water..."

Slaughter: "Repeat the question, Representative. What's the question?"

Mayfield: "Oh okay, so we're just going to play dumb today? All right."

Slaughter: "What's the question?"

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

Mayfield: "Thank you. Thank you. I'm happy to repeat the question. The question was, based on your criteria that you have outlined in Senate Bill 2052 to which you stated there were no exemptions, therefore, a person whose home is on well water, meaning that they do not meet criteria number two, which is one year without a water bill, so they're not paying a water bill. So, all they need are two years of delinquent taxes for you to go in and say, we're going to take your home. Is that or is that not what the Bill does?"

Slaughter: "The judge is declaring that the property would be abandoned. What you're stating, Representative..."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. So, you just answered my question."

Slaughter: "...is in statute..."

Mayfield: "If you're on well water..."

Slaughter: "...already."

Mayfield: "...with two years of delinquent taxes, god forbid you have a problem, because he is just... this Bill is going to give them permission to go and take your home. Moving on, farm land."

Slaughter: "The judge makes that order..."

Mayfield: "I pass by a lot of..."

Slaughter: "...Representative."

Mayfield: "...farms coming down to Springfield where there's nothing out there but an old abandoned barn. And guess what? There's no water. There is no water to the Bill... or I'm sorry there's no water to that barn but because of the language in this Bill that attaches the barn to the underlying property, god forbid that farmer should have a problem and have two years of delinquent taxes and have a greedy municipality eyeballing

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

their 20 acres of land that has been in their family for years. Because again, they did meet the criteria. They didn't have water but they had two years of delinquent taxes..."

Slaughter: "Representative..."

Mayfield: "...so..."

Slaughter: "Representative..."

Mayfield: "...this Bill will allow..."

Slaughter: "Representative..."

Mayfield: "No, no, no. Let me finish. You asked my question."

Speaker Manley: "Colleagues..."

Slaughter: "She's got to stop first."

Speaker Manley: "Colleagues..."

Slaughter: "Representative, out of respect for you and the chamber and this process I'll take the Bill out of the record."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Slaughter: "I will take a great Bill out of the record."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Slaughter: "Out of respect for you."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Slaughter: "And for our inability to address blighted properties throughout the state, we'll put this on hold but I will take this out of the record."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Slaughter: "You're welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please take the Bill out of the record.

Moving on. Senate Bill 2096, Leader Davis. Mr. Clerk, please
read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2096, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Davis on Floor Amendment 3."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Floor Amendment #3, I believe the last Amendment that we adopted speaks to the idea that a review of the new school funding formula will happen not only in five years but then 5 years thereafter. I ask for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Davis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2096. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2096, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Davis."

Davis: "Simply put... and I know there'll be questions that come as a result... this Bill attempts to do essentially three things. It attempts to restructure the way the professional review panel was put together that was a part of the school funding formula that we have been under for the last couple of years. Secondly, what it attempts to do is to make what we think are corrections, if you will, to the way that the Property Tax Relief Grant is administered. It was a grant designed to help low wealth, high tax areas to be able to provide them with some financial relief pending some processes that have to be

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

in place. We have had some success with getting the first round of that process moving forward but what we noticed is that there are some wealthier school districts that because of the way the formula works have access to these dollars. And I think there's an attempt to try to make it work the way that we intended it to work with regard to making sure that certain types of districts have access to the resources. And then also a change that we are making with the way things are calculated suggest that we do have some unit districts in the State of Illinois that under the way their current formula rolls... is put in place do not have access to those property tax relief dollars. And so, this is an effort to allow for unit districts to be able to access those same districts the way that elementary and/or high school districts have. And then of course the third change that I just stated was the Amendment that we adopted, speaks to the fact that the... the formula will be reviewed in five years and then five years thereafter. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. This is on Short Debate. Do you want to change it to Standard Debate? No. Short Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates..."

Davis: "Absolutely."

Speaker Manley: "...that he will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for your work on this Bill. I have one question about process, but first for the Body, as your fellow professional review panel member in this chamber, thank you for bringing forward the changes. I

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

think the changes to the panel will be good for transparency. I think they're important to be able to evaluate our formula and its implementation well. And I think the five year evaluation clarification is important. With the Property Tax Relief Grant changes, I don't disagree with the intention of them going to unit districts. My question, though, is with the new professional review panel changes, are you open, in the future, to having this Property Tax Relief Grant language reevaluated by the professional review panel to make sure we're implementing it well?"

Davis: "I believe so, yes."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. I... I just have some pause with changing language in the formula so soon after implementing this policy without going through the PRP. I know we've had issues with the PRP, we're working through those, that's part of this Bill. I would urge my colleagues to vote 'yes'. And I appreciate your willingness to work with us on the professional... I mean the Property Tax Relief Grant language."

Davis: "My pleasure, Representative. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moeller or Zalewski, do you rise in opposition? This... this Bill is on Short Debate and we've had now one speaker on both sides. Nobody has risen in opposition. Leader Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Thank you to Representative Bourne who has walked this walked with me for the last few years regarding the overall changes to the school funding formula. We think these are great changes and I appreciate her acknowledgement of making the PRP changes... excuse me, the Property Tax Relief Grant changes. And yes,

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

that is indeed something that we'd like for that review panel to be able to handle in the future. I ask for a 'yes' vote." Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2096 pass?" All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Habrook, Mazzochi, Parkhurst. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 108 voting in 'favor', 4 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 420, offered by Representative Turner. And House Resolution 423, offered by Representative Morrison."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing time for the Clerk... I'm sorry, perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, May 29 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; 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. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 421, offered by Representative Skillicorn; House Resolution 422, offered by Representative Feigenholtz are referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3846, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3847, offered

59th Legislative Day

5/28/2019

by Representative Ugaste, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of these House Bills. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1719, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."