60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "The House will come to order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Representative-Rabbi Mark Kalish. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off their cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Rabbi."

Rabbi Kalish: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. During this prayer of thanks, I ask that we have our families who sacrifice everyday on our behalves, the staff who stand behind us and next to us to make us all look better than we are alone. And each other, for even when we disagree, we truly care about each other and we are thankful for each other's presence here in the House of Representatives. Let us bow in a prayer of thanksqiving. We are thankful to you that you Hashem our God and the God of our father's, forever. You, Hashem, are a rock of our lives, the shield of our deliverance, you are in every generation. We will give thanks to you and recount your praise for our lives which are committed to your hand and for our souls which are entrusted to you. And for your miracles of everyday with us and for your wonders and benefactions at all times, evening, morning, and noon. You are the beneficent one for your compassion is never withheld and you are the merciful one for your kindness never ceases. We have always placed our hope in you. And for all the foregoing, blessed be your name, our King, constantly forever and ever. And all the living shall thank you forever. And praise your name with sincerity, the Almighty who is our deliverance and our help forever. Blessed are you, Hashem. The beneficent is your name and you, it is fitting to praise. Amen."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Very well... very good Representative Rabbi. We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Villa."
- Villa 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 Hoffman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are no excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side. Representative Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The party of Lincoln is here and ready to do business with no excused absences."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 118 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1786. Representative Conroy, Chairperson from the Committee on Mental Health reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 459. Representative Ammons, Chairperson from the Committee on

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 41. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2023. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 220. Representative Lilly, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1813."

- Speaker Hoffman: "We will go to page 10 of the Calendar. On the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 2, Representative Flowers. Out of the record. On page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Thapedi on House Bill 26. Out of the record. Representative Rita Mayfield on House Bill 38. Representative Mayfield. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I'm trying to pull this up, bear with me. There was a slight change that was made in the Senate on this Bill that deals with House of Worship."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Yes, I'm sorry. My screen was not open. There was a slight change that was made to this Bill within the Senate. It is still a good Bill. It just addresses crimes that happen within a place of worship and it just clarifies that. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick on House Bill 38

  Amendment #1."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Batinick: "Is this from a Class 1 to a Class 2 felony or Class 2 to a Class 1?"

Mayfield: "The original Bill was a Class 1, it is now a Class 2. It is an enhanced penalty and this is in direct result to individuals that are going into places of worship and committing crimes. They're hurting the parishioners. There was a minister that was killed in front of his congregation in downstate Illinois. So we are addressing those issues and of course there's been crimes across the nation that have dealt with these type of incidents."

Batinick: "All right. So this is one of those times where the direction of the Class 2 is actually weaker than Class 1. But what's the underlying Bill, so what is it now, is it going from Class 3 to Class 2 instead of Class 3 to Class 1? What is the overall direction of the Bill? I mean I know we all supported it on the way over there, I just want to have clarification."

Mayfield: "The current law is a Class 1, at least that's what it says in my analysis."

Batinick: "Okay. Our analysis says that your Bill previously made it... okay, so here's what I'm hearing from one of the best staff members in the General Assembly, Representative Windhorst. Is that it is currently a Class 3, we were going to move it all the way down to a Class 2 which is a penalty enhancement, or Class 1. It is a penalty enhancement, but just not as heavy of a penalty enhancement as it was when it left the House. The Senate weakened it slightly, but it is to

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

correct the important situation that you referred to, correct?"

Mayfield: "Absolutely."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. I just want to reiterate my thanks to Representative Mayfield for bringing this Bill. The event that she referenced earlier actually happened in Maryville, Illinois which is in my district, the 112th District. Where the Pastor was gunned down in front of his congregation and attacked. And the community is still reeling from that event that happened years ago. So I really appreciate you bringing this forth."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is 'Shall the House Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 38?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House shall concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 38. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On a point of personal privilege, Representative Ford. Please state your point."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege. Members of the Body, I rise today for a point of personal privilege for the people on the West Side of Chicago. Yesterday, Evelyn Holmes of ABC7 did a story because a young lady was killed at the age of 24. Evelyn Holmes from ABC7

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

wrote a story, it says a neighborhood is in turmoil after a 24 year old woman was shot and killed as she held her oneyear-old daughter in her arms, Tuesday morning. Brittany Hill was killed while she talked to her boyfriend, who was sitting in his car in the 1200 block of North Mason Avenue in the city's Austin neighborhood. It goes on to say, 'all of a sudden I hear all these gun shots ringing out. I see Jacob running and Brittany lying in the street over her baby. Ladies and Gentlemen, the gun shots and the murders that's happening on the West Side of Chicago and the Austin community seems to be louder than the voices here in Springfield to bring help. According to the Chicago Health Atlas, the Austin community has one of the highest death rates associated with chronic illness such as cancer, heart disease, and diabetes. The average life expectancy of residents on the West Side of Chicago is only 68.2 years of life while individuals just seven miles east of I-290 live to become about 88 years old. For example, about 258.2 per 100 thousand residents died from cancer each year. To put this in perspective, that's about a quarter of the population on Chicago's West Side or about 1 in 4 people. I must add that the Austin community has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the city at 10.5 percent compared to Chicago's overall rate of 7.9. With regard to violent crimes, nearly half of all homicides reported in 2017 occurred in the Austin community. Last year 530 murders were reported in Chicago but about 48.7 percent of those were from the Austin community. So today I rise and ask you to join me and declare the Austin community in a state of emergency and we must send help to the people in the Austin community where

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

I live, where I represent. Today, Austin is in a state of emergency. Governor, people in this Body, we need your help. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Stuart on a point of personal privilege."

"Thank you. I have the pleasure of inviting a couple of Pages to join us today. And they're both helping that it's a long day and that they have a lot of errands to run. So help me keep them busy. First I have Aaron Spaulding. Aaron's eight years old, he's just finished the second grade. He loves reading, and he particularly likes Diary of a Wimpy Kid and Captain Underpants books. He also loves to learn about science and when he grows up he wants to be a scientist. And my other Page, this is Will Gillis. Will is actually the son of my assistant back home in my Collinsville office, Miranda, who's sitting up in the Gallery. And his younger brother Owen is very jealous that he doesn't get to be down here on the floor with us. So if we could give him a wave, he would really appreciate it. Will is 10, he just finished the fourth grade and is really excited for summer. He loves to play baseball but hockey is really the love of his life. He would love to play hockey for the Blues when he grows up, but he knows that's not a forever job so he also would like to be a teacher and coach hockey. And he would really like me to ask everyone here to say let's go Blues because of the game tonight. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Let's go Blues! And Will, everyone is excited for summer here, too. Representative Meier point of personal privilege."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Meier: "Yes, point of personal privilege. Today I have with me Kori Huelsmann from Highland, your hometown, Jay. And she just graduated grade school there. Her favorite subjects are history, social studies, and math. And she has a goal in life of what she wants to do. In 2040 she will be old enough and she would like to be, if there's not been a woman president, the first woman President of the United States. And she is joined here today by her mother Lisa and her sister Lindsey. I'd like everybody to welcome her. And of course, go Blues."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome to Springfield. Returning to page 10 of the Calendar House Bill 26, Representative Thapedi on a Motion to Concur."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Thapedi: House. I rise today for final action on House Bill 26, the Top 10 Percent Program. Before you today is a Motion to Concur which corrects the scrivener's error in the Bill. underlying goal of the Legislation remains exactly the same since I first ran this Bill on the House Floor a little bit more than two years ago to the day. And that is to retain our best and our brightest students here in the State of Illinois. The legislation models legislation that emanated from Texas which was tested in the United States Supreme Court, in an affirmative action case captioned Fisher v. the University of Texas. Most notably, the University of Illinois system will not be participating in the Top 10 Percent Program because of its strenuous objections and its hefty support in this chamber. My guess is that the U of I will continue to have the worst diversity figures in the state with only 10 percent black students enrolled there. The Top 10 Percent Program

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

only applies to the directional regional universities, Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western. Students who graduate in the top 10 percent of their graduating class and satisfy the SAT and/or ACT benchmarks for the specific university and the specific college within the university to which they seek admission will be automatically admitted. There is no cost, whatsoever, to the state. The Top 10 Percent Program will be a four-year pilot undertaking and will be better positioned within that four-year time period to obtain the data to determine where the best steps to retain our best and brightest students here in Illinois and to further diversify our universities. I want to thank Representative Flowers, Representative Gordon-Booth, Representative Davis, Representative Meyers-Martin, Representative Representative Keicher, and the entire committee on Higher Education that helped me push it over the finish line. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 26?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those by 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 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 26. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Slaughter on House Bill 94. Out of the record. On page 10 of the Calendar House Bill 120, Representative Kifowit. Please proceed."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendments on House Bill 120. The Amendment simply, as you recall, this was a Bill that created a task force for ailments with regards to our current veterans that may not be recognized by the VA. What the Senate did was combine another task force in with it to be more efficient."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this concurrence Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Batinick: "Can you describe the other task force? It's a veteran task force, and is it two veteran task forces that are combined into one Bill? Or is it two completely separate task forces?"

Kifowit: "Two veteran task forces combined into one. So the other task force is regards to looking at disability claims and how the state can help veterans with their disability claims and their VA benefits a little bit more expediently. So they're loosely connected and they're tied both to the veteran community."

Batinick: "That sounds efficient. Thank you."

Kifowit: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 120?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yingling. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

voting 'present'. This Bill... the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 120. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Arroyo on House Bill 128... 124, I apologize."

- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion to concur Senate Bill 1, Amendment 1 that includes the language clarifying the application cannot be disqualified for not meeting the educational requirements prescribed by the Merit Board Administration Rule. However, that the Merit Board may use a lack of compliance of education and the training requirements when this should be promoted. I ask for an 'aye' vote. This Bill passed a couple days ago, so we just brought it back for concurrence. Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 124?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those against signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Carroll. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 124. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant on House Bill 210. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Sorry, I apologize. Please proceed, Representative Bryant."
- Bryant: "Thank you. I rise to encourage a concurrence on House Bill 210. It passed unanimously in here, went over to the Senate. At the request of the Lieutenant Governor, three

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

members of Lieutenant Governor's... three members were added to the task force including making Lieutenant Governor or her designee the chairman of the task force. It's to study the possible reopening of the Tamms Minimum Security Facility. And I urge a concurrence on this motion."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. On this Motion, Representative Mason. Representative, are you speaking to the Bill?"

Mason: "I'm sorry, no I'm not."

Speaker Hoffman: "Okay, we'll see you in a bit, okay?

Representative Ford."

Ford: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Ford: "I just heard... my computer is down. Did you say that this Bill will reopen Tamms?"

Bryant: "No, this is a task force to look at the minimum security unit that sits next door. So it was... there's actually two facilities there. One's the Supermax, this is the minimum security facility next door. I believe it was closed inadvertently. And this is just a task force to see if we can find a use for it."

Ford: "Thank you so much, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further questions, the question is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 210?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 210. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carroll on House Bill 247."

Carroll: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that we had a very nice debate on a few months ago and I appreciate everyone's concern. We're just adding an Amendment to simply change the language to carve out a small exemption for special education students. And I am hoping for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We may need Standard Debate,

I'm hoping not... but... okay, we are not requesting Standard

Debate. We are requesting Standard Debate, apologies."

Speaker Hoffman: "It will be on Standard Debate."

Batinick: "Standard Debate, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, the original Bill was about when you use a third party driver's education course, they have to follow the same evaluation process as non-tenured teachers, correct?"

Carroll: "Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "Okay. And then the Amendment added what?"

Carroll: "Again, it's just very simple language that carves out a small exemption for special education students."

Batinick: "It's an exemption for special education students that if they're trained by third party officials, those third party officials don't have to have the special training?"

Carroll: "Yes."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Of the evaluation process?"

Carroll: "Yes, that is correct."

Batinick: "And what was the purpose of that?"

Carroll: "Well... I mean... I think that just sometimes students with special needs have a different... you know process involved. So we just want to make sure that the evaluation process takes into account that there are some special needs students involved with the process."

Batinick: "Okay. Maybe I'm misunderstanding it. So... because I would think that you would maybe want more evaluation for that process, so what you're saying is the carve out goes which way? The carve out says that teachers of special education students go through the evaluation process or they don't have to go through the evaluation process?"

Carroll: "No, it's just for the students. It's not for the process itself. So if they have special need students in their classroom that would not be as much of an impact on their evaluation process. So if they're dealing with special need students there's going to be a different process of evaluation."

Batinick: "Okay. So what you're saying is that people who teach drivers ed don't have to follow necessarily the same evaluation process if they teach through a third party that regular teachers would that have to deal with special needs students?"

Carroll: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. To the underlying Bill. One of the things that I think came up after the debate. We didn't have a chance to debate was, I would imagine a lot of police officers, Illinois

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

State Police, and Troopers might want to teach drivers education. Are we giving them actually a higher standard than what a regular tenured teacher would have then?"

Carroll: "This has nothing to do with the State Police Department, Sir. This has to do with teachers and educators."

Batinick: "What I'm saying is, if I'm going to be a third party instructor of drivers education, one of the first places I would go to would be a former police officer, a retired police officer, Illinois State Police who are either doing it extra, or on their own time or after retirement. Are we now actually saying that somebody with that much qualification still needs extra supervision?"

Carroll: "Well, you know, I would say that you know again this is applying to people that are teachers and certified teachers in the area of drivers education. And I am sure that... and I know for a fact police officers would be great teachers of the driving rules and regulations, but they're not certified teachers. Talking about people that are certified to teach drivers education."

Batinick: "All right. I don't think we need to bother this too much. We had a long discussion last time. I think the vote was 70 to 34. I voted 'no' last time, I intend on voting 'no'. But we'll see where this lands. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bourne."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I know we had a good debate on this before, but I just wanted to reiterate some of the concerns that we had on the first time we voted on this. In

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

your legislation, you're not changing anything about the certification of the teacher, is that correct?"

Carroll: "Yes, Ma'am."

Bourne: "So currently drivers ed teachers already have to be certified?"

Carroll: "Yes."

Bourne: "Okay. So what we're changing is the evaluation process and who we require to evaluate driver's education teachers?"

Carroll: "It's just carving out a small exemption for special education students."

Bourne: "The Amendment, right, but the underlying Bill we are talking about who evaluates the driver's ed teachers, is that correct?"

Carroll: "Yes, that's correct. But that's the original Bill that you're talking about Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Which remains, correct?"

Carroll: "Yes."

Bourne: "So do we require any other school employee, or I should say contracted employee of the school who is not an employee of the school district, to be evaluated by district staff?"

Carroll: "This Bill applies to driver's education teachers. Again,
I'm not going to pretend to give you an answer on that. But
I don't know. I'm just going to focus on the Bill that I have
in front of me."

Bourne: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. This is kind of an onerous mandate on school districts requiring them to evaluate employees who are not their own. We're not requiring the actual employer of the driver's education teacher to evaluate them, but instead the school district staff who they're

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

contracting with. I think it's okay to have an evaluative process, but let's do it at the employer level and not at the school district level. School districts don't do this for other contracted employees like speech pathologists, psychologists, et cetera. I think we need to leave that up to the employers. We already have licensing standards in place. I think that should be enough. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Brady: "Thank you. Representative, just a couple quick questions I think. First off, what you're trying to do here is just have the evaluation in the same manner as regular driver education teachers, these third party contractors, is that correct?"

Carroll: "Yes, that is correct, Sir."

Brady: "And then to your carve out, your exemption of special education students. So just so I understand, is it the special education students that are going to be given an evaluation, or is it the supervisors of these third party who hire them? So to speak a little bit more to the carve out for special education students."

Carroll: "Yes, give me one second, okay."

Brady: "Sure."

Carroll: "Thank you for your question. What we're saying is that because sometimes special needs students have a different level of need in the classroom, we want to make sure that the people that are evaluated are not evaluated on students that

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

may have different requirements than the standard student in class."

Brady: "One more time, I'm sorry."

Carroll: "Okay, sorry. So Leader Brady, what I would say is that in the process... in coming again... I'm a former special education teacher, I've been through the process. Sometimes when you have nontraditional learners in a classroom environment, the way that those students are evaluated would be... that they would create the classroom environment might be different than your traditional students. So in reality, we want to make sure when we're evaluating driver's education teachers especially in the classroom environment... sorry, driver's ed teachers with students with special needs that we're taking into account that there might be students with learning differences or behavioral differences in those classrooms. That's all we're trying to do. We're not trying to do anything else but just to make sure that that's accounted for in the evaluation process. Frankly, this actually helps some of the third party contractors so they're evaluated fairly."

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

Carroll: "My pleasure."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further individuals seeking recognition, the question is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 247?' 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 82 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 247. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Willis on the Motion to Concur on House Bill 1583. Representative Willis."

- Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on House Bill 1583. The underlying Bill was to allow arrest warrants to be transmitted through audio visual. It had always been the intent to also have a hard copy in the file. This just codifies it and clarifies that for everybody. I request an 'aye' vote on concurrence."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1583?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Evans. Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1583. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Guzzardi on House Bill 252. Representative Willis in the Chair. Please proceed, Representative."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 252. This simply moves the effective date from January 1 of 2022 to July 1 of 2022. I ask for your support."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are going to... can we move to Standard Debate on this one?"

Speaker Willis: "We may."

Batinick: "And I would like to yield my spot to Representative Keith Wheeler."

Willis: "Representative Wheeler is recognized."

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

Willis: "He indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Will, think back to the discussions we've had on this Bill so many times. By the way, pleasure to see you as always my friend."

Guzzardi: "The pleasures mine and I'm so excited to relive this discussion one more time. This is the Bill that expands protections of the Human Rights Act to cover all employers of all sizes."

Wheeler: "I'm familiar with that. You may recall some of my concerns about this specific Bill."

Guzzardi: "I recall your concerns and I respect them deeply. But I don't believe that they pertain to this concurrence motion. This concurrence simply moves the effective date back."

Wheeler: "Which is why I'm asking."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, just moves the effective date back to allow the department and to allow business owners more time to prepare to conform with the new regulations."

Wheeler: "Is there an expectation to be any rules promulgation based on the language... of this legislation as a whole?"

Guzzardi: "I'm not sure why we would need to promulgate rules, no."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Wheeler: "I'm just asking if that's what they're needing time for that's why?"
- Guzzardi: "No... the department... they'll need to add some additional... they may need to add some additional staff and they'll certainly need to make some documents that they want to share with business owners to let them know about the new rules and let them know how to comply with them. So they asked us for a little bit of extra time."
- Wheeler: "Okay, no that does seem fair. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the... I guess the concurrence Motion. Those of you who have looked back to your previous votes on this issue, the concurrence doesn't change the fact that there are still small business concerns that aren't being addressed by this concurrence Motion. With all due respect to my good friend the Sponsor, I am grateful for his efforts here. I'm not able to support this yet, so I'd encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 252?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed voting '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 roll. On this question, there are 76 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. This... the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 252. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Going to page 11 continuing on concurrence House Bill 250, Representative Walsh. Please proceed."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the General Assembly. Today, I move to concur with Senate Committee Amendment #2 to House Bill 250. The Amendment would clarify some sale and error issues containing hazardous waste or substances in delinquent proper... tax properties and set the guidelines for how those sales would occur. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I have a little helper here today who is Shannon and Nick Bellini's son, 13 year old Seiger Dunston and he's going to help me vote on this. So, I'd ask for a concurrence vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "I didn't have a chance to review the concurrence too detailedly, Representative. Is it... is the Bill substantially the same?"

Walsh: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay."

Walsh: "Yeah, the underlying Bill that we passed out is the same and this was just added. It was identical to Senate Bill 158 that came across. That came out of the Senate unanimous."

Batinick: "Thank you. I think it went out unanimous here before too, so. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 250? This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question... I'm sorry, please take the roll. On this question,

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 250. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the Order of Concurrence House Bill 250, Representative Guzzardi on the Motion. I'm sorry, 254. Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 254. This is another date change. It corrects a drafting error that we had in the House version, moving the date from 2021 to 2020. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick on the Motion."

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

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, what was the... what was the vote on this the first time?"

Guzzardi: "I'll check my notes here."

Batinick: "84 - 30, it looks like."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, it was a nice bipartisan roll call. Which I am always happy to see. Eighty four to 30 is exactly right. Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "Okay. So, for... for our benefit over here, even if it's just moving a date. It doesn't allow us time to... it doesn't allow us time on this side to understand what the underlying Bill does.

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Batinick: "Can you explain the underlying Bill that you changed the date on?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Guzzardi: "Happy to. So, the Bill requires an additional layer of reporting about class sizes. So, in trying to confirm with the evidence based model we want to make sure that school districts and schools themselves have class sizes that provide for the best educational opportunity for our children. And the reason for the date change is we asked ISBE to compile this data in the beginning of 2021 and they need to compile it from local districts. So we need the local districts to submit the data in the fall of 2020, not the fall of 2021. So, we want to get the locals to do it in the fall of 2020 so that the state can do it in January 2021."
- Batinick: "Apparently, a lot of your Bills have date timing problems."
- Guzzardi: "It is... I'm never good with numbers, Representative. I really got to tighten that up."
- Batinick: "I won't argue with you on that one. No further questions."
- Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 254?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Manley. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. On this question, there are 86 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 254. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Burke in the Chair."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Burke: "Members, moving to page 9 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 1966 offered by Representative Willis.

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 2 is offered by Representative Willis."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118."

Speaker Burke: "How long do you anticipate being away?"

Butler: "At least 61 minutes today."

Speaker Burke: "I'll give you 62, but thank you. The House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Introduction of Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 424 offered by Representative Harper and House Resolution 425 offered by Speaker Madigan. These were referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Kalish: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Kalish: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in the gallery we have an incredible and incredibly diverse group of religious leaders who represent different communities in our state. These leaders took time out of their busy days to come down to

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Springfield and advocate for a common cause. HB3021 is a Bill sponsored by myself and Representative Cassidy, together with the Progressive and Jewish Caucuses, which would benefit each of these person's communities and more in lieu of the staggering, hateful acts that have taken place in our country. Every person deserves to feel safe in their community regardless of their religion, race, ethnicity, creed, or sexual orientation. I want to recognize each one by name, if we could have a minute. Father Antwan Latchen from the Assyrian Church of the East, his Representative is John D'Amico. Raj Mago from the Sikh Religious Society in Palatine, he personally lives in Karina Villa's district but their Gurudwara is in Tom Morrison's District. Dr. Donovan Price from Solutions and Resources who lives in Justin Slaughter's district. Abdullah Mitchell, Executive Director of the Council of Islamic Organization of Greater Chicago, Representative is Thaddeus Jones. Mita Shewakramani from the Shree Ganesh Temple in my district. Rabbi Phil Karesh from the Midwest Regional Director of Orthodox Union in my district. And last but not least, Rabbi David Wolkenfeld, he's the Rabbi at Anshe B'nai Shalom, his Representative is Sara Feigenholtz and you may recall that it was his synagogue who was recently fire bombed on Sunday, May 21. We thank all of these religious leaders for coming down and representing their communities and we give them a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Welcome to the Capitol. Turning to page 9 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 1966. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Willis."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis on the Amendment."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment takes into consideration some concerns that we heard from Committee Members on the charge of \$50 for a FOID card and for renewals. We took that under consideration and we reduced that charge to a bare bones minimum of \$20. It still keeps intact the \$15 of that going into the State Police Firearm Service Fund and \$5 going into the State Police Revocation Funds. We also put in a cap on the Livescan charge that vendors can do at \$30. We also did some adjustment on because we had reduced the FOID card purchase, we no longer had money from the FOID card to go to the school based mental health. Instead, we looked at what was actually being done with the monies from the concealed carry licenses and put into statute transferring that money as appropriately to this Bill to take that money and put it in a combination of the school based mental health fund and a community based mental health fund to be distributed by DHS. That is what the Amendment does and I'd be happy to debate the Amendment and the rest of the Bill on Third Reading, Ma'am."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Madam Speaker, inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Wheeler: "We are looking at notes that have been filed here, do we have the status of those notes?"
- Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "We are still waiting on a housing and land conveyance note."
- Wheeler: "Are there two other notes as well that have not been replied to yet?"
- Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "We are still waiting on a housing and land conveyance note."
- Wheeler: "So then Madam Chair, what's the status of the Bill without these notes are being replied to, you know?"
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Willis, do you have a Motion regarding the note?"
- Willis: "I would Motion that housing and land conveyance are inapplicable to this Bill and make that Motion, please."
- Wheeler: "I'd like to object to that Motion. I would also like to inquiry about the judicial note that's also not responded to in the notes."
- Speaker Burke: "So, Representative Wheeler, what we'll do is adopt the Amendment first and then we'll take up the issue of the notes."
- Wheeler: "Fine. Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Willis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1966. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment 2 is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Willis and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis on the Amendment."
- Willis: "Floor Amendment 3 is just correcting a drafting error.

  When we put in Floor Amendment 2 we accidentally left out the underlying requirement for person/person transfers that are required to go through a federal firearms dealer on that. So, that's what we're dealing with."
- Speaker Burke: "Are there questions on the Amendment #3? Seeing none, Representative Willis moves to adopt Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1966. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments, but a housing note as sent by the Senate has been requested not filed at this time."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Willis, do you wish to renew your Motion?"
  Willis: "Yes. I'd like to make a Motion that all outstanding notes
  are considered inapplicable, please at this time."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler?"
- Wheeler: "Inquiry of the Chair, again. As far as how many notes are outstanding?"
- Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "A housing note as introduced or as introduced in the House is still outstanding."
- Wheeler: "Okay. Still an objection based on that one Motion. A Roll Call Vote is requested."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Willis has moved to rule the notes inapplicable. This is a Roll Call Vote, Members. Those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record, 62 voting 'in favor', 52 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. The notes are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis. Excuse me, Third Reading.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill has come about as a response to an unfortunate tragedy that we saw a few months ago where... which brought to light a number of loopholes that were in our FOID system. Prior to that, we also had seen some studies that were done by the John Hopkins Institute and the Webster Group that showed that we had some deficiencies in the State of Illinois. These deficiencies do not, in my opinion, take away anybody's 2nd Amendment rights. What they do do is they realize that we have got some work to do in the State of Illinois to make sure that firearms are only owned by law abiding citizens. Those people that have a right to own those firearms. And so, as a result of a working group where we had a number of people come together and we started with people on both sides of the issue and unfortunately we had to bring it down to those that we were going to make sure that we got what was our best thing in here. We worked extensively with the State Police, with other enforcement. And we also worked specifically with the Aurora Police Department who were, unfortunately, caught up in the

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

results of what had happened by having inefficient areas in our FOID system. And so, we took all of those things to mind and we came up with what we consider a good Bill that does not take away anybody's Second Amendment right. So what the Bill does, it modernizes our FOID Act. FOID has been around since the '70's. It has never been increased in the cost. It has never been really modernized, it's been the same system all the time. People put in their name and their address, request to get a FOID card, pay a ten dollar fee. They do a cursory check of their background. Nothing pops up, the State Police issue you your FOID card. Well, we have found that there is some deficiencies in that. Oftentimes, people change their names. Oftentimes, believe it or not, people lie on their FOID cards when they apply for it. So we have found that really, truly the best way that we can take care of this is we can make it modernized. So, we've done a couple of things. We've shortened the time for a FOID card from ten years to five years. We are requiring fingerprints, fingerprints don't lie. When you submit your fingerprints, we know who you are, where you are from, it doesn't matter what you put on there. We are going to make sure that we have an adequate check of not only the State of Illinois's database for felonies but also national databases so that we can make sure that we're correcting and not having the wrong people have a firearms owner identification card. We also found that there was insufficiencies in the data that was shared with law enforcement and that is something that we need to correct. And so, what we are trying to do is making sure that this portal is most update and user friendly for all law

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

enforcement so that they can have the correct information available so that they can know, as they're doing checks that they are making sure that we only, again, have the correct people owning firearms and having them throughout the State of Illinois. We also knew that there were some problems in the courts. The unfortunate incidence with the Aurora shooter, he was in front of court a number of times and nobody caught that he had a revocation before him. And so, we have gone and clarified and made this portal much more easier for the courts to be able to do it. We also found that there was a loophole that could often be used in what is called a person to person transfer of firearms. And not always, while it is strongly suggested that a background check is done as those transfer are done, it's not always being done. And so we want to make sure that we have a firearms dealer, a licensed dealer that is going and facilitating those transfers so that we can get rid of any loopholes on those checks not being done. These are the things that we think need to be done. Well, unfortunately, it takes money to have this be done and that is why it is recommended in here that we increase the FOID card cost. When we are dealing with over ten thousand FOID cards annually being revoked for a number of reasons, we need to make sure that we give the State Police the resources and the ability to do their job appropriately. By increasing the FOID card cost, we can go and give them the money and the resources to do their job, to make sure that we do not have miscommunication and tragedies like we saw in Aurora just recently. This is something that needs to be done, it needs to make sure that we take care of all of this in the most

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

efficient way possible so that all members of law enforcement are safe. They need to be safe if they need to do a revocation, they need to have as much information as possible. And that's what we've out into this with many talks with the State Police, local law enforcement, and gun owners as we're going through. Fingerprinting is nothing new to this world that we have today. We do fingerprinting on a lot of levels. Many people when they apply for various jobs are required to submit fingerprints. We have fingerprinting when you go and you open up a checking account you can be asked if you want to have a fingerprint to verify your check, that gets done. Some people do fingerprints on their iPads or their computers. There is a variety of things that we do that. This chamber in fact, required fingerprinting for people that work with children. We've done that to make sure that we have correct background checks that we are protecting our children. Well, another way we can protect our children is making sure that the wrong people do not own firearms. And that's going to be requiring fingerprints for all firearm owners. One of the things that we've took into consideration is that once you do do this, your fingerprints are on file, you do not need to repeatedly do that. And we're taking that into consideration. So, if you chose to put in fingerprints to speed up your concealed carry license, when you did that a number of years ago and we have it on file, you are good. You don't need to redo it again. We're making sure that we're trying to make this as easy as possible to allow those members, those people that are lawfully own their guns to continue to do that. There are fingerprinting in other states right now that have no problems

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

with it. It's been able to do, Hawaii, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Washington D.C., New York, Connecticut, and Texas require fingerprinting. So, with that, I'm sure the other side of the aisle has a lot of questions. I will save the rest of my stuff to answer their questions as we go forward but I do request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Members, as we move into debate we will be using a five minute timer. Every Member who seeks recognition will be recognized. This is a very... an issue that many people feel passionately about. We'll have a thorough debate on it but I ask you to please be respectful. Representative Welch for an announcement."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Joyce Mason is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Burke: "Thank you. Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative Willis, thank you for making your presentation today. I have a little bit different recollection of how... how this all kind of unfolded. So, with your indulgence, I'd like to kind of go through what my recollection of the process in this was. So, help me with... I think everyone knows but maybe for those who were not here, what's... what started... what... was there a... there was an action or a tragedy here in the state that kind of started this conversation. Can you remind us what that was?"

Willis: "Well, actually this was originally started from the report that came out from John Hopkins Institute on some ways

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

that we could clean up our FOID card. It got brought to the head and probably put into a much more urgent issue as a result of the Henry Pratt shooting in Aurora."

Bryant: "In Aurora. So that's what I remember, is that there was an investigation done after the Aurora shooting, after the tragedy there. And there were some deficiencies found in some of what transpired in the time that that shooter applied for the ability to get a concealed carry license and all of that. I have the timeline for that if we need to go through it. But just remembering that I know that you wanted to put a working group together and my recollection was that Leader Durkin then asked several of the Members from our side of the aisle to be a part of that working group and there were four Members. So, in putting the working group together at our first meeting, we had some Legislators, some legislative staff from both sides of the aisle. We had some gun rights advocates as I recall there was one advocate that wanted to be there that was excluded. There was some Representatives on the phone from G-PAC and maybe another organization and we had some law enforcement members there from the state and some local level, including Aurora. At that time, presented a list of twelve items that I believe that were put together. They were some G-PAC requests and in that... in that meeting we looked at those in one of the main issues on that list was fingerprinting. I think you may remember or recall that during that meeting we gave a pretty strong objection to the idea of fingerprinting, otherwise law abiding citizens, for exercising a Second Amendment right. And even said that that particular point could be a non-starter for us and if

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

that what this was all about, we probably weren't going to be able to go any further with our conversations. Do you recall that?"

Willis: "I do, Ma'am."

Bryant: "Okay. Thank you. So, as we reviewed the list we were then kind of tasked with trying to decide of those points, which ones maybe we could find some common ground on and we scheduled at least the idea of having ongoing meetings and then we had a second meeting. I want to say at that first meeting, I believe that you assured me that there was... that the impetus of this was not ultimately to make sure that we got fingerprinting for those otherwise law abiding citizens who had done nothing else wrong except want to exercise their 2nd Amendment right."

Willis: "Well, I think what I probably assured you was that was the not the only reason to be behind this. That we were looking at the FOID card revocation issuance as a whole. What I think came out of the meeting just as your group stated that fingerprinting was a non-negotiable. It came from the other side that they felt very strongly that fingerprinting needed to be part of the package as we continued on."

Bryant: "Okay. But at that point we were still... we were still talking."

Willis: "We were and we..."

Bryant: "And arranged to have a second meeting."

Willis: "We did."

Bryant: "At the second meeting, I recall we had Legislators there, law enforcement, and some staff and the gun rights advocates were not there and neither were the… those in opposition for…

60th Legislative Day

- those who were supporting the G-PAC twelve pointer. Is that... that's right? Okay."
- Willis: "We had some smaller meetings as we went forward, yes mostly with legislators."
- Bryant: "Yea, because it became evident at that meeting that there had been some other meetings..."
- Speaker Burke: "Excuse me, Representative Bryant, your time has expired but your seat mate has sought recognition. I'm wondering if Representative Severin is seeking to yield time to you?"
- Severin: "Absolutely. Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "All right. Five more minutes for Representative Bryant."
- Bryant: "Thank you. So, we have second meeting. In that second meeting, the twelve points again were kind of brought forward and we did talk about the possibility of... I believe we talked about the possibility of perhaps offering up fingerprinting provided that that was an option similar to CCL, where it would maybe just speed up the processing. But the conversations were ongoing and I left there kind of feeling like we were in a good place. Did you feel like that at the end of the second meeting?"
- Willis: "I do. I think that we continued to have open communication through the entire process, Ma'am."
- Bryant: "Thank you. So, I left the meeting then thinking that we were going to have another meeting and then within about twenty four hours, House Bill 96 was filed which ultimately had, if not all at least majority of those twelve points that we had discussed in Bill form. You and I had a telephone

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

conversation about that and you indicated that you did not intend to move that Bill forward, that we were going to go ahead and have continuing conversations. Is that accurate?"

- Willis: "I did. I reached out and made a phone call to you directly to make sure that we were... you knew that I did not intend to have our conversations stopped at that time."
- Bryant: "Okay. So let's talk about what was in House Bill 96 even though that is not the Bill we're looking at today but there are still major elements in today's Bill that are a part of that. You have amended it so we'll talk about those Amendments as well. So, House Bill 96 and those elements that still remain would have been an increase in the FOID card. That particular Bill was taking FOID from \$10 for ten years to one hundred... I'm going to use ten years as the comparison so we're comparing apples to apples. So it would be... from now, \$10 to \$100 over ten years which is a one thousand percent increase. The Bill that we are seeing today has been amended so that is now \$20 for five years, which is \$40 per ten years. So we are still talking about a four hundred percent increase as compared to what someone is paying today for a FOID card, is that right?"
- Willis: "Well Ma'am, what I would bring out to your attention, if we adjusted for inflation when the \$10 was put in originally in the'70's or \$5... in 1968 and now with inflation going through, current inflation would say that today's card would be \$38."
- Bryant: "So... okay. So, you agree that it's a four hundred percent increase?"

60th Legislative Day

- Willis: "Well, math doesn't lie. I can't argue with you on that, so."
- Bryant: "Okay. Okay. So, 400 percent increase. Just curious, do we have any other constitutionally... a constitutional right for which we charge and if we do, have we had a four hundred percent increase on that particular..."
- Willis: "Well, what..."
- Bryant: "Second Amendment... on that particular constitutional right?"
- Willis: "I would say if you want to consider the right to leave our country a cost of a passport is in there and the current cost for a passport..."
- Bryant: "A passport is a constitutional right?"
- Willis: "Well, the… right to free travel, if you want to consider that. I mean it's not necessarily written in the constitution but…"
- Bryant: "Which... what... could you...? I'm not familiar with that

  Constitutional Amendment. What number is that?"
- Willis: "It's not necessarily in an Amendment but I would say the right to travel certainly would go under the right to move around or whatever so that you are not held captive. If you want to go that way."
- Bryant: "All right. I'll get with... I'll get with your staff later and find out which Constitutional Amendment says I can travel. Okay. All right. So, going on then, we are also removing the timeline from ten years to five. In our conversations with the State Police, do you remember them saying that one of their major objections was going from ten years to five. Because... the reason we moved it from five to ten was because

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

they were having trouble processing them at the five... they didn't have the staff to do it. And they specifically said 'can we not change it to five years?' And so I'm wondering what led to changing this then over their objections?"

- Willis: "Well, I think that they realized that it would be much more efficient to do it that way and at this point the State Police are totally on board with the five year time on it. It makes it consistent with concealed carry licenses."
- Bryant: "So in my conversations with them, the conversations were mostly that they need money and they don't... they don't really care because they need the money, so."

Willis: "No."

- Bryant: "They are looking to get the infusion of money here so let's... let's be clear about that."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Bryant, your time has expired but Representative Marron is seeking recognition. Do you wish to yield your time to Representative Bryant?"
- Marron: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to yield my five minutes to Representative Bryant."
- Speaker Burke: "Okay. Five more minutes, Representative Bryant."
- Bryant: "Thank you. I'd like to go back to the cost of this again. So... so in the... in House Bill 96, the original legislation we also have in this legislation, so this is the same. We have an issue of a background check and fingerprinting. However, in this Bill, you make clear in your Amendments that you are limiting the amount of cost that the... the vendor that is taking the fingerprints can charge. So, with that being said so we're actually at an expense even with those changes, we're back up to a minimum expense over the ten years of roughly

60th Legislative Day

- \$100. So we are going from ten back to one hundred which takes us to one thousand percent increase again on the cost of an otherwise law abiding citizen exercising their Second Amendment right guaranteed by the Constitution?"
- Willis: "Well, the one thing you're not putting in to consideration, the fingerprinting is a onetime charge. Not every person will need to get fingerprinted. If they already have their fingerprints on file from a concealed carry license, they will not need to redo those fingerprints. So fingerprinting is a one-time charge, so I don't think that really works quite right in your figures."
- Bryant: "So, currently do you know how many percentage of current FOID cardholders have their fingerprints on file?"
- Willis: "Not off the top of my head. I'm sure we can get that for you."
- Bryant: "Well, let me help you then. It's roughly .06 percent of FOID cardholders so basically everyone, right. Almost everyone except of the .06 percent who have theirs on file right now will have to be fingerprinted?"
- Willis: "I'm sorry, Ma'am, I missed your question?"
- Bryant: "It's not really a question, I'm just saying that there is .06 percent of present FOID cardholders have their fingerprints on file. So basically, almost everyone who has a... who presently have a FOID card right now is going to have to be fingerprinted. So, let's talk about fingerprinting for just a second. In committee, a question was asked about fingerprinting and the question was if you supported universal fingerprinting? Do you remember what your answer was to that?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "I said if it makes it a safer state, I am in support of anything that makes our state safer."

Bryant: "Okay. So, I just want to make sure the Body is listening right now. Make sure the Body is listening right now. So, all due respect to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, she's okay with statement was that fingerprinting. Okay with universal fingerprinting. Every citizen of this state, it would be okay to fingerprint them. Otherwise, legal citizens doing nothing illegal but it would be okay to fingerprint them. So let that sink in for just a little bit. Okay, going on, so we know that there were some deficiencies identified after the investigation from the tragedy in Aurora. I think every gun owner in this state wants to make sure that we are doing it legally and that we're keeping our citizens safe. The whole objective is to get the bad guys off the street and the ones who don't have a legal right to own them, we want to make sure that they don't ... that they no longer can do that. So, I don't know... I'm... if you are aware that Representative Wheeler... are you aware that Representative Wheeler has filed a Bill that kind of goes at this from the... from the back side to address the issues that were identified in Aurora? That's House Bill 3839, are you aware of that?"

Willis: "I am aware of his Bill, Ma'am."

Bryant: "Okay. And... so... in his case... do you... or in that Bill's case, do you know what the status of that Bill is?"

Willis: "I believe it's in Rules."

Bryant: "In the Senate?"

Willis: "I honestly don't know, Ma'am."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Bryant: "Okay. But we... we do have a Bill..."

Willis: "Okay, so it's in Assignments in the Senate then."

Bryant: "...okay. So we actually do have a Bill that is out... that is current and that we could actually pass in this Legislative Session that does address the issues that we found from the tragedy in Aurora without infringing on our citizens Second Amendment rights."

Willis: "Well, there... with all due respect to the Representative that filed the Bill, I do believe there are some major deficiencies in that Bill that did not address many of the concerns that were brought up from the Joyce Foundation when they did a study of FOID cardholders."

Bryant: "But..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bryant, your time has drawn to a close again. Representative Demmer wishes to yield his five minutes to you."

Bryant: "Thank you."

Willis: "Not to mention, there is no funding in his Bill to actually be able to do the things that he feels are necessary."

Bryant: "Okay. So... but we... could... but we still have time to take the real issues and we could work on some funding methods so there is that... I just want to make sure... that everyone understands that this isn't the end at to be all right here today."

Willis: "Ma'am, if that Bill came over from Senate that Bill is currently in the Senate. I have no control on when that Bill will move from the Senate over to the House."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Bryant: "If it did... if they were working on that in the Senate and it moved over to the House, would that be something that you think you could support?"

Willis: "I would certainly look at the Bill much closer and try to be able to support if I could."

"Okay. Let me... let me just move on then really quickly. In our conversations and in committee, it was stated that immediately if... if this Bill passes, immediately it will be litigated. We know... you know that there is outstanding... there is an outstanding litigation right now that's going to be going to the Supreme Court that actually may wipe out the FOID card in Illinois totally and should that happen, basically the work on this Bill will totally go away. But, in fact the Bill that Representative Wheeler has actually would stand up to constitutional scrutiny and I just want to make sure that the Body here knows that today. I'm not going to take too much more time with this Bill because I think there are some other speakers that are going to speak on this as well. I just want to highlight a couple... to the Bill. There is a couple of things I want to highlight, I think will also be brought up with some other speakers coming along. This Bill does absolutely nothing to address the very real issues identified in the tragedy of Aurora. There has been another study that's mentioned. But the driving force behind this was to fix what happened in Aurora so that we can all get beyond what those problems were. It creates a real question of constitutionality, will absolutely be litigated and struck down causing a delay in addressing the real issues that have been identified. Three, it divides a constitutionally

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

guaranteed right into two categories, those who can afford it and those who cannot afford it. It opens a wide door to requiring fingerprinting to exercise a constitutional right and by the Sponsors own testimony in committee, encourages universal fingerprinting. It redirects valuable dollars, which is a point we didn't even get to yet in the Amendment. Takes money away from IDNR, \$2 million a year. So over that twenty year period, \$20 million dollars a year from IDNR that is directed to the Conservation Police that should be used to make sure that our state parks are managed and properly taken care of. It also sets a fee limit for private businesses. an unenforceable requirement for local Creates enforcement to confiscate private property and also allows for them to enter private homes. This is a bad Bill that the ... the attempt at this from the beginning was applaudable. We can probably get to a place where even Members like me, who usually oppose almost all of these, I think we could get to a place where we can find common ground. I would like to work on the Bill that Representative Wheeler has presented. We can do it over on the Senate side with our... with our friends and allies over there and bring it over here. But this is not the Bill. Friends, I urge a 'no' vote today to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens in this state and to ensure that when the Supreme Court... when the Supreme Court rules that the FOID card in Illinois is not constitutional and wipes it out, we don't waste this valuable time addressing the issues that have been identified in the tragedy that happened in Aurora. I urge a 'no' vote."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "Okay. May I respond to a couple of those last things,

Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Burke: "Yes, you may."

Willis: "Okay, so FOID cards were put in in 1968. To date, they have not been found unconstitutional. In fact, they have been upheld through many challenges. Fingerprinting, there are a number of cases that have gone before the courts regarding the constitutionality of fingerprinting. One is Gong v Bloomberg. Again, it did not violate the second Amendment right to do fingerprinting. Same thing in Heller v. District of Columbia. On the fingerprinting requirement of a gun registration in 2015. So, while I believe that gun owners and gun right advocates will..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, excuse me. Representative Bryant had spoken to the Bill so I was in error in allowing you... I'm sure you will be able to get your points in with another speaker."

Willis: "...okay. No problem."

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson on the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee actions taken on May 29, 2019: recommends be adopted referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 97, Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 220, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1854."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Burke: "She will."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Wheeler: "Thank you. Before we begin, Madam Speaker, I want to go to the point you made early on before the debate began about decorum. And I'd like to personally thank the Sponsor for the many discussions, as well as some important changes that were made to the Bill based on those discussions. I thank you for that. I also want to take a moment for James Hartmann from House Dem Staff for ... yes ... for your hard work on this and most importantly for Jen Paswater and all of our House Republican staff who have put in many hours on this issue. A lot of good discussions and I thank you for your help and your friendship. Looking at this Bill and how it began. I know my colleague had outlined, kind of, the path it took and I know this came out of Aurora. And Aurora is a very sensitive issue for me. And I was really looking forward to getting to a place where we would all land together and we didn't quite reach that in this Bill. I was hoping to get a little more balance. I do appreciate those discussions so let me ask a couple of question about my concerns about the Bill that's on the board The requirements for fingerprinting... the right now. requirement... or the restrictions on the cost of... what a fingerprint can cost to a taxpayer or actually in this case, to somebody whose applying for a FOID card under the language in the Bill, as long with the restriction on the cost of what an FFL can charge in a transfer are things that I believe were mentioned in committee that would probably be a challenged almost immediately in court if this Bill were to become law after being signed by the Governor. Do you recall that discussion in committee?"

Willis: "I do recall that discussion."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Wheeler: "So, let me bring this idea to you here on the floor. I think when it comes to public safety, and we are talking... we both want improved public safety."

Willis: "Yes, Sir."

"When it comes to public safety, I would implore us all Wheeler: in this case to let's start with the things we can agree upon and run that part first. This Bill reaches into other places that really don't have a direct connection to what happened in Aurora. It may have connections to a study that you had found and I can understand and appreciate that. But some of the pieces of this particular Bill don't do that. So, I bring that up because one of the things that is very important to me is that we fix what happened with respect to a revoked FOID card. What happened in Aurora was done by a person who had a revoked FOID card. We have discussed this many times. To me, that's where we should begin in this process. All of us agree that someone who has had their privileges revoked for reasons that are already on the books, should not have a FOID card in their possession and they should not have the weapons in their possession. That's the first part first and my concern, why I asked you those questions Kathy, has to do with if this Act is challenged in court, I would expect those making that challenge to object to the entire Act. Which then slows down the implementation of the rest of the Bill as you put it forth. I have concerns about that. I have a public safety concern that we should take the first step first and run it. That's the major impetus why I filed the Bill. I have a question for you... actually I want to make a comment. I am glad you included an online database in this Bill. For

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

prohibited persons for use by law enforcement, for state's attorneys and judges to use while those prohibited persons are actually in a court room or they are detained by law enforcement. So they know, quickly and easily, they don't have to go search through databases of something else to find out if that person has a revoked FOID card and if they should be asked for it. Actually that's... idea... credit goes to Leader Durkin for that. He brought that to our team here and I think we brought that to the table and again, I am grateful it was in the Bill."

Willis: "Actually, it came from one of the gun advocates that wasn't invited to the meeting that you and I both had a private meeting with."

Wheeler: "Okay. First, I heard of it actually... it came from Leader Durkin in a totally separate conversation. So I guess, like minds were getting together on that part of it. One of the most important elements of what you have put in this Bill, and in our discussions, has to do with actually having a system in place that we don't have right now. Currently, if someone's FOID card is revoked, the process as I understand it, correct me if you see a difference in this, a letter is sent from the Illinois State Police to local law enforcement. Another letter is also sent to the revoked FOID cardholder and that's pretty much where the system stops right now, as far as what happens bureaucratically within the State of Illinois. There is no follow up. Do you care to comment on that?"

Willis: "No, I... you are correct. It is very permissive."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Wheeler: "So, consequently, the idea of placing an assigning responsibility for that process to an entity is in your Bill and I think we agreed on the idea that the Illinois State Police is the proper place for that to occur."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative, your time has closed but Representative Reick, do you wish to yield your time to Representative Wheeler?"
- Speaker Burke: "Five more minutes, Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The idea of creating this Illinois State Police Task Force who is responsible for weapon recovery with the assistance of local law enforcement is something that the State Police had agreed to in your discussion with them, correct?"

Willis: "Correct."

- Wheeler: "And it's important to also note that the local law enforcement who may be involved, at their discretion, in this recovery process they need to be reimbursed for their activities and their efforts."
- Willis: "That is the whole idea behind the Firearm Revocation Fund."
- Wheeler: "Correct. Pointing to that then, there is a cost involved in that process. We don't know necessarily to my knowledge yet what a... that cost would be per situation, per the... the whole element of what is involved in that. Do you have an... any estimate at all?"
- Willis: "Well, we have... I have an estimate that was given to me on the total cost of the FOID program. And they... that is broken down into what it cost using the estimation if the 2.4

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

million FOID cardholders out there. And it's broken down to approximately \$20.74 to enforce the program as stated."

Wheeler: "But as it currently exists, the enforcement element of a revoked FOID card comes down to two letters and two envelopes and two stamps."

Willis: "Well it also does back... you know, making sure that the database is up and all of that stuff, too."

Wheeler: "I agree with that part. I'm talking about just the recovery process once a FOID cardholders privileges have been revoked."

Willis: "Revocation. Yes."

Wheeler: "Sorry?"

Willis: "For what we are doing on revocations that is the only cost that is right now, one hundred percent in there and then depending upon if they actually do those that come up to the top of the batch that are considered 'clear and present danger' and we do have revocations where they do have people that are going out to homes to actually enforce this now."

Wheeler: "By my understanding, those are local law enforcement efforts not necessarily Illinois State Police efforts."

Willis: "Well, we've seen in cases..."

Wheeler: "It may be a combination, but."

Willis: "There is a combination, I mean, there was a task force that, again, had another tragedy in Rockford when they were trying to work together on stuff. It wasn't just a revocation."

Wheeler: "Right. That was federal warrant, right? This... I believe.

This is a little different. So, I'm... what I'm trying to get
to is there has to be some kind of an understanding of what

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

a program like this is going to cost as we begin to figure out how that should be implemented. The *Chicago Tribune* posted an article, I want to say late last week, that points to the fact that there are potentially tens of thousands of revoked FOID cards in this state that have not been recovered by law enforcement. Are you aware of that?"

Willis: "Thirty four thousand Illinoisans have lost their right to own a gun, nearly 80 percent of them may still be armed."

"I am pointing to that article for a reason. Because when we fund a very, very important initiative like what you've outlined in this, Illinois State Police task force responsible for recovering FOID cards, responsible for recovering weapons that potentially could exist. We don't know, that's an estimate from our friends at the Chicago Tribune. The idea to me... in my mind of saying we are going to take an amount of money from a FOID card and hope that's enough, isn't enough. That' something that's a public safety measure. As a state, I believe, we should appropriate from public safety funds through general revenue or some other source we can find. I don't see a path, because I don't understand the cost part of it yet, but in my imagination as best I can make it, I don't see how what we've taking in this Bill and moving into that recovery fund is actually going to be able to be enough to do that in year one or two or three."

Willis: "Well, I think what the argument would be is we do have general revenue funds and operating costs that the State Police already have. We are hoping that it is enough and once they get caught up, we don't know and you're right. And I would be... that was why we came with \$50 as the initial cost

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

hoping that go but we weren't able to get that accepted by everybody and so we are trying to do that. Also, one of the things our previous Governor swept \$4 million out of the State Police funds. So, we're dealing with that right now also."

Wheeler: "I understand that but I'm bringing this to a point though because the reason why I filed the Bill that I filed has to do with the fact that I think that is a public safety initiative that protects the entire state. Most FOID cardholders based on the fact that there is 2.4 million of them and we have a category of revocations in the ten thousand area."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, your time has drawn to a close.

Representative Keicher, do you seek recognition to yield your time?"

Keicher: "I do. I yield my time to Representative Wheeler."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed, Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Chair. The... where I was trying to go

here has to do with these costs are not going to be balanced based on what's taken from the FOID card fees. We don't necessarily charge more in a driver's license to try and catch up with the fact that there is a speeding epidemic in the State of Illinois. This to me is a public safety issue. We should treat it as such. We should ask the State Police for a budget number to apply to what they believe they need to run these task forces. That's why the Bill that I filed, I actually printed it that way instead of having a revocation fund. And I want to point out one other thing while we are talking about this. In Amendment 1 to this Bill when it was \$50 dollars for five years for the entire cost of the FOID,

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

we had \$15 dollars going to the State Police Revocation Enforcement Fund. In Amendment 2, when the total cost of the FOID card dropped down to \$20 for five years, that number got moved down to \$5 for the revocation fund. Now, how are the State Police going to be able to do that same thing that they said they needed in Amendment 1 with the money allotted in Amendment 2?"

Willis: "There are going to have to set priorities on those that are clear in present danger, that's what's going to unfortunately happen. They won't be able to do everything that they want to. They will have to take out of their general operating expenses and perhaps they will come back to us asking for more appropriations to be able to continue to safely do revocations."

Wheeler: "But Representative, you do believe that this is an important element of your Bill, right? This is one of the... the most important parts of the Bill."

Willis: "Yes, I do."

Wheeler: "Which means that we should treat it as such. We should fund it as such and we should as expedite it as such. That is why I will still ask the Body and you, the Sponsor, to let's break these measures into two pieces. Do the revocation part of it, well actually the recovery part based on revocation, as a separate measure that can be run with probably pretty wide bipartisan support in a way that will get this done. It will not be challenged in court. But for the other elements of the Bill, that some consider to be an overreach."

Willis: "You know, this is just mandating and putting into law what we're going to do with money from the FOID cards. This

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

does not prevent the State Police from doing their budget and as we passed our budget in the next couple of days, making sure that there is additional funding for the State Police. Just like when we had to go and pull money from the Department of Natural Resources. We have gone and made them whole this year by finding money for them in the state budget, not from FOID cards but in the state budget."

"My point to you, Representative, is that this is a... Wheeler: effectively a random quess as based on what we fell we can get out of increased fees to law abiding, FOID cardholders in order to fund something that is still a public safety measure that the entire state benefits from. I'm going to go to the Bill, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill on the board is not the only path we have forward to effect better public safety when it comes to the Firearms Illinois Identification Card in the State of Illinois. It is not the only measure we have to improve public safety when it comes to those issues in the State of Illinois. I filed a Bill in the House and I believe it's being picked up also in the Senate that will take the first step, first. It doesn't reach too far. It will, I believe, not be challenged in court. It is something that will take effect more quickly and dependent on those of us in this Body and in the Senate to appropriate the appropriate amount of money for the first step rather than waiting for money to roll in from FOID card renewals and applications. Could we improve the FOID card process, should we improve the FOID card process, yes there are things we could do. But we need to very carefully examine how we do that to respect the constitutional rights of all of our

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

citizens. And wouldn't it make sense to do that part of it later knowing that we've got a Supreme Court of the United States rendering a decision on a New York case, possibly next month or sometime this summer that could provide some important guidance for how we should move forward in regarding... how we reform the FOID card process. That makes more sense to me and someone who wants to see action sooner than later when it comes to how we deal with what happened in Aurora and what could happen anywhere in our state based on the fact that we have tens of thousands of FOID cards that have been revoked and not yet recovered. At this time, I respectfully request the body to vote 'no' on this measure and look to another path. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Unes."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Unes: "Representative, am I correct if your Bill were to pass, is it accurate to say that there would be no more private transfers? If there are two FOID card owners that want to transfer their gun ownership from one FOID card owner to the other, they could no longer do that privately if this Bill were to pass, is that accurate?"

Willis: "That is correct. Unless they are same members of the same family."

Unes: "Okay. Thank you."

Willis: "They will be required to go to a federal firearms licensed dealer."

Unes: "Okay. Thank you. I'm going to go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are many reasons why I am opposed to this

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Bill and there are many reasons why I feel a 'no' vote is the right vote. But I am going to speak on one that I think everyone in this chamber should be in agreement on and that's the one that I am going to concentrate on based on the question that I just asked. And so we just heard the Sponsor say that if her Bill were to pass the only way... the only way a legal gun owner can make a transfer is by going to a dealer... a licensed dealer. So Ladies and Gentlemen, I have the application, it is ATF form 4473 from the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosives, and this is the form that a legal gun owner would have to do ... would have to fill out if they want to transfer to another legal gun owner. Looking at this... so for the record, let me just say first of all, there is a lot of talk, everybody knows there is a lot of talk about legalizing marijuana in Illinois. I, for one, am opposed to it. I will not be supporting it but if it were to pass... if it were to be legalized, anyone that would legally then be using it would not be allowed to make a legal transfer of their... of their gun. Because on this form, number 11 E, it asks... and this is what every person would have to fill out, it asks are you an unlawful user or addicted to marijuana or depressant, stimulant, narcotic drug or any other controlled substance. And then it says, in bold print, in bold black print it says 'WARNING: The use or possession of marijuana remains unlawful under Federal Law regardless of whether it has been legalized or decriminalized for medical recreational purposes in the state where you reside'. So because marijuana is federally illegal and because if this Bill were to pass, there would no longer be a lawful way for

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

two law abiding citizens to legally be able to privately transfer... to transfer their gun ownerships. There would be no way for that law abiding citizen to transfer and no way for that law abiding citizen to make a legal gun purchase of any kind. There would absolutely be no possible way, none, no possible way for someone who is a legal medical marijuana cardholder or someone that wanted to, if the marijuana law should... if recreational use, which again is not something that I am for, but if that were to pass, there would be no way, absolutely no possible way for that law abiding citizen to either transfer or purchase a gun lawfully and..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, your time has expired.

Representative Ugaste is recognized."

Ugaste: "I'll yield my time to Representative Unes."

Speaker Burke: "Okay. Please proceed."

Unes: "Thank you, Representative Ugaste. And, if someone were to falsify, if they went legally to the dealer, filled out this form and were to falsify this form, that is a federal felony. So we are taking away the ability for an otherwise, law abiding citizen, a citizen that has done everything that they were asked to do according to the law. They have dotted every 'i', they've crossed every 't', they've done everything that they were supposed to do and we are taking that law abiding citizen and turning that law abiding citizen into criminals. Again, there are many reasons why you should vote 'no' on this Bill, but for that one in particular reason, nobody in this chamber should be supportive of that. Nobody in this chamber should be okay with knowingly turning that law abiding citizen into a criminal. I urge a 'no' vote."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Member from DuPage yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Skillicorn: "Thank you very much. Representative, so, let's just start going to the Bill right now and I've pulled up the actual text of the Bill here. And I just wanted to go to say page 11 of your Bill, Section 7 and 8. It talks about existing statute and giving a task force ability to enforce the FOID Act, Concealed Carry Act, and the Gun Dealer Licensing Act, correct?"

Willis: "Correct."

Skillicorn: "So, let's go after the line of questioning from the Member from Peoria. He was talking about the cannabis. So, what happens if someone answers that 4473 questionnaire and let's say they have a medical card and they don't answer that question honestly, will the task force go and revoke that person's FOID card and confiscate their weapons?"

Willis: "Well, I'm glad you asked that question because one of the problems right now is that it is a Federal Law on cannabis use whether it is medical or recreational. And so the loophole that is being touted as a lawful transaction is actually an illegal transaction under Federal Law. And, so whether it is done through a private sale or a dealership sale, it is a violation of Federal Law."

Skillicorn: "Well, according to your Bill, again, page 11, Section 7 and 8, it empowers a task force to enforce the law. Will... there be state troopers knocking at a door and confiscating weapons?"

60th Legislative Day

- Willis: "So the task... the part of the responsibility of the task force is to prioritize the revocations and what they're doing as to putting those that are a clear and present danger. Somebody that is a medical marijuana user would not necessarily by that alone, make them a clear and present danger."
- Skillicorn: "Was Mr. Martin, the Aurora shooter, was he considered clear and present danger?"
- Willis: "I honestly am not familiar with everything in there. I do know that he had a number of run ins with the police and I do believe that he probably would have been... if they knew that he had a firearm in his possession, he would have been up towards the top of a clear and present danger."
- Skillicorn: "So let's go to page 10 of your Bill. You know current statute talks about information and data. So, if we go to page 10, specifically a task force may develop and acquire information. Is there any limit on the data or information that this task force may acquire?"
- Willis: "That's under the current Violent Crime and Intelligence Task Force, so we did not change any language in that."
- Skillicorn: "So, you're telling me that you didn't change any language about acquiring information?"
- Willis: "No, I did not change any language that is in the statute that you are referring to."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. So I hear that Chicago has a criticized gang database. Does your Bill prevent the State Police or any of these task force from creating their own gang database?"
- Willis: "It does not address gang databases at all."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Skillicorn: "It doesn't address it but it doesn't change current law about data that is gathered.

Willis: "This Bill does not address gang databases."

Skillicorn: "So it does not eliminate any of these databases?"

Willis: "This Bill does not address gang databases."

Skillicorn: "And it is still empowers the task force to gather this information and create these databases?"

Willis: "The task force is already empowered under current law."

Skillicorn: "Where in this Bill is the State Police or one of these task forces prevented from creating registration or a registration system for firearms?"

Willis: "That is not addressed in this Bill."

Skillicorn: "So it's not addressed, it's not prevented?"

Willis: "Would you like... would you like me... would you like me to put a gun registry in this Bill?"

Skillicorn: "I would like something in this Bill to prevent that."

Willis: "It does not address it, therefore it does not allow it under this Bill."

Skillicorn: "Is that... your intent that they... that that should not be prevented?"

Willis: "It does not address it in this Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn, your time has expired."

Skillicorn: "Someone willing to yield time?"

Speaker Burke: "Representative Welter, do you wish to yield your five minutes to Representative Skillicorn?"

Welter: "I do."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed, Representative Skillicorn."

60th Legislative Day

- Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative, where in your Bill is the State Police prevented from acquiring gun dealers to give up sales information if the task force wants it?"
- Willis: "That is not addressed in this Bill. I believe if you go back to my gun certification Bill, there is some information in there that addresses that."
- Skillicorn: "Is there any intent to prevent that or to gather data for how many sales are done in a month?"
- Willis: "That is not addressed in this Bill."
- Skillicorn: "So let's go to page 8 of the Bill and the..."
- Willis: "I'm sorry, what page?"
- Skillicorn: "...page 8. And the Prohibited Person Portal. How would a citizen... how would one of our constituents get off that list?"
- Willis: "I think it more of a concern of how one of your constituents get on that list."
- Skillicorn: "You don't have concerns of due process of how someone might get off that list?"
- Willis: "That is actually language that came from your leadership.

  The prohibited..."
- Skillicorn: "I am quite independent of any leadership, that's why
  I asked the question. All right. I'll go on to the next one
  here."
- Willis: "I will state that this is a database that is not openly available and it is actually only for law enforcement personnel only. If it would the same with anything else. If somebody was found that they were, inadvertently, put on there because of false data, they can certainly petition and request

60th Legislative Day

- whoever put it on to clarify that. If it was their name was wrong or something along those lines."
- Skillicorn: "So your intent is that they could petition to get off this prohibited person portal?"
- Willis: "I think that's just the way that ... whenever we have mistaken identities dealt with, that would be my intent that they would be able to address that."
- Skillicorn: "All right. Next question, I'm going to go to there is a lawsuit right now here in Sangamon County where the State Police denied someone a FOID card, the State Police claimed it found a conviction but it won't produce it. The involved individual has a FOID card for a number of years and says he has never been convicted of anything yet. What is the standard the State Police have to prove?"
- Willis: "Well, I think that is one the things that will be easily clarified under fingerprints so that we can make sure that we don't have false accusations going out."
- Skillicorn: "But then again, we go back to this database. Clearly, the State Police says that this is someone who is committed offense, that deserves revocation of their FOID card yet how do they get off that list?"
- Willis: "The point behind the database is not to go and have a huge list of felons or unsavory people. It is to make sure that we have a much better portal of information sharing. So that we can prevent tragedies that only one law enforcement agency knows and not letting those in other districts or in local places be aware of."

60th Legislative Day

- Skillicorn: "So you mentioned about due process and someone that would be able to petition to get removed from the list. Who pays for that? Are they supplied a public defender?"
- Willis: "I... that is not addressed in there and this is not what this is intended to do. Again, I believe that if we hold to the standards of fingerprinting, we will make sure that we are dealing with... without having to worry about false identities."
- Skillicorn: "So, you say that we have to make sure that we identify this and don't have any false identities."
- Willis: "That is... I'm saying that fingerprinting will be a step to assuring that we do not have false identities out there."
- Skillicorn: "Would your Bill help them recover attorney fees to correct when the State Police is wrong?"
- Willis: "That is not addresses in here. Fingerprints don't lie, Sir."
- Skillicorn: "On page 12 of your Bill, it creates a new fund. The State Police Revocation Enforcement Fund."
- Willis: "Yes."
- Skillicorn: "But then on page 13, it provides that the money may be used to hire and train State Police officers and other law enforcement purposes. Why is there a conflict there?"
- Willis: "That's the language that come from the State Police. I don't... that is so that they can go and have local law enforcement assist them on revocations."
- Skillicorn: "But why doesn't the language say that. It specifically says 'to hire and train State Police officers and other law enforcement purposes'."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "So they might be hiring additional personnel and that is why that language is the way it is."

Skillicorn: "Okay. So, next question, it's really probably my last question here, is we talked about the 1968 five year FOIA Bill and the... the five or ten dollars..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn, your time has expired."

Skillicorn: "...yes. May I finish this question?"

Speaker Burke: "No. Representative Walsh. Walsh?"

Walsh: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Walsh: "Just one quick question. I got a phone call from DNR and from our former colleague, Representative Costello, concerning some dollars that they received from FOID cards and just wondering if that issue has been addressed."

Willis: "Thank you, Representative for bringing that. Yes, it has been addressed. What we have done is we have gone and put into the budget to make them whole for this year, the money that they would have gotten on FOID cards. So we made sure of that. And I have made a commitment to Director Costello that I will be working with him over the summer to find a continual source of revenue for him. It will not necessarily be from the FOID card but I will be working with him to make sure that we have this so we can continue to keep them whole."

Walsh: "So we will have a trailer Bill in the Veto Session regarding..."

Willis: "It won't necessarily be a trailer Bill but there will be some... hopefully, there will be some piece of legislation that

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

we'll work through to keep the Conservation Police Funding whole."

Walsh: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Willis: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Villa."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. As you have heard today, on February 15, 2019, Aurora, Illinois joined a city... a list of cities that has been steadily growing for years in the United States. It is an infamous list. A list that nobody wants to join. Aurora became a city victimized by senseless gun violence. Victimized by senseless death, deaths caused by serious omissions in our qun violence prevention laws. On February 15, 2019 at Henry Pratt Company, an employee killed five people and injured six others. The shooter had a felony conviction and still obtained a FOID card. When he was denied a concealed carry license, his FOID card was revoked but still he did not surrender his firearm and there was no additional follow up. Several days after the shooting, I received a call from one of my constituents, a gentleman who was in the room when it happened. He told me the story of his experience and urged me to work on strengthening our gun laws. This gentleman was a gun dealer and knew our existing laws were flawed. We must do more to protect the people of this state from senseless gun violence by criminals. We must do more to protect our school children from the fear that invades their lives. There are dangerous gaps in the State Law that allows this shooter, and which will allow future criminals easy access to guns. We can do more. We must do better. This Bill addresses gaps in the background check system and helps ensure

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

that people with violent, criminal histories are prohibited from gun possession. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Connor."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Connor: "Representative, given the situation that happened in Aurora, can you please explain to this Body if there is anything in legislation or State Police regulations at this point that would prevent another individual from going in, doing the exact same thing the Aurora shooter did in obtaining a FOID and going out and legally purchasing a firearm here in Illinois?"

Willis: "Under current legislation, under current statute, unfortunately there is not. It is all permissive."

Connor: "Thank you. To the Bill. Just too quickly reference a... a reference from another Representative though, right to travel was recognized by the Federal courts as a fundamental right in 1823 under Corfield v. Coryell. In addition, I'd like to make the point that the right to private... the word privacy does not appear in the Bill of Rights and yet we recognize that as well. So, fundamental rights are not limited to specific language from the Founders of this country. And fingerprints didn't exist in 1789. When you go to the happiest place on Earth, Disneyworld, you scan your fingerprints. And we can't do as well as they can do at Disneyworld to protect the citizens of Illinois. So, I would ask this Body, since there is no other way to prevent this from happening right now, let's pass this legislation today. Because, if Disneyworld can do it, to protect the people who go there, we

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

most certainly can do it to protect the citizens of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes, I have a couple of questions. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Meier: "Down in our area, we have a lot of shooting matches put on by KC clubs, fire departments, different groups. If somebody wants to borrow somebody's gun for that, they would have to first go three days and put it and do a transfer?"

Willis: "No. For a borrowing, that does not require it. It is only for a transfer of ownership."

Meier: "Some people tell me they believe that the transfer is when you take that gun from your hands and you put it in somebody else's."

Willis: "Well, that is not correct according to the law. Page 25 of the Bill, line 15 will clarify that for you, Sir."

Meier: "Okay. What about our people that can't produce a fingerprint? What will we do with them?"

Willis: "Everybody can produce a fingerprint."

Meier: "No. Ask the State Police because several years, I have carried a Bill here so that I can try to get a bus driver because of a medical condition, she has no fingerprints. We have a State Rep. in this building right now, who cannot produce a fingerprint. So, my school bus driver was never allowed to drive a school bus again. The State Police cannot get a fingerprint any way from her. So will our... people like this be denied their constitutional rights?"

60th Legislative Day

- Willis: "Well, they would have to do their best effort to make sure that they would scan whatever they have on their fingers and if it is not doable, that would not necessarily be the reason to prevent them from getting a FOID card. If they have made every attempt to do that."
- Meier: "Well, the State Police determines right now, as they've said in committee for the school bus driver, that they cannot... she cannot get a permit to drive a school bus because she doesn't have fingerprints. So, what's the difference?"
- Willis: "What percentage of citizens in the State of Illinois do you think that actually would affect? That sounds like an awful strange anomaly to me."
- Meier: "It should not matter but, you know, there is a 118 in this building right now, in this room and one of them can't do it. So, already we've said one out of a 118 out our colleagues here, would not be able to get a conceal and carry... I mean a FOID card right now."
- Willis: "Well, the other seven states that do this haven't seen this as an issue or a problem."
- Meier: "Maybe Illinois is unique because I know several people with this and I believe they have a constitutional right to have a FOID card. What about... we know this is going to be challenged. What about the fact that where is this money going to go. If this is going to go to the U.S. Supreme Court, will this money be refunded with interest to everybody that was forced to pay it and forced to get the fingerprints?"
- Willis: "Sir, with your argument like that, there are many Bills that many people would say could be challenged so why do we

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

bother to pass legislation because anybody could challenge anything at any time."

Meier: "Well, if I'm paying for something that I find out, I was forced to do illegally, I would expect a refund. I would expect my Legislators to go out there and fight for the fact that we get this money back because we've already pay taxes on this money. It's our money and we are being forced to do something the Constitution says we don't have to."

Willis: "You wanted a response to that?"

Meier: "Well I'd just like to know that, you know, if this is found unconstitutional, I'd like to know if this money will be returned?"

Willis: "That would probably have to be part of the lawsuit and since I'm not a lawyer, I could not tell you that."

Meier: "And, do you not believe because, the biggest thing I have in my office... I get more calls right now on people's FOID cards and the fact of how long they can call for a month straight and never get an answer with this department. You know, that ware way far behind. I'm not seeing where things are being sped up in this Bill. To help people with their FOID cards. They may have their middle initial misspelled on their... on their FOID card and they can't get it. But you know, we can't service what we're trying to do right now and you are putting more restrictions out there."

Willis: "Representative that is actually one of the main reasons why we have increased the cost behind FOID cards. So, that is one of the main reasons the State Police say they oftentimes run into slow processing. They do not have the money and the resources to speed up the process. This is the goal of this.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

To help for that basic beginning process to make it go faster and more streamlined. I, too, get calls in my office all the time on it and I, too, would like to speed up process for lawful gun owners."

Meier: "Well, I just believe..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, your time is drawing to a close but I believe Representative Bourne seeks to yield her time to you, so five more minutes."

Meier: "Maybe I missed something here but I've seen where these funds are going. I don't see funds specific... specific for the State Police to increase this. You say we are going to maybe take care of..."

Willis: "It's in the Firearm Services Fund. That's where that comes from."

Meier: "And that... will it... we've got it in black and white. It should be part of this Bill, that they will be caught up and able to do the job they are supposed to do. We constantly ask our State Police to put their lives on the line for us and protect us and we don't give them extra funds. I believe the money from this should be used to make sure that when you go out and we... you have a constitutional right quaranteed by the United States of America and we challenge that and then we can't produce a FOID card in less than a month or two months. We can't even have anybody answer the phone in over a month. I believe we have to do something about that now before we start putting more things on that. We need to be looking at this year's budget, doing that tomorrow. It's a.m. it was put into law a few years ago and we aren't taking care of that right now. So, I think we need to take care of that first."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "Representative, I hope when it comes time to vote on the budget so that we can adequately fund the State Police, that you'll give us a 'yes' on that."

Meier: "We'll have to negotiate that budget. Seems like we're not doing much negotiation on that budget right now. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wilhour."

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

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Wilhour: "Representative Willis, do you believe that firearm ownership is a right or a privilege?"

"I think it is a right with a responsibility behind it." Wilhour: "Okay. Well, I appreciate that you at least acknowledging that we're dealing with a legitimate constitutional right here because when we are dealing with constitutional rights we should avoid at all costs undue burdens on exercising those rights. And, I would just like to read, really quickly into the record the brief exchange between Senator Harmon and then Senator Kwame Raoul from April 10, 2014 in regards to an Amendment to the Illinois Constitution prohibiting voter ID laws. Senator Harmon: 'Senator, in a court challenge involving one of these voting laws or procedures, would the law or procedure be subject to strict scrutiny or simply rational basis review?' And in response, Senator Raoul: 'The law and procedure at issue would be subject to strict scrutiny in a court challenge.' Representative Willis, this Bill requires fingerprints from everyone who applies for a FOID card or a conceal carry, is that correct?"

Willis: "Yes, it does."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Wilhour: "In Illinois, one must have a FOID card to possess a firearm, is that correct."

Willis: "Yes, it is."

Wilhour: "Does your Bill anticipate that gun owners or prospective gun owners will find a private party vendor, pay them for fingerprints and then have them submit it to the State Police?"

Willis: "That is... that is the intent of the Bill. That is the way it is drafted, yes."

Wilhour: "In 2014, this Body passed House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #52 that prevented the enactment of a voter ID law. You voted for that Representative and many of the folks in here voted for that. Do you remember that?"

Willis: "I do."

Wilhour: "I'd like to read additional portion of the debate from Senator Raoul, who is obviously now Attorney General Raoul, in 2014. He said 'It should be noted that 11 percent of U.S. citizens lack a photo ID. Of that 18 percent of American aged 65 and older, do not have a government issued photo ID. And citizens earning less than \$25 thousand per year, are more than twice as likely to lack a photo ID. And 25 percent of voting age African-Americans, do not have a photo ID.' Representative, are you familiar with Accurate Biometrics?"

Willis: "I am."

Wilhour: "Yeah. They are one of the largest fingerprinting vendors in Illinois. They're registered and approved by the State of Illinois. I want to read a couple things from their Web site on the directions for getting fingerprinted in order to comply with the Concealed Carry Law. It's a two-step process. Number

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

one is print and complete the fingerprint authorization form. And, number two and this is a big one, bring this complete form and a government issued photo ID to an accurate biometrics fingerprint location. Given these statements, clearly Senator Raoul, now Attorney General Raoul, many of the folks in here, including most likely you, Representative Willis, believe that this was too much of an imposition on the right to vote. It was unduly burdensome to the ability to carry out a legitimate constitutional right. Considering this position, how is it not an inappropriately high imposition for them to have to have a photo ID in order to get fingerprinted, to get a FOID card for their right to own a firearm?"

Willis: "Well, I'm going to quote from a court decision that says, 'for the foregoing reason, we believe the district has adduced substantial evidence from which it reasonably could conclude that fingerprinting and photographing registrants will directly and materially advance public safety by preventing at least some ineligible individuals from obtaining weapons and more important by facilitating identification of the owner of a registered firearm during any subsequent encounter with the police. Therefore, these requirements are not unconstitutional. These requirements... those requirements are therefore not unconstitutional.' I'd also further state that nobody died from voting. That's not necessarily the same from being on the wrong side of a firearm."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, your time has expired but Representative Spain, do you wish to yield your time?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to yield my time to Representative Wilhour."

Speaker Burke: "Five more minutes."

"Thank you. I'll just go to the Bill. Clearly there is a double standard here. We can't pick and choose which part of the Constitution we uphold. Guns are... they are part of American culture. The right to bear arms is a fundamental constitutional right. Laws like these laws, counterproductive. They don't take guns out of the hands of criminals. Criminals by their very nature, they don't respect laws, they don't value laws. What we should be talking about in this Assembly is why people are committing these acts in higher numbers than ever before. Americans have always had access to firearms but it's only in the last couple of decades that this has really became an epidemic. This is a mental health issue. A segment of our society is... they're sick. But why aren't we asking why, why aren't we dealing with that? Is it because, as a society that we've devalued life in our culture. Is it because we allow and promote our kids sitting in front of these video games where they're encouraged to blow each other's head off? I don't know. I don't think that you do either. But do we care. Why aren't we focusing on that? Maybe we should focus on how we keep people safe in gun free zones because that's where most of the crimes are committed. This Bill does very little of either of that. What it does do is it makes it more onerous, more burdensome for law abiding citizens to exercise a legitimate constitutional right. I'd ask this Body to stop the political opportunism, deal with real issues. We are not dealing with the real issues here.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

This... it will not take the guns out of hands of criminals and I ask us to respect the Constitution and vote 'no' on this blatant government overreach."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Swanson is recognized."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I'm fortunate Swanson: today, as I look at my FOID card and I just got a new one so I've got nine more years to go at least before I have to worry about another expense on my FOID card. What I'd like to talk about though are some numbers. We talk about the second, third order of fact of our types of legislation we pass through the House. As I understand it, there's 2.3 million FOID cards out there today and I bet if I asked this House how many of your legislative aides back home receive a call Monday through Friday requesting assistance on their FOID card, I know in my district, I get at least three to five calls a week, someone who needs help with a FOID card. And most of these FOID cards are ten years old. Now let's look at rolling 2.3 million FOID cards back to a five year license. Now, we're looking at four... almost five hundred thousand cards that are going to be due every year. So, we'll be able to take that three to five phone calls a day or a week to six to ten calls a week. And that's just our offices, we have 118 different offices. But let's take it down to the Illinois State Police. I've gotten to be very close and talk pretty much every day with a person who worked at the State Police who helps with the FOID card and the CCL issues. If we look at 2.3 million FOID cards or five hundred thousand cards per year renewed, that's 221 cards every hour of an eight hour day per year that's going to be required to renew or 1,770 per day. The numbers are phenomenal

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

when we start looking at what we're going to create for Illinois State Police but yet we don't have the budget increased to increase the man power. So now we are bottle necking our constitutional rights to access to something that I don't believe is constitutional to begin with. Most of those phones calls I receive are from the elderly people at that. You know, I ... that we can't access it through the computer or I need help and we work with these individuals closely to help get their FOID cards. So I just bring that to everyone's attention that those of us in the office today who help with individuals requiring a FOID card renewal that our work load is going to increase two times as many as what the State Police is. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bailey is recognized."

Bailey: "Thank you, Madam Chair. To the Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Bailey: "Thank you so much for this opportunity to be able to speak on behalf of the 109th District and much, if not all, of the Southern Illinois. During my time here I continue to try to hone in my skills on being a good Legislator, being a good Representative. I've talked to many people that I respect and have learned from and I've developed four principles for deciding... for helping me know how to vote. Number one, I ask myself, does it restrict personal freedom? Number two, I ask does it raise or lower taxes? Number three, I ask does it deregulate business? And number four, does it make the scope of government larger or smaller? All four of these, which I reflect... believe are what it takes to make a good government and to allow this... these United States to thrive. So as I

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

consider this, I look at number one and I ask myself does restrict personal freedom? Well, I believe that fingerprints are obviously an intrusion on our privacy. I believe that people in general don't trust government with their money, with what we're doing here most of the time. Maybe we need fingerprinted here since we are handling so much money. Number two, does it raise or lower taxes? All session long, on almost every Bill that we have been talking about, I've heard a lot of concern about those who are less fortunate in this State. We are creating a system that is going to take of the over 2.6 million FOID cardholders and additional \$67 million over the next ten years. Additional, on top of the current FOID costs. Number three I ask myself, does it regulate business? Well SB337 was signed into law in January and it forces new regulations on the over two thousand FFL dealers. New fees were originated. We were told that a minimum fee of \$300 would be charged and a maximum fee of \$1,500 per dealer would be charged. So far every one of my dealers in the 109th District, many of which literally operate out of their homes, have got on the Internet as they received their letters, they filled out the form and guess what, to no surprise, every one of them are falling into the \$1,300 category. Over a ten year period, this is going to take an additional \$8 million from the over 2000 FFL dealers in Illinois. So, ask yourself that are we regulating business? Number four, does this make the scope of government less or greater? Well that's the biggest problem that I have. Government does not need our fingerprints. They don't need the fingerprints of a law abiding citizen. I'm curious where

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

to find the facts of the many crimes that have been committed throughout our state, especially in the Aurora area, how many of those people who committed these crimes had a FOID card. Government needs to hold government accountable to do what we ask them to do here. This Bill is a total and complete infringement of the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution. Yesterday, I sat here and I listened as many of you invited people from neighboring states to come to Illinois and get an abortion. What on earth is going to keep anyone from bringing a gun across the state lines? I do not understand that. I do not get that. Bad people are going to do bad things and it's high time that we start punishing those bad people for doing bad things in an appropriate way instead of burdening our citizenry. Everything about this is wrong, friends. Been saying that several times this week. This is not right. This Bill creates a financial burden on Illinois families. It infringes on the very freedoms that make this country the most awesome country in the world. Friends, I'm afraid that the passage of this Bill is going to take this state to places that we don't want to go. We are here to figure out problems and instead, time after time after time again, we believe that throwing money at the problems and creating more regulation is the answer. It's not the answer, let's deal with the problem. Please let's deal with the problem. Thank you so much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Madam Chair. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is something that we shouldn't be blaming the State Police for. They have done the very best that they can

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

possibly do. But the answer to government's failure is not more government. And that's exactly what we are doing. We are trying to fill a hole that cannot be filled. It's been said that people are going to do bad things to people, absolutely. Let's say was take all of the guns off of the face of the earth. What's next? We're going to have to take knives, we're going to have to take clubs, we're going to have to take hands and arms and legs. Because people will always find a way to kill other people. Maybe we should find ways of getting rid of some of the free to kill zones. Because that's exactly what we are creating in this state. I am a firm believer that we should have teachers and more law enforcement officials in schools that will be able to defend our future generations. There are several teachers that used to be in the military that know exactly how to handle a weapon. Law enforcement is obviously trained in how to deal with these situations. Again, the failure of government cannot be corrected by more government. And I hope that's something that resounds in this chamber because it can go with other Bills beside just this one. And we can look... let's ... let's take another country. Look at Japan, 19 people killed by one person with a knife, a knife. Forty five injured. I hope people understand it's not just guns. We're talking about taxpayers having to pay more because the criminals will never follow these laws. So as we are telling the taxpayers, the law abiding citizens, that they're going to have to pay more for this they're going to have to pay more for their gas, they're going to have to pay more for their license plates, they're going to have to pay more in everything else that we are discussing here in this

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

chamber. We are taxing people out of this state and it's not going to solve the problem. I agree with Representative Wilhour that we definitely need to look at funding mental health because that is going to help curb the problems that many of these incidences are starting with. Law enforcement can't be everywhere and they can't be everything and it seems that's what we are trying to make them do. It won't work, it won't work. We would love to prevent any and all murders but we can't. There is no way on God's green earth that we can be everywhere all the time. There is no way that the State Police is going to be able to file through all of this information. We have Bills that we passed out of this House limiting the amount of time that law enforcement can keep information, yet we are going to keep these fingerprints forever. Where is the uprising for that when law enforcement wanted to keep license plates, readers, the information for a longer period of time? I would urge a strong 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hammond is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Hammond: "Representative Willis, for the sake of argument, this legislation essentially raises fees if we take everything into consideration. Not just the FOID card fees but also fingerprinting, transaction fees. So, for the sake of argument, we raise those fees somewhere between 400 percent and 1000 percent. These fees are for FOID cardholders, is that correct?"

Willis: "Correct."

Hammond: "So..."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Willis: "Or those attempting to become FOID cardholders."
- Hammond: "...so where in your legislation, Representative, do we address individuals that are convicted of crimes involving firearms, the perpetrators are not FOID cardholders. Where in your legislation do we increase the penalties on those individuals from 400 percent to 1000 percent?"
- Willis: "Ma'am, that is not in this legislation. The intent of this legislation is to address those that are FOID card owners or want to become FOID card owners. I will tell you though..."

Hammond: "So, why..."

- Willis: "...that there are every year, and we look at it historically, approximately 10 thousand FOID card owners that no longer should be FOID card owners that need to then go through revocation."
- Hammond: "Representative, I would argue that there are hundreds of thousands of crimes that are committed by individuals that are not now FOID cardholders nor were ever... ever were FOID cardholders or ever could be in the future. So I'm just... I'm really..."
- Willis: "And I would agree with you. That is true."
- Hammond: "...I'm really confused if you are going to put this... these excessive fees on individuals that are FOID cardholders, you wouldn't also make it applicable to those that have been convicted of crimes?"
- Willis: "There are other pieces of legislation that affect other crimes that go throughout. That is not in this one."
- Hammond: "And I'm certainly look forward to you sponsoring that legislation as well. To the Bill. We heard, in the very beginning, when these discussions were going on that

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

certainly DNR was going to maintain their fees that they currently receive from the FOID card applications. We've just heard, recently, that in fact, DNR is no longer going to receive any of the dollars for the FOID card. The Department of Natural Resources does 70 percent of the enforcement for FOID cards. Seventy percent. They will lose \$2 million a year, \$20 million over 10 years. And we have heard, not to worry because we're going to put that money in the budget. We're going to put that money on the budget. You know, I've seen a few budgets around here and I've seen a whole lot of times where people say guess we must have missed it, guess we must of missed it. So we could in fact miss the very agency that does seventy percent of the work and the enforcement for something that I think is a vitally important program. Vote 'no'. I yield the rest..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You said you're not trying to take away Second Amendment rights and as a FOIA (sic-FOID) cardholder I don't necessarily think you have agreement on that. But what you haven't addressed are the Fourth Amendment rights at stake. Will the Sponsor yield to questions?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. So yesterday we heard all about why we needed to pass what frankly in many ways was an offensive Bill that we didn't need because we were told that our laws must always be changed to conform to current Supreme Court case law. Now on this question of the fingerprint requirement, do you agree that the Fourth Amendment to the U.S.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Constitution applies to the states by virtue of the Fourteenth Amendment?"

Willis: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. And do you agree that the US Supreme Court, in both for example, Hayes v. Florida, Davis v. Mississippi, held that even in the context of a criminal investigation, fingerprinting someone is subject to the constraints of the Fourth Amendment and that the act of taking someone's fingerprints constitutes both an investigative stop and seizure under Terry v. Ohio. Do you have any basis to believe this is not good law at the Supreme Court level?"

Willis: "There is no case law that says in this context it'd be unconstitutional."

Mazzochi: "That's not... I'm asking about Hayes and Davis and the act of fingerprinting."

Willis: "I am not a constitutional lawyer, Ma'am. And I'm not going to get into a constitutional lawyer debate with you. You can re... go and give me many, many cases and I am not a lawyer. And you will win in a lawyer debate."

Mazzochi: "Well, you should think about these Constitutional issues before you start filing these kinds of Bills. All right, well to the Bill, since she's not going to answer constitutional questions. Let me inform the Body that Hayes v. Florida also explained that in the absence of probable cause or a warrant suggesting anyone has to cooperate with the police for fingerprinting 'could not be squared with the Fourth Amendment'. And in fact, no one can be compelled to submit to the police for interrogative purposes or fingerprinting absent probable cause or judicial warrants.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Now there are some exigent circumstances but again those types of scenarios has to involve someone who is under reasonable suspension of engaging... being engaged in criminal activity. And I resoundly reject the notion that every single person who applies for a FOID card is someone who can qualify as a suspicious individual in the process of seeking to engage in criminal activity. And while you did mention some other state that have some fingerprinting regimens, first none of them have actually risen to the Supreme Court level for challenge and survived. And certainly not on Fourth Amendment grounds. The New York case is still being argued and debated. Second, you also indicated that you thought D.C. v. Heller actually upheld D.C.'s fingerprinting licensing regime. absolutely untrue. And in fact, the Supreme Court said they were going to just assume that the petitioner's issuance of a license would be satisfied and quote 'do not address the licensing requirement in their Constitution analysis'. And the Texas laws that you mentioned are limited to certain types of licenses to carry which is different from what we're saying here in Illinois. Which is to merely own or process, you have to have the fingerprinted FOID card. And if you are going to get these fingerprints, where do they go? According to the Illinois State Police, all fingerprints for the applicants are going to be submitted to the ISP. The ISP will retain the fingerprints in their automated, biometric identification system and they will use those fingerprints in connection with future criminal justice submissions and requests. That initial fingerprint submission will also be forwarded to the FBI. Does anyone really think that that data

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

and information is going to be secure and is going to not be abused and that the FBI is going to let that kind of information go? I'm frankly distressed that you think that keeping fingerprints of innocent people on file in a database for criminal investigations when those fingerprints were surrendered by force of law and not consent, is a feature and not a problem with this law. You also said that fingerprints don't lie. Well, go and Lana Canen about that, eight years she spent in prison based on bad fingerprint analysis. Go ask Richard Jackson, gay male in Philadelphia convicted of murdering his lover on the word of three fingerprint analysis who were all wrong and his conviction was overturned. You also think this is simple because Disney can do it and what's the big deal about a little fingerprint. Well this Body passed the Biometric Information Privacy Act, precisely because we recognized that the... people have a deep privacy interest in their fingerprint data and recognize this data is vulnerable to abuse. The Bill is not giving more resources to our State Police. It's not going to cause people to start prosecuting the straw purchasers and I suggest you urge the Cook County Prosecutor to do that because she's not. Start following up on the revoked licenses..."

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

Mazzochi: "Thank you. This Bill is not going to stop another Aurora. Not this Bill. Not this way. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Weber is recognized."

Weber: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Weber: "I know you've spoke a lot... we've heard a lot about fingerprints. I have had some local law enforcement (unintelligible) officers ask me, will these fingerprints be available so the collar counties can reference previous crimes to be able to match up fingerprints?"
- Willis: "The State Police would be able to access them to solve unsolved crimes."
- Weber: "So... okay to clarify, any crime that's been in the past, they can use this database to look up and match up fingerprints even if in all cases, I assume?"
- Willis: "It is in the State Police database so they would have access."
- Weber: "Okay. And then another question I have since we hear about how the burden and infraction of the cost and fees of the fingerprints. If every FOID card applicant submits and has their fingerprinting done, could you explain to me what the necessity of renewing it ever again would be since your name and fingerprint would be on file. Because if you commit a crime they would cross reference it and there you would be. So what would be the purpose of every 5 years?"
- Willis: "Well, I think there's... we would not require your fingerprints every 5 years."
- Weber: "Why anything every 5 years?"
- Willis: "But you would be updating your other personal information. You may move out of state. You may chose not to renew your FOID card. You may become deceased. There are a number of reasons why it's important. One of the other aspects are we're asking also if people would like to submit an email so that they could have quicker communication with the State

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Police on other updates and things like that. That's another reason why you would want to constantly be able to update your FOID card. And this makes it every five years that people don't just forget to do that and make sure that it is done in a timely manner like that."

Weber: "Is there any other human right or right protected under the constitution where we have to check in every 5 years?"

Willis: "Your passports go every 10 years."

Weber: "I'm not talking about passport. I'm talking about a right like breathing, the right to protect myself. The right to freedom of speech. Ones that are actually listed."

Willis: "I don't think the right to breathing quite falls in under this category, Sir."

Weber: "Well, I think protecting my family does. And I think I live on a dead end road where I live out in the unincorporated areas and yes this is a part of my life is protecting my family. So, I consider that a right."

Willis: "And I agree with you on that. I do agree with you that it is a right. But it is a right with responsibilities."

Weber: "What would be the importance of updating an address in whether I have a freedom to bear arms?"

Willis: "Well, why would you not want to update your address?"

Weber: "Because it costs me money on something where you already have my fingerprint and information and you can run a background check. So to the Bill. You're going to hear me probably say this multiple times. I just like to remind everyone the Constitution was written not to restrain people but to restrain the government. Second Amendment is not a right given in the Constitution. It is a right protected by

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Constitution. The first ten amendments of Constitution make up the Bill of Rights were not chosen by our founders lightly. They were chosen because the notion of liberty for all led them to revolt against the oppressive government. And they learned that to ensure people retain their liberty, these ten rights must be protected. Including the right to keep and bear arms. Knowing that without that right the others would eventually disappear. reasonable people we can all agree that society benefits from reasonable protections against those who abuse these rights. But when government makes it incredibly difficult for the average citizen to exercise those rights it tyrannical. But this Bill exceeds reasonable measures and infringes on constitutional protective rights and it should give us all a pause. Our other constitutionally quaranteed rights do not require us to give as much of ourselves to exercise them and no citizen should be asked to jump through as many hoops to exercise their human rights, their constitutional rights. The reality is that thousands of law abiding citizens in Illinois will not be able to reasonably meet the extensive demands of this Bill. This Bill does nothing to protect our children. It doesn't give money or funding to service school resource officers for bulletproof glass. The only thing that will protect our children and our families."

Speaker Burke: "Please bring your remarks to a close Representative."

Weber: "Will do. The only thing that will stop a bad guy is a good guy that's armed to protect them. Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Halbrook: "Leader Willis, are there any exemptions in this measure
for anyone's religious beliefs?"

Willis: "No."

Halbrook: "Have you consulted with anyone of the various faith communities around the state if they have concerns or reservations about the fingerprinting?"

Willis: "No, I have not. It's been out there for a while, I have not heard anything. This is the first I've heard that there would be grounds for religious concerns."

Halbrook: "Yeah, I have a rather large population of gun owning Amish men."

Willis: "Do they own... do they all have FOID cards?"

Halbrook: "The ones that have guns do have FOID cards."

Willis: "Okay, good."

Halbrook: "So I'm just making sure that if they have concerns we don't want to damage anything that they already have. You understand that's a unique set of religious beliefs there?"

Willis: "I understand."

Halbrook: "So just for clarity, would you explain to the Body what happens in the process of a private sale when the buyer does not meet the requirements set forth in your measure?"

Willis: "Okay. So if the transfer is not being able to be completed because the person they're going to move it to does not meet the lawful requirements it goes back to the original owner and it is there gun to find another purchaser for."

Halbrook: "It immediately reverts back."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "To the original owner."

Halbrook: "So my understanding of the legislation is slightly different than that, I just want to be clear about that. My understanding is that the FFL holds that and potentially that the original seller has to be background checked again before he receives that firearm back. That's my understanding, I just want to be clear about that."

Willis: "That is... that is correct, Sir."

Halbrook: "What happens when that original seller if there's a glitch in the system and that happens and so the system kicks out that person and he or she is not able to receive their firearm back? What happens in that situation?"

Willis: "So the dealer has possession until a lawful transfer can be arranged."

Halbrook: "What happens if the FFL or the gun dealer leaves town with all the firearms. What's the recourse there?"

Willis: "I would assume that would be something that would probably end up in small claims court."

Halbrook: "Thank you. To the Bill. As a legal FOID card and CCL cardholder I find this legislation extremely intrusive on multiple levels. While there are concerns with the current FOID Law mainly with revocation, Representative Wheeler has legislation that addresses that issue and I wish we would take a long hard look at that as him and others have talked about here this afternoon. Once again we are seeing issues cropping up out of a small geographical area of our great state and the Sponsor of this legislation is casting a wide net that will affect all of our law abiding citizens and the rest of Illinois in a very negative way. We see this before

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

us an attempt to infringe on our constitutional rights to defend ourselves, our families, and our homes, and our businesses. In the district I serve as well as most of Illinois we just simply are not having these issues that this measure seeks to remedy. And this is a broad overreach of our state government. The requirement of fingerprinting for me as a citizen to carry out my constitutional right goes on belief. What other constitutional right do we have to ask our government for and be licensed and pay a fee for? For this reason I am voting 'no' and I strongly urge this Body to vote 'no' also. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield just for a few questions?"

Speaker Burke: "She will."

McCombie: "Thank you. Just through debate here I've just heard a few things. You state that the purpose of the Bill is to better the revocation process of firearms, is that correct?"

Willis: "Yes, Ma'am."

McCombie: "Okay. Then why cut the DNR... all the DNR dollars when they're the ones that are handling 70 percent of the FOID enforcement?"

Willis: "Well I'd like to know where you got that 70 percent. I asked for statistics from the director and he could not supply me that. It was one of the things that when we... they are not doing anything when it comes to revocation. They do not do anything when it comes to revocation that I can be made aware of. And interesting enough there are some things when we were talking with the director that there are some things that I

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- would state they're probably not doing enforcement correctly. If you can go with a FOID card and request a hunting license, have your FOID card expire before your hunting license expires, I think there's a deficiency right there in their enforcement issues."
- McCombie: "Well, we actually heard from Director Costello so who I think we all know on the floor and he directly said they take care of 70 percent of the FOID enforcement. So hopefully he got around to that on that."
- Willis: "He's been on the job for one week. And when I asked him for it."
- McCombie: "Well I'm pretty sure he's probably pretty passionate about that."
- Willis: "And I agree. And DNR is neutral on it."
- McCombie: "I'll just continue with my questions. Are there any exemptions for the fingerprinting in Illinois? And I think that's what Representative Halbrook was maybe trying to get to."
- Willis: "There is nothing in this Bill that puts anybody exempt from fingerprinting."
- McCombie: "Okay. Are there any workarounds for those people although few and far between that do not have fingerprints?"
- Willis: "That would have to be addressed by the State Police on a case by case basis."
- McCombie: "So you don't know whether or not they would be able to get a FOID card?"
- Willis: "That would have to be addressed by the State Police by a case by case basis."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- McCombie: "So, no you don't know if they would be able to get one? Okay. You stated that the fingerprints can be used in outstanding crimes, correct?"
- Willis: "That is my understanding of what the State Police told me."
- McCombie: "Okay, so fingerprints can be used in outstanding crimes. Have you taken into account any possibility for those crimes being solved and an increase in our prison population?"
- Willis: "Are you telling me, Ma'am, that you don't want unsolved crimes solved?"
- McCombie: "I just want you to answer the question. Have you taken account in the budget for the possibility of any increase in our prison population for the crimes that may or may not be solved with the fingerprints that you will be collecting?"
- Willis: "No, I have not."
- McCombie: "Thank you. Okay. To the Bill. This is a bad Bill for individuals, our state agencies and unfortunately this will not protect the public. Please vote 'no'."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Morrison is recognized."
- Morrison: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Skillicorn."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."
- Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Leader from DuPage yield?"
- Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."
- Skillicorn: "Great. Thank you very much. So earlier in this discussion we talked about the FOID card costs and the 400 percent increase. So what I did is I pulled up my handy dandy Mike Fortner inflation calculator and I just want to inform

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

the Body that it was 2008 that we created the ten dollar ten year FOID card. Since then, inflation has been 18.7 percent which comes out to \$11.87. I just want to make sure that correction is known. So it really is a 400 percent increase and this is a big bite for some communities and some people that this is such a big increase in cost."

- Willis: "If you go with adjusted for inflation from the cost in 1968 of being \$5 for a FOID card with today's cost of inflation, it would come to \$38 and some change."
- Skillicorn: "But that's not the newest and best information.

  Because it was 2008 that the State Police requested that it goes to ten years because they actually saved money because it was less often. But that's okay."
- Willis: "Again, 10 years ago. We'll do cost of inflation, it still comes out to the same of what it goes to."
- Skillicorn: "Cost of inflation in 11 years is only eleven dollars and eighty-seven cents. But furthermore, we've talked a little bit about this slush fund we are talking about. Can the State Police, can they buy squad cars with that slush fund?"
- Willis: "It is not a slush fund, Sir. It is Firearms Fund and a Revocation Fund."
- Skillicorn: "But your language which I assume that you were responsible for says other law enforcement purposes. So can they buy squad cars the way this Bill is written?"
- Willis: "They may do what they need to and purchase what they need to and purchase what they need to do the job of the State Police. If that means buying a..."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Skillicorn: "Can they go to a conference and pay for hotel fees and dinners?"
- Willis: "It does not specifically state what they can purchase other than what they need to run as the State Police of the State of Illinois."
- Skillicorn: "Can they... does law enforcement purposes include gun buy backs?"
- Willis: "The Bill does not speak to that."
- Skillicorn: "To the Bill. I'd just like to point out because the slush fund exists and because it's so broad, it could go to things other than preventing violence. Go to things other than preventing gun violence. Go to things other than revoking licenses for felons. Because the language is so broad, effectively it opens the doors for everything else. So it could be money that is pulled away from other useful purpose. And I think we do agree that bad guys should not have guns and they should be taken away. So there's a couple other things. First, this is very significant because it raises cost, it restricts people's rights. So I live personally in Kane County. So the average response time for the Kane County Sheriff is over six minutes to get to someone's house. A lot can happen in six minutes, Ladies and Gentlemen. And if someone is either waiting around to get a transfer or can't scrape together the extra money or can't get to some place to get their biometric fingerprints, that six minutes is a long time. Literally that six minutes is longer than I'm allowed to speak about this. Let's think about all the damage that can be done by a bad guy with bad intentions to an innocent person. Furthermore, I cannot and I will not support such an

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

infringement of our rights. I advocate a 'no' vote and Leader,
I will not be supporting your Bill today."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Buckner is recognized."

Buckner: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

"First, I want to thank Leader Willis for the time and energy that she put into this Bill. And Leader Turner for his questions to contextualize some of the issues that people have with it. What happened in Aurora was sickening. My prayers have been with those families since the ticker came across the TV screen on that Friday afternoon. However, I do take some issues with raising fees for folks who are already economically depressed. We're talking about single mothers, the elderly, multi children families on a fixed income. I also want to make sure that the right of self-defense is not a luxury that's available only to those who can afford it. I don't want to see fees adjusted to a point where they become so steep that they may drive a person who would normally follow a legal process in a different direction because they can't come up with the money that we're now demanding for them to come up with. I do not live in a dream world. I grew up around gun violence. It still terrorizes my community today. My family has suffered tremendously because of it. I buried my best friend from gun violence at the age of 15 years old. There was a fatal shooting on my block two weeks ago upon my return from Springfield. So these are not just newspaper clippings to me, this is real life. Raising fees to allow the Illinois State Police to operate more efficiently is a noble gesture. But raised fees and fingerprints alone

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

will not fix our problem. Our problems are with inequality and inaction. Gun homicides in the U.S. are 25 times higher than the average of other high income countries. Factors such as poverty and inequality are the contributing factors. We talk about poverty, but inequality is also the measure of economic wellbeing that has a strong correlation between homicide per million and inequality. Secondly, inaction. There is a major lack of funding in Illinois for mental health services. As the state has made some of the largest budget cuts in the nation in that category. What I keep being reminded of is that you put resources where you think they are most important. And right now the states inactions suggest that people with mental health conditions and the communities they come from are not very important. This is opportune because May is mental health awareness month. And we can pass all the cute Resolutions that we want, but if it does not directly fix what we've broken and that we think that a prohibitive fee increases and fingerprints alone are going to make us safer, then we are the ones who are crazy. I'm going to vote for this Bill but I want us to make sure that we are putting resources into communities that need it and that we are addressing the mental health issues that we seem to suffer from as a state and that we have not been diligent about or intentional about. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Miller is recognized."

Miller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will you yield, Ma'am?"

Speaker Burke: "Did you ask, will the Sponsor yield?"

Miller: "Yes."

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Miller: "First of all, I just want to thank you for all the hard work that you've done on this Bill. Because this Bill has done more to unify Southern Illinois than we've been able to do in the last 25 years. So I really appreciate your work on this. One of the questions I have is what happens if you're in violation of this Bill?"

Willis: "Which part would you like me to address? Not having a FOID card?"

Miller: "Yes."

Willis: "Or not... it's the same as the violation is right now."

Miller: "Take them one by one I guess."

Willis: "It's a Class 4 felony for failure to have a FOID card."

Miller: "Which means what?"

Willis: "One to three years imprisonment."

Miller: "One to three years in prison for not having a FOID card?"

Willis: "For having possession of a firearm and not having a FOID card, yes."

Miller: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. One of the things that bothers me about this Bill is that I'm a legal gun owner. But even though I believe in the Constitution and I believe in the Second Amendment, I have to go through the trouble of obtaining a FOID card, I have a legal concealed carry license, I've been fingerprinted. I'm a senior citizen. I'm an AARP member and a lifelong citizen of Illinois and legislation like this bugs me that I've got to jump through these hoops every so often. Stand in line. Pay a fee. When I've already been granted these constitutional rights by the United States of America Constitution. And not only would I encourage you to vote 'no', I would encourage you to vote 'no' with

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

enthusiasm. Sorry about that. I knew you were waiting. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Windhorst: "Leader Willis, most of my questions have been answered, so I just have a few that haven't been covered yet.

How many FOID cardholders are there in the State of Illinois?"

Willis: "There approximately 2.3 million FOID card owners in the State of Illinois."

Windhorst: "And if my math is correct, that is about one fifth of the state's population over the age of 18?"

Willis: "I believe that's a proper..."

Windhorst: "So the state would be maintaining a database of one fifth of its population for the exercise of a constitutional right, is that accurate?"

Willis: "If everybody that is in there chooses... we have it right now. We do have a database that has who the FOID card owners are, so yes."

Windhorst: "But it does not require fingerprinting at this point?"
Willis: "No."

Windhorst: "Is there anything in the Bill that covers a situation if this Bill or this were to become law would it be declared unconstitutional, what would happen with that database?"

Willis: "It is not addressed in this Bill."

Windhorst: "So it's possible then the state would maintain a database of an unconstitutional law and use that in other ways?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "I feel very strongly that this will not be found unconstitutional. If by some bizarre reason it does, I'm assuming that it would be addressed at that point."

Windhorst: "Well you reminded us earlier you were not a constitutional attorney."

Willis: "I am not."

Windhorst: "I have a couple questions about the caps on fees.

Those fees for the fingerprinting are capped at what amount?"

Willis: "Thirty dollars for them to scan."

Windhorst: "And how was that fee established?"

Willis: "That was established by us doing an arbitrary look at what the highest and the lowest were for fees for fingerprinting scans alone and we went somewhere in the middle."

Windhorst: "So you admit it's an arbitrary number?"

Willis: "It was an average."

Windhorst: "Was there any study preformed to come to that number?"

Willis: "Other than staff went and looked at what was readily available on the Internet, I would not say it was a study that was paid for. The fingerprint vendors I've not heard any opposition from them on it."

Windhorst: "With regard to the FFL fee cap. Would you describe that fee cap?"

Willis: "It's at \$10."

Windhorst: "And that would apply for any private transfer going through an FFL dealer?"

Willis: "All private transfers must now go through an FFL dealer with this legislation."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Windhorst: "So all of those transfers would have a fee cap of \$10?"

Willis: "Correct."

Windhorst: "And that would be per firearm, correct?"

Willis: "Yes."

Windhorst: "How was the figure derived?"

Willis: "It's based on what other states have done."

Windhorst: "Do you know if there have been any studies in those states to come up with that figure?"

Willis: "I do not."

Windhorst: "Did you or any member of your staff have a study conducted to come to that figure?"

Willis: "They compared what they found. My staff looked at what was done in other states and that's where they came up with that figure."

Windhorst: "No independent study though?"

Willis: "No, but I mean this was what they found on... when they did a study. When they searched what other states did."

Windhorst: "Thank you. To the Bill. This Bill puts more burdens on law abiding gun owners. It increases fees on those gun owners and it requires law abiding citizens to be fingerprinted to exercise a constitutional right. This Bill is a massive overreach and I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "She will."

Davidsmeyer: "I think that we can both agree that gun violence is a major issue not just in our state, but across the nation correct?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "As a legal gun owner, nobody wants to get rid of gun violence more than me. Because my rights are constantly under attack. I have concerns that we are more worried under this dome... as politicians, we are more worried about doing something. We are more worried about the perception of accomplishing something than actually doing something that will affect the right kind of change to try to get rid or work towards getting rid of the gun violence that we see. Going after legal gun owners does not get rid of the gun violence. Having a FOID card does not mean that somebody will not have that problem in the future. In the State of Illinois, and I've said this on the floor before, we actually served on the public safety working group for at least a year together. And we talked about mental health, we talked about school safety, but it always came back to how do we take ... and I don't want you to take this the wrong way. How do we regulate guns ... legal guns more? I would argue that there are more legal guns in my district than there are in yours. Would that be fair to say?"

- Willis: "I honestly don't know. I will tell you the thought process of gun ownership in your district in my district are vastly different."
- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, I grew up, when I was four years old I was hunting with my grandfather and my dad. I learned gun safety at a very young age."
- Willis: "We've had that discussion numerous times about my perception of guns as weapons, yours as tools."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, it's a... a shotgun to me is no different than a baseball bat, right. Some people go out and play baseball and I use my gun for sporting events. So now you're regulating something even further that is not being used and will never be used in a crime. My wife's from Ohio. If my father in law comes here to go hunting with me, and we go to the Farm & Home store to buy shotgun shells, I have to show a FOID card. He does not. That makes me a second class citizen in my own state. That is absolutely crazy. Not only do we not... does this... do we not live in a bubble, these guns illegal legal can come across the border at any time. So we're not accomplishing the goal. We are more worried about the perception that we are accomplishing something. That is my concern. My concern is that people walk out of here and say hooray we did it when we actually did nothing. We went after legal gun owners that are not causing these problems. This is a very personal issue as I said I've been hunting with my grandfather and my dad since I was four years old. My son is a very small kid so he didn't shoot his first gun until just this last year. He's nine years old. And that was my decision because that was the right thing to do for safety reasons. I know that there's nothing that I will do to change your mind, Leader Willis, but I hope that people understand what this is doing to me and my law abiding constituents. Madam Speaker, should this receive the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification. And this is a very personal issue, so I would request a certain amount of respect and decorum as we go through that verification. Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Burke: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Davidsmeyer has requested a verification. Representative Barbra Hernandez is recognized."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Hernandez, B.: "I am born and raised in Aurora and on February 15 I was five minutes away from the shooting. I could hear the first responders speeding through I-88. I feared for my friends who worked at Henry Pratt and for the first responders who I call my friends. Over the weekend, over that weekend I attended too many vigils and saw all the heartbreak within my community. Once again, my community. I do not want to see this happen anywhere else. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Chesney is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Chesney: "Leader Willis, do you own a firearm?"

Willis: "I do not, but two of my children do."

Chesney: "To the Bill. That does not surprise me. While I don't think the constitutional arguments will resonate with the Democratic majority, I will share a few personal experiences that I feel might help in you making your decision. Like many people I moved away for college and I went to the largest college in the entire country, I moved to Arizona. It ranks currently fourteenth in population, has had both Republicans and Democratic Governors and that was my exposure and my first exposure to the Second Amendment. But also then within my first job Leader Willis and Members on the other side of the aisle, I worked in home communities that were in very remote

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

areas and I'm going to share a very, very personal story. There was a lady that was raped and murdered. Oftentimes when we sold properties we had to be alone, defenseless. Now I worked for a corporation, the largest home builder in the entire country. Not knowing how he was going to respond, he responded very, very simply. Do what you have to do to protect yourself. Think about that, folks. The lawyers in this room went crazy. How can a fortune 500 company say such a thing? Do what you do to have to defend yourself. And the ladies in the industry and many of the men did exactly that. They did what they had to do to defend themselves. However, unlike many people, I moved back and one of the first things I had to do was be introduced to these FOID cards. The only thing that's not accurate is my weight, but I think it's reasonably accurate. I got all this plastic. I got a FOID card, I got a concealed carry, and I also got one in Arizona just to make sure you all on the other side of the aisle got the warm and fuzzy and felt very safe. But the FOID card wasn't really a bad thing, Leader Willis. It was only ten dollars for ten years. While I didn't agree with it, I was obedient law abiding and I got this wonderful FOID card that the Democratic majority made me get. But to follow up to make sure you were extra safe, I got the concealed carry in both Arizona and Illinois. I wanted to make sure you all felt the warm and fuzzy and that my family could exercise their Constitutional Amendment and make you feel safe. But the Supreme Court did one thing, didn't they Leader Willis. They required you to get concealed carry. Why? Because you infringed on the Second Amendment. But policies are about results so let's talk

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

policy. Let's go to the most dangerous cities in the entire country: Saint Louis, Detroit, Baltimore, Memphis, Kansas City, Little Rock, Milwaukee, Rockford, Cleveland, Stockton California, do you know what they all have in common? They're all ran and controlled by Democrats. That's right, Democrats. Chicago is 21st. So let's talk about how Mayor Lori Lightfoot had to... how Lori... Mayor Lightfoot had to address the people in Chicago during Memorial Day and I quote, 'We're flooding the zone. We know the areas in the city where we believe there are challenges and we're going to make sure that we are physically present.' What does that mean? Twelve hundred Chicago police officers working overtime and adjusted their schedules. She went on and said, 'I didn't come into this with any illusions that we're going to be able to wave a magic wand and reverse trends and have been in the making for some time. We are down on homicides from a year ago, but we're up on shootings.' That's clearly unacceptable. The new Mayor said, 'But the Democratic majority did take a page out of the former Mayor Rahm Emanuel who was famously quoted as saying, 'Never let a crisis go to waste.' And that's exactly what you're doing folks. That's exactly what you're doing. But you're actually hurting the middle class and the working poor that you also eloquently talk about protecting. You are raising the FOID cards 1000 percent. That disproportionately hurts the working poor and the middle class. You are going to ask that one in four people that I represent get fingerprinted. Why don't you make this requirement look like the legislative districts and make this for Chicago? Let's

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

gerrymander this. This doesn't apply to the rural areas that I represent, Leader Willis. Not even close."

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

Chesney: "But this will impact the seniors, the veterans, and the rural residents. Yesterday we heard..."

Speaker Burke: "Thank you. Thank you. Representative Grant is recognized."

Grant: "I'm going to take the time for myself. To the Bill. I have listened to this debate this afternoon and I only heard a couple of times, just a couple of times did the conversation turn to mental health. A healthy person does not get the idea to kill another person. But of course the mental health issue is a difficult and costly subject to solve. Maybe we should consider taking the revenue from this Bill if passed and put it towards mental health. Let's have a conversation about this. Say 'no' to this Bill. It does not solve the problem."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

McDermed: "I yield my time to Representative Meier."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Will you yield, Kathleen?"

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Meier: "I was looking through the Bill with your answer, I want to go back to our trap shoots. How is that covered from us loaning a gun to somebody to use at a trap shoot? You said it was covered."

Willis: "Page 25, line 15 through 17."

Meier: "Can you read those to me?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Willis: "'A person who is loaned a firearm for lawful hunting or sporting purposes while in the presence of lawful owner of the firearm'."

Meier: "That's lawful hunting."

Willis: "So that is under the exemptions."

Meier: "Lawful hunting or shooting. What about a trap..."

Willis: "No, it said sporting purposes. So I would assume trap shoot is sporting."

Meier: "Where I'm reading it, it says on premises of a hunting range, a licensed hunting range. Is that part of that? That's the way I'm reading it."

Willis: "Are you on page 25 of the Bill, line 15 through 17? It's under the exemptions and it says, exempt number I. 'a person who's loaned a firearm for lawful hunting or sporting purposes while in the presence of the lawful owner of the firearm'. The key word is in the presence of the lawful owner of the firearm."

Meier: "Give me one minute, please. Talking about, is it considered a transfer when you loan that... you know, I'm just wanting to make sure."

Willis: "It is an exemption of the transfer requirement. So you don't need to actually file paperwork or go before a fire arms dealer or anything like that. It is an exemption to the transfer clause."

Meier: "Well as I read in page 24, line E, it would not be considered legal."

Willis: "That's a different exemption, Sir."

Meier: "So it's definitely going to be all right for our trap shoots going on in our city parks on our ballfields to go

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

ahead and take a gun and put it into one of our other persons hands and let them use it or to let a relative of ours use a gun even if we're not there if there's other people there?"

Willis: "If you, the lawful owner of the gun, are present, it is exempt."

Meier: "Okay. So if I'm out of state and my child is off on a trap team shooting with my gun that I own, how is that going to be addressed? Because I can't be there. I may be out of state."

Willis: "Is your child a lawful FOID card owner?"

Meier: "When you're on a school trap team, you're not 18."

Willis: "Page 24, line 26 addresses that. A minor who is loaned a firearm for lawful hunting or sporting purposes while under the direct supervision of an adult."

Meier: "It doesn't have to be the owner of that gun then?"

Willis: "No, as long as that's under that next one there. So that would cover all sporting purposes."

Meier: "Does that adult have to have a FOID card?"

Willis: "The supervising adult would be, yes. I believe so."

Meier: "So I have a lot of friends whose wives don't have a FOID card. So they can't take their child to that shoot meet and use their husbands and their father's gun?"

Willis: "The supervisor is required to have the FOID card."

Meier: "The mom, yes."

Willis: "So the trap shooting coach would have to. Let's put it this way. I do not have a FOID card. I would not be the appropriate person to supervise a gun team... a shooting expedition. So even if I... let's say as I stated earlier, two of my children do have it. My son owns firearms, lawfully

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

owns firearms. I would not be the person to supervise that transfer or that sporting expedition if he loaned it to someone else."

Meier: "Thank you. I hope that it's interpreted that way. I'm still not convinced. I'm sorry about that. I'd vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

- Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Before we get started, to my friend from the Austin neighborhood, I want you to know that I have a very, very dear friend and her husband who served in the 11th District which is Harrison Street, she's on a tactical team. I understand the gun violence in your area. I pray for her every night for her and her husband's safety. In no way would I ever want to put them in harm's way. To the Sponsor, please. Your contention that a fingerprint is the way that we can identify a gun owner. It's our form of identification is your unique fingerprint."
- Willis: "There are multiple ways, but fingerprints are the way that we put in to accurate identification and this is what the State Police..."
- Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. And we're going to keep that fingerprint on file. State police will have it. Do you know that the FOID card... the owners of FOID card, their information is not susceptible to a Freedom of Information Act request? I can't ask someone... I cannot go to."
- Willis: "Nor will the fingerprints be to other law enforcement agencies."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Caulkins: "No, but you said they were going to be used by other law enforcement agencies."
- Willis: "FOIA requests are different from..."
- Caulkins: "But you're asking me to give my fingerprint to the state police in order to exercise my right but that fingerprint can be used for other purposes. Whereas my ownership of a FOID card is not susceptible to any discovery."
- Willis: "It is to other law enforcement agencies."
- Caulkins: "But it's not protected. The fingerprint is not protected. I have a question about an estate sale. I pass away, my wife doesn't have a FOID card, she wants to sell my collection. She gives my weapons to an executor, does that person have to have a FOID card?"
- Willis: "So what happens in inheritances is there is a 60-day period in which to do a lawful transfer for that."
- Caulkins: "Okay. But my wife decides to... she doesn't have a FOID card, she decides to sell my weapons to another person. Goes to the dealer, transfers the guns to the dealer. The dealer finds out that the person she wants to sell the guns to is not a lawful FOID cardholder."
- Willis: "Therefore that sale would not be able to take place."
- Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. What happens to those weapons?"
- Willis: "They are held temporarily in the custody of the dealer."
- Caulkins: "No, Ma'am. No, Ma'am, that's not true. Within 24 hours your Bill requires them to be turned over to the police."
- Willis: "Can you tell me where you saw that, so I can double check that?"
- Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. It's in your Bill."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Willis: "Well can you give me the page reference, I'd be happy to check that."
- Caulkins: "No, Ma'am. I want to keep moving. I'm very short on time."
- Willis: "Okay, because I'd beg to differ on that."
- Caulkins: "We have several counties and sheriffs who have said that they don't believe that this law is constitutional. They don't have the resources or the time to enforce it. Are you going to... does your Bill require the State Police to go in and overrule the State's Attorney and the sheriffs in our counties?"
- Willis: "I'm going to tell you this about the states and the counties and particularly those that choose to be Second Amendment sanctuary counties. They are required by law to follow all State Laws. If this Bill does pass, this will be State Law. They will be required to follow this law."
- Caulkins: "And if they choose not to enforce this law is the prosecutorial discretion?"
- Willis: "If they choose not to follow a State Law, I hope they will all turn in their badges."
- Caulkins: "Well, I think that you need to spend more time in downstate Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This Bill does not solve any of the problems that it pertains to save. This Bill will not help the Chicago Police Department solve one murder, one gun crime. We are imposing a standard on our citizens that has been granted to us by the Constitution of this great country. I know this will surprise some of you, but back in 1966 when I raised my right hand swore to defend and protect this Constitution for the very

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

first time, which we all did in January, this Second Amendment was a very, very serious part of that commitment. There is no other constitutional right that we enjoy that we have to pay for. This is unconstitutional in my opinion. I believe it is a very, very difficult standard."

Speaker Burke: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. And I can tell you that we will rue the day if this Bill passes and I strongly, strongly urge you all to vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Guzzardi."

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

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Guzzardi: "Leader Willis, a few questions for you. The freedom to assemble is constitutionally protected right, is it not?"

Willis: "Yes, it is."

Guzzardi: "Sometimes when you want to have a public assembly you have to get a permit to do that, don't you?"

Willis: "Yes, you do and you sometimes have to pay for that permit."

Guzzardi: "Sometimes you have to pay for that permit, don't you?" Willis: "Yes, Sir."

Guzzardi: "Wouldn't you describe that as an instance where a constitutionally protected right requires a small fee in order to be used fully?"

Willis: "Yes, Sir."

Guzzardi: "Another question for you, Leader. The increase in the cost of the FOID card from \$10 every... walk us through how

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- much it's going to be increased? Forgive me for not knowing the exact details."
- Willis: "So currently the cost for a FOID card is \$10 for ten years. Six dollars of that went to a different agency, not the State Police. So they were only given four dollars to do all the work they were expected to do with that."
- Guzzardi: "And now it's going to be an increase of \$20 over the course of five years?"
- Willis: "It is \$20 for five years dividing that funding into \$15 for the State Police Firearms Fund and \$5 for the State Police Revocation Fund."
- Guzzardi: "So the total cost, not the new cost but the total cost would be \$100... or sorry \$20 every five years?"
- Willis: "Correct. I'll be \$20 every five years. So it would be a total of \$40 for a ten year period at a onetime charge for your fingerprinting."
- Guzzardi: "So that's an increase of \$30 over ten years or \$3 a year, correct?"
- Willis: "For the FOID card itself? Yes, Sir."
- Guzzardi: "Twenty five cents a month?"
- Willis: "I'm going to trust your math. I didn't figure it out to a month, but I'll trust you."
- Guzzardi: "Four dollars is a dollar every three months. Maybe it's 33 cents a month, forgive me. Somewhere in the order of a penny a day if I'm doing my math right."
- Willis: "That sounds about right. Thank you."
- Guzzardi: "Okay. To the Bill. There are in fact many instances in which we require people to pay a nominal fee in order to exercise certain rights that they're afforded. And the fee in

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

instance is awfully nominal. I volunteer at neighborhood public school. It's a wonderful experience and one that I cherish deeply. In order to do that I had to get fingerprinted. I had to go downtown and get my fingerprints taken. The one penny a day and the same fingerprinting process that we ask for people who work with our children, these aren't preposterous burdens that couldn't possibly be met by any law abiding citizen. These are the kinds of things that we ask people to do every day in order to participate in the basic acts of democracy. I said yesterday on this floor that a right is only so good as your ability to access it. I stand by that. I don't believe that this Bill is putting any burden in front of anyone that they cannot reasonably be expected to meet in order to access the rights that they are guaranteed under the Second Amendment. And I'll conclude by saying that respect so deeply the efforts of Leader Willis in negotiating on this Bill in lowering the cost in response to many of the concerns from the other side. But I cannot help but find it frustrating that when we talk about reducing the incredibly burdensome court fines and fees that are on people who face prosecution. We hear nothing about how burdensome those fines and fees are. We hear nothing about trying to lift those burdens from people who are faced with burdens they can barely afford to meet. And yet here when we're talking about an increase of a penny a day suddenly the concern about unduly burdensome fines and fees rises to the fore. I think the Leader has done a remarkable job in threading the needle here, in making sure that our law enforcement has the resources that they need to protect our

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

families while making sure that law abiding citizens can access the rights afforded to them within a reasonable means. Thank you so much for your work on this issue. Thank you to all who participated in it. Thank you to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for a civil debate. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Morgan is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Morgan: "Thank you. Leader Willis, just a few questions. I was trying to follow some of the different aspects of this legislation. If you could help us walk through again kind of the source and the origin of this in terms of the working groups and the organizations involved with you and the others that were crafting this legislation given that this was largely a response to the loopholes that we saw and the gaps in the FOID law that we have today, can you just walk me through that again?"

Willis: "Sure. This is actually a two-fold process that came through about the same time as the tragedy that occurred in Aurora. A report came out from the Joyce Foundation that addressed gun violence and specifically throughout the State of Illinois and came up with constructive ideas on how to possibly reduce that. One of the things to keep in mind and bear in mind is this is not a magical solution to all gun violence. But they did have some recommendations in there and one of it was to tighten up the FOID process. Unfortunately, at that same time as that report was coming out we had the tragedy at the Henry Pratt Center Facility in Aurora that

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

blatantly showed the loophole that was in our FOID process, specifically when it comes to revocations. So we followed that up meeting with the Anti Violence Advocates, gun owners, members that have an interest in sensible gun legislation on both sides of the aisle. I reached out to Leader Durkin, he assigned a number of his Members along with law... the legal staff from the Republican side of the aisle and our legal staff and we brainstormed with some ideas. Going over some of the suggestions from the Joyce Foundation and looking at how we could do and progress further."

- Morgan: "And Leader, inevitably, there were a lot of ideas that were presented and discussed, some accepted and put into this legislation, others that did not make it into legislation. For instance, I know one of the other... the other chamber had some legislation to deal with a semiautomatic weapon ban. Is that in this legislation?"
- Willis: "No it is not. Nor is... there was also in there an in person application requirement and we took that out because we felt that could possibly be too burdensome also."
- Morgan: "And just to clarify, Illinois State Polices' position on this legislation?"
- Willis: "Illinois State Police was instrumental in helping to draft this legislation along with the Aurora Police Department, the Chicago P.D. and numerous other local law enforcement throughout the state."
- Morgan: "Thank you, Leader. To the Bill. I come from a community that is different from many of you in the chamber. My friends on the other side of the aisle, my community is a north suburban south part of Lake County community that doesn't

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

address these issues in the same way or have the same cultural perspective on FOID Act or other commonsense gun safety legislation that we've discussed here today. So I respect the differences that we bring to this issue and I think there's a lot of work to be done. For instance, my community's introduced and my local municipalities passed municipal ordinances different laws and including semiautomatic weapon ban. My Village of Deerfield, where I live, passed a ban that was struck down by the courts. That was something that is still to my perspective something that has to be addressed at the state level if it's going to happen. Doing it as patchwork and a local issue isn't going to fix the problem. But I think there are things that we can do together and I appreciate that this Bill has some issues that everyone can agree on, but it left out some of the other issues that I think there would be a lot of disagreement on. And I think there are a number of friends on the other side of the aisle that would disagree with my perspective on some issues of commonsense gun safety and legislation. And I know they don't exist in this legislation. So I bring it up for that purpose. The other piece is when we deal about fix the FOID and we talk about fix the FOID. The idea that we're not going out there and dealing with gun revocation for those that have lost their FOID for specific and appropriate reasons of losing their FOID. We've already started to see the impact of what happens when we try and fix this issue. In Lake County... the Sheriff of Lake County, John Idleburg, and his departments have already had multiple occasions, dozens of occasions of individuals with possessions of weapons that

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

should not have them anymore after their FOID card has been revoked. In fact, there is a specific instance that the sheriff talks about where an individual changed his name to avoid having his gun revoked. That's what this Bill addresses. Fingerprinting is a difficult thing to do, but it's the right thing to do. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Carroll: "Hello, we've had a very short debate so far today so I appreciate that. I have a few questions for you."

Willis: "Please."

Carroll: "Representative Willis, do you hate the Second Amendment?"

Willis: "I support the Second Amendment and all of the Constitution of the United States."

Carroll: "Okay. So could you walk us through why this is not a violation of the Constitution, please."

Willis: "Well, we've had numerous cases that have been upheld in other states that state that this is not a violation. Certainly the right to bear arms comes with it a responsibility and it doesn't say any arms and anybody. There are numerous case laws that go into that. But I'm not going to... I'm go through one that my legal assistant put up because as I say before I am not a lawyer."

Carroll: "You mean the great James Hartmann. Thank you."

Willis: "The great James Hartmann who I could not do anything else without. But in the McDonald case it states in the

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- majority opinion the state and local government can experiment with reasonable firearm regulations."
- Carroll: "Okay. So you're not trying to inhibit anybody's ability to own a firearm? What you're saying is we want to make sure that firearms get into the right people's hands. Is that correct?"
- Willis: "That is 100 percent correct, Sir."
- Carroll: "Great. And how long have you worked on this legislation?"
- Willis: "Well I have been working on sensible firearm legislation for over six years. This one has been about a year in the making."
- Carroll: "Okay. And so again let me be clear. You are not trying to restrict people's ability to buy guns?"
- Willis: "I am not."
- Carroll: "Okay, great. Thank you very much. To the Bill. Like my friend from Highland Park, Representative Morgan said, excuse me Deerfield as I have been corrected on, they are two great towns. You know this is an area... this is a part of our district, an area in our district where this is something that's of strong concern. And it's of no disrespect to other people and other communities and what their needs are, but in our communities this is a big issue. This is something that people in our district want to see us do a better job of. And I don't want to stop people from owning guns either and I don't want to stop you from legally obtaining firearms but we have to do something. Gun violence is just plaguing this state and plaguing this country and we have to start taking steps in the right direction. Are these going to stop violent

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

crimes? No. Can they prevent them? Absolutely. And if we prevent even one crime from happening, I would say that this is a really good idea and something that we should continue to focus on is public safety. So I want to applaud the Sponsor Leader Willis on her hard work. I want to applaud her for taking everyone's questions and everyone's jabs and everyone's everything else and really working through them. So thank you so very much for that Representative Willis for your hard work. And I would hope that everyone would support this Bill with a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I just wanted you to know that this is certainly an emotional issue on our side of the aisle as I'm sure it is on your side of the aisle. And sometimes those emotions get away and I really want to bring it back to one specific important point about the Bill that you know I believe makes it unexecutable and which is going to make this get over turned in the courts. You know you worked in a very bipartisan way on the gun restraining order and I supported that Bill and I know that was worked on behind the scenes in a bipartisan way and I wish that might have been... we have a Bill out there that kind of achieves much of what we want to achieve here today but in a way that I think will hold up court scrutiny. What I specifically want to get to is you capped the fees that a gun dealer can charge for the transfer at \$10, correct?"

Willis: "Yes, Sir."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Okay. The minimum wage is \$15 an hour, correct?"

Willis: "Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "My understanding is that I probably wouldn't want a minimum wage individual handling this situation. Let's say that individual is making \$20 an hour. I don't know if the rest of the Body is aware of what a burden is. But to pay somebody \$20 an hour because there's insurance, social security and other things actually probably costs about \$25 an hour. Then you have to store the guns for three days because of the transfer, then you have to pay for insurance, then you have to have a building, then you have property taxes and a whole host of other things. If you're putting in your Bill a burden that makes this absolutely impossible to achieve, how is this going to hold up court scrutiny, Representative?"

Willis: "I'd beg to differ that it is not going to hold up to court scrutiny. And I also would venture out there last year when I passed the gun dealer licensing certification Bill I was told I was going to be putting gun dealers out of business. I'm giving them some business with this Bill. I'm helping them to stay in business and I don't think it takes more than an hour to do a gun transfer."

Batinick: "Representative, how long do you think it will take to handle the paperwork for a gun transfer? Tell me the number.

And tell me how that is achieved for less than \$10?"

Willis: "I think it can be done in much less than an hour's period of time."

Batinick: "How much time?"

Willis: "It is a one page ATF form that needs to be filled out."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Buying a gun now takes more than an hour."

Willis: "Well that's because you're looking at and you might want to decide what type of gun you want. Making sure you have all of your stuff."

Batinick: "No, no. Just the paperwork, Representative.

Representative, the cost of this when you take a \$20 an hour employee."

Willis: "Would you like me to increase the cost and then would you support the Bill?"

Batinick: "To the Bill. To the Bill. This provision makes this Bill... this Bill will never be enforceable by law. Here's why. The cost of the transfer is going to be more than \$10. Imagine how many gas stations we'd have in the state if we mandated that gas stations could sell gas, but not more than 50 cents a gallon. Would anyone go into the gas station selling business? No, they wouldn't. This is a simple provision that is poorly done. The reason it's done this way is because we don't want to make the cost overly burdened. But you're putting burdensome rules in. This legislation will not be law because the courts will overturn it. We have a serious situation. We have a solution that will not be overturned in the courts. I suggest we work together to get something right that we all can be proud of. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bennett is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Bennett: "Thank you. Representative, it's been a long day."

Willis: "Yes, it has."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

"Speaker or Chairman, thank you also for being there. Bennett: It's been a long day for everybody. We've heard a lot of things and let me just touch on these as I think we're getting close to the number of people that will be speaking is getting down to a number. In essence here's some of the points I just want to touch on. In essence the fees will increase by 900 percent to 1000. It could extend the waiting period by two weeks. Several concerns have been raised about fingerprints. You've heard the phrase overreach of government a number of times. You've heard the burden on gun dealers. Penalizing law abiding citizens. You heard Representative Mike Unes talk about the firearm transaction record, and I hope everybody heard what he was talking about because this can impact everybody or a number of people in every district we have in the State of Illinois. You may recall the warning that he read, the use or possession of marijuana remains unlawful under Federal Law. No matter what we have here guys. Under Federal Law. It's regardless of whether it's been legalized or decriminalized for medicinal or recreational purposes in the state where we preside. I hope you're hearing me because the question they ask on the form when apply for the gun is this question. Are you an unlawful user of or addicted to marijuana or any depressant, stimulant, narcotic drug or any other control substance? And as Representative Unes was trying to talk about, we're looking at marijuana legalizing maybe perhaps tomorrow. And this would fly in the face of what you're trying to do. And this would create a number of individuals that would now be criminals I quess you could say because that's what this form is trying to say. So I hope

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

you're aware of what you're doing here today on this. So I hope I've helped summarized a number of issues and number of points. And I thank you for your time. And I move for a 'no' vote please."

Speaker Burke: "For our final speaker, Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to say something. My friend from the 39th District, the Gentlemen, the tall Gentleman with the beard that is not Abraham Lincoln over there said earlier, I will have to give this Body a lot of credit for the two long debates we've had over these last two days. And you know this is the way we should debate issues. Leader Willis, you've done a great job with this. I know you're passionate about this issue and if you don't mind I've got a couple of real quick questions for you, then I'd like to speak from the heart instead of from the head because I'm not an attorney. Representative, do you believe the right to bear arms is a constitutional right?"

Willis: "I do. With a responsibility."

Butler: "Can you cite any Illinois Statute that requires fingerprints to carry out a constitutional right?"

Willis: "Off the top of my head I don't have one."

Butler: "To the Bill. There's been a lot of talk this week about fundamental rights and constitutional rights. This little card on my microphone here allows me to carry out my constitutional right as a gun owner in the State of Illinois. Voting, which we had a long debate on the floor last night about voting. Voting is most definitely a constitutional right that we should not have to be fingerprinted to exercise

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

that right. To attend your church, mosque, or synagogue you should not have to be fingerprinted. It's a constitutional right. The people who put on the displays in the rotunda of this building including the one who put on a satanic display over the holiday season should not have to be fingerprinted to exercise their constitutional right for freedom of speech. The media assembled in this well, journaling our proceedings should not have to be fingerprinted to carry out the freedom of press. Do we think the people joining us in the gallery today and join us every day to watch these proceedings looking down on us, do you think they should have to give their fingerprints to come into this building to exercise their right to peacefully assemble and to petition the government for their addressed grievances? Of course not. Of course not. We would never ask that for people when it comes to their constitutional rights. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. Shall not be infringed. It's been proven time and time again that people can own firearms because they have the right to bear arms. The other little Constitution that people always forget about is their own Illinois Constitution which has 24 Sections in our Bill of Rights to the Illinois Constitution. Section 22, Section 22 in the Illinois Constitution is the right to bear arms. That was drafted 50 years ago by someone who runs this chamber was in the room when that was drafted. Section 22, the right to bear arms. Subject only to the police power, the right of the individual citizen to bear arms shall not be infringed.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Ladies and Gentlemen, who are going to vote for this Bill in the affirmative you are frighteningly using that police power against other citizens in the State of Illinois. Creating a police state by asking for fingerprints that will be databased to be used for who knows what. It's not a laughing matter and I hear people laughing over there right now. This is a serious issue that a lot of us care about. You should not have to be fingerprinted to own a firearm. Madam Speaker, I yield the rest of my time to Representative Wheeler."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to remind the Body after this very respectful and long debate, both sides, that law abiding gun owners in this state are champions for reducing gun violence. Each of us that has a FOID card that I know personally, which is a lot of our caucus want to move this forward, want to see gun violence ended. This Bill, unfortunately because of its overreach, doesn't achieve that. The court challenges that are likely to occur are going to delay implementation of the parts that we actually all agree with. With that in mind, I respectfully remind you that there is another path available. You can vote 'no' or 'present' and we can find that path together. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members of this Assembly. I appreciate the courtesy that was given on both sides of the aisle. There is no doubt that we look at guns and the use of guns differently. It is oftentimes a geographic look, not necessarily a Republican or a Democratic decision. This Bill is not a magic solution to gun violence. It is not

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

a magic solution to take care of the 34 thousand plus revocations that have not been followed up in here. But it is a step in the right direction. I want to make sure that I thank those that help put this through. Legal staff on both sides. Mr. James Hartmann, Jen Paswater. Your time and effort did not go unnoticed and I truly appreciate that. Members of the working groups from both sides. It may not have always been followed through as extensively as you'd like but I do appreciate your input and I did take it seriously. And I know while we differ in the basic outcomes, I do appreciate your efforts and your help in this. One of the things that did get brought up that I want to make sure that I make very clear before we go for a vote is the thought behind mental health funding. And that is true. We never have enough of it and we have had four years of mental health deserts that we're trying to overcome. That is why when I needed to lower the fee for the FOID card I made sure I did not lose that source of mental health funding and we made sure we included that in here from the concealed carry legislation that we passed a number of years ago where that funding was just left languishing. So again, I do not feel this is overreach. I think this is sensible legislation. It will not go and prevent lawful gun owners from holding their weapons still and it will make sure that we do not have loopholes that we saw happen in the Henry Pratt shootings. It will make sure that we give the State Police the ability to actively participate and go forth and take care of those approximately 10 thousand revocations that they face and have to deal with every year. Who at one point were lawful FOID card owners and lawful gun owners, but we

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

need to make sure that we follow through so that we take the guns out of the wrong people's hands. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you very much, Members of this establishment."

Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Davidsmeyer has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1966 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? Arroyo. DeLuca. Durkin. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'in favor'; 52 voting 'against'; 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative. And Members, our debate has been a model of decorum so please be respectful during the Clerk's reading of the names."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Buckner; Representative Burke; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Connor; Representative Howard; Representative Costa Representative Crespo; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative Didech; Representative Edly-Allen; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Barbra Hernandez; Representative Representative

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Hernandez; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Kalish; Representative Lilly; Representative Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Martwick; Meyers-Martin; Representative Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Ortiz; Representative Representative Ramirez; Representative Rita; Representative Robinson; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Representative Villa; Villanueva; Representative Walker; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative West; Representative Anne Williams; Representative Jawaharial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative Walsh. Hey how are you doing over there? DeLuca. Oh, didn't vote for it. Thank you Representative DeLuca. I remove my request."

Speaker Burke: "On this question, there are 62 voting 'in favor'; 52 voting 'against'; 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hoffman in the Chair.

Representative McDermed, for what reason do you rise?"

McDermed: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

McDermed: "Thank you. Yesterday on this House Floor we debated a Bill about abortion, an emotionally charged issue for sure. For many people it might be the most heartfelt floor debate we will ever see. Both sides debated the Bill with civility and decorum as is due this chamber. As with many issues we debate on this floor, there are winners and losers. Yesterday our side lost but I can stand here and say that everyone on this side of aisle and I think many of you on your side no matter where you stand on the issue of abortion can agree that Leader Bourne debated on the merits of the Bill and did so in a way we can all be proud of. I bring this up today to call out something I had hoped we were putting behind us. The bullying and harassing of Members for our convictions and beliefs. Today I witnessed what can only be described as a pathetic case of a sore winner. Terry Cosgrove and male Members of the House and the Senate Democrat Caucus stood together today to gloat about their legislative win. During their tacky press conference, Terry Cosgrove referred to Assistant House Republican Leader Avery Bourne as a cheap political ploy. Refereed to a Leader of this House as a cheap political ploy. Terry Cosgrove's comments were offensive and yet another example of bullying and harassment. They have no place in this building. This is a time when we talk about the importance of empowering woman and acknowledge their value in leadership roles. So for personal pack and those Democrat male members of the General Assembly who stood with him to degrade our Assistant Leader's importance as a spokesperson for our caucus is absolutely indefensible. Leader Bourne has always been one of our caucus's most outspoken advocates for

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

the protection of unborn life. Any attempts to diminish the credibility of her voice are appalling. And Mr. Cosgrove and the Democrat Reps and Senators who stood with him should immediately apologize. Immediately apologize. In addition, I urge the women Legislators across the aisle to stand with House Republican women in condemning this highly inappropriate and sexist attack on Leader Bourne. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch, for what reason do you seek recognition."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I was one of those men who stood this morning with other men in support of choice. And the press conference was just that. Men standing up for choice. And we were encouraging the Senate to follow the action of the Illinois House yesterday. At the conclusion of statements made by Members of the House and Senate, Mr. Cosgrove was asked a question by a reporter. That was Mr. Cosgrove's response, it was not endorsed by any Member of the House or any member of the Senate. In fact, we believe that Leader Bourne conducted herself honorably, respectfully, with dignity, and grace yesterday. We do not condone the comments made by Mr. Cosgrove. Those were his own comments, just like we owned our comments. And I can say in all respect, Leader Bourne thank you for the way you handled yourself yesterday. We appreciated the way you handled yourself yesterday and there was no one who stood this morning, standing there with any intention to disrespect you. So on behalf of us, we

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- apologize if any of that was reflected on any of us because that was not our intent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Returning to the Calendar. Page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 97. The Bill is on Second Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 97, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ammons, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on Floor Amendment #2."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 just makes a technical correction to make sure that Piatt County has a judge that is specifically assigned to Piatt County. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say... I apologize. Representative Halbrook, for what reason do you rise?"
- Halbrook: "I wish to move this to Standard Debate, please. I'm
  sorry, I'm sorry."
- Speaker Hoffman: "We're on Second Reading. If we could move the Bill to Third Reading. Could we move the Bill to Third Reading, Representative?"
- Halbrook: "So we yesterday... could you tell me the status of
   those?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative, could we adopt the Amendment and then go to the notes?"

Halbrook: "Yes."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Speaker Hoffman: "Is that okay? The Representative moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 97. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, notes."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note, Home Rule note, housing note, judicial note, state mandates note on Amendments #1 and #2 have been requested, not filed at this time."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several of the notes have already been filed that show that there was no fiscal impact and the remaining notes we believe that there is also no impact in relationship to this move. And I ask that they be withdrawn and Motion to consider them inapplicable."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Halbrook, for what reason do you rise?"

Halbrook: "To the motion."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

- Halbrook: "Yeah, we object to the motion and we'd like to know the reasoning on the other ones that have not had a response to. And why they're inapplicable."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons, why do you believe that the notes are inapplicable?"
- Ammons: "What was most important in this has come back, which is that there in fiscal impact by this move. Similar to Will County, there was no fiscal impact by moving it to its own circuit and I argue that these notes are inapplicable at this time."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Halbrook: "We disagree with that. We believe the judicial note has great impact because it deals with the judiciary and we feel that it has impact. And we object to that and we are asking for a roll call and we'd like to take them individually."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, are you seeking that each of the notes be voted on individually regarding their applicability."

Halbrook: "That is correct, Mr. Chair."

Speaker Hoffman: "Okay."

Halbrook: "That is correct."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, the first note."

Clerk Hollman: "The fiscal note."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons, regarding the fiscal note. Why do you believe it is inapplicable?"

Ammons: "The note that's come back says there is no fiscal or population impact and at this point we can't demonstrate any impact that's going to be different from what we currently have."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons moves that the fiscal note be held inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 Motion, there are 71 voting 'yes'; 45 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And the fiscal note is ruled inapplicable. Next note, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The Home Rule note."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on the Home Rule note."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Ammons: "As I said before, each of these judges that are going to be elected from Champaign County would be elected by the people and will not impact the other counties. And I believe that this one is also inapplicable."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons moves that the Home Rule note is inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 Motion, there are 71 voting 'yes'; 45 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And the Home Rule note is ruled inapplicable. The next note Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The housing note."

- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons regarding the housing note."
- Ammons: "I don't believe that there is anything impacting housing in this action and ask for it to be ruled inapplicable."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons moves that the housing note be ruled inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 Motion, there are 71 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the housing note is ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The judicial note."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on the judicial note."

Ammons: "Once again, we believe that the judges of Champaign County should be elected by Champaign County. This would not impact Champaign County in a negative manner and I believe that this also should be ruled inapplicable."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Yeah, there has to be some impact to the judicial because this affects change in territorial lines. We're looking for a response there. It affects two different circuits through the creation of a new one."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Thapedi: "Representative Ammons, how many judges are going to be proposed by this legislation?"

Ammons: "This legislation will create 11 judges that already exist and it would allow simply the people of Champaign County to vote for its judges."

Thapedi: "So the judicial note, Statute 25-ILCS 60 says the purpose and effect of which is to increase or decrease the number of appellate judges, circuit judges, or associate judges in the state either directly or indirectly, you've already given the answers to how many judges are going to be increased by this legislation, correct?"

Ammons: "Yes, Sir."

Thapedi: "So it's irrelevant, correct?"

Ammons: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Yes, to the judicial note. This Bill will impact the judiciary in the 6th District. It will split it and it will cause serious implications of sharing of judges amongst the district and we believe that this note should be further examined."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi. Please proceed."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Mazzochi: "One of the concerns that I have is that the statute you know is also requiring... I mean the Bill is actually changing the number of judges in a particular county if I understand what the purpose of the Bill is. So I don't know how we can say that this judicial note is completely inapplicable if we actually are changing the number of judges assigned to a particular county which is what I understand to be the Sponsor's intent. And I'd like some explanation from the Sponsor on that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "The judges that will be serving the two circuits will still be the same number of judges at the end of the day."

Mazzochi: "But Section 2 says whenever any measure by which a judicial note is requested effects more than one county, circuit, or judicial district such effect must be set forth in the judicial note and... but when you get back to it, the initial language of Section 1 talks about shall have prepared for it prior to Second Reading in the House an introduction a brief explanatory statement of the need of a change in the number of judges in the particular county, circuit, or district of the state. So what's the need that's driving the need to reassign one judge exclusively to one county and remove them from jurisdiction for any of the other counties?"

Ammons: "I think that's a little confusing. We're only affecting Champaign County at this point. The other ones will remain where they are. We are not making any additional changes to those judges."

Mazzochi: "Right, but you're changing though. Do we actually have a ruling from the judiciary saying whether or not they think

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- this is going to impact their ability to function and whether it's creating a change in connection with the statute?"
- Ammons: "We already have the number of judges here so that's what your note is supposed to figure out. We already know the number of judges that will be impacted because they're already there. We are just making this Champaign County specific."
- Mazzochi: "Well, can you please pull this from the record until we can actually get the commitment from the judiciary one way or the other?"
- Ammons: "No, Ma'am. No, Ma'am. My action is to ask the General Assembly Members to rule this note inapplicable."
- Mazzochi: "This is a separate but equal branch of government. This is a judicial note. They have the right... I believe they have the right to be heard to weigh in on whether this note is applicable or not and to weigh in or not. Because you're saying this has no impact. This is a separate but equal branch of the government and you are saying that you are not going to allow the judiciary to weigh in on a circuit change. We can ask them. I'm assuming they will be prompt in responding, but let's remove this from the record until we can at least get some feedback from that co-equal branch of government."
- Ammons: "My action, Mr. Chairman, is to rule this note inapplicable. This is one chamber. It will go to another chamber after this."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Mazzochi: "Yeah, this is our responsibility. You know this whole season we've been counting on the Senate to do our work for us to make sure that our statutory language that we're

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

proposing is actually constitutional and compliant. We all swore an oath. We all have an independent duty to make sure that we are complying with our duties, with our obligations, with our constitutional requirements and our statutory requirements and I really don't think it's unreasonable before we make a change to a judicial circuit's jurisdiction which is going to impact a tremendous number of existing cases and future cases and you're saying to take them from one form to an elected form, et cetera. This is going to have a major impact, and to say you won't even wait 24 hours to get feedback from the Judiciary is really not appropriate. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. To Representative Mazzochi's point, has anybody from the 6th Judicial Circuit been contacted for their opinion on this?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "I'm asking at this time this note be ruled inapplicable.

We are following legislation that already exists in Will

County, McHenry County, Kane County, Cook, and Lake."

Marron: "I would request a verification of the vote on this. And then I would also like to ask has anybody from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts been contacted?"

Ammons: "Right now this question is about whether we want to rule this note inapplicable. That's a 'yes' or 'no' answer before we do that."

Marron: "I request a verification of the vote please and I call for the vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons to close on the motion."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Ammons: "I ask that this note be ruled inapplicable, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Hoffman: "I apologize Representative Ammons.

Representative Davis, you had your light on and I missed it,
I apologize."

Davis: "Well, my light was on, is it okay? I hope it is since we're talking about Democratic processes, I just want to have something to say with regard to everyone is questioning why something like this is necessary. If anybody knows the history about Judicial Subcircuits, you'll understand that Judicial Subcircuits are a way to acquire, a way to try to get equal and fair representation in the courts. That's what Judicial Subcircuits are for, to give us that opportunity to do so. So while you all are asking for this note, she thinks it's inapplicable and not necessarily germane to what she's asking for. But again if we think about why Judicial Subcircuits are necessary which is what she's doing and she's not doing anything that hasn't happened in a couple of other counties already, then I don't see what the big deal is about allowing this to move forward in Champaign County if that is indeed her desire to create more opportunities so that more judges may have the opportunity to be elected. So while I can understand why you might desire this if you will, or desire for this not to go forward, I mean that begs a broader political conversation. And I don't know if Members on that are interested in engaging in that political conversation, but again if we've done it in other counties, there's absolutely no reason why we can't do it in this particular county as well. So as you all are talking about

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

the Bill and not necessarily with regard to the note if you will, then yeah let's get through all of these notes. Presumably, you're going to ask for all of these to be remained... be deemed inapplicable and let's just get to the heart of the Bill so that we can debate the real reason why this type of legislation is indeed necessary. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "So you're saying... have you heard from the Illinois State Supreme Court on this?"

Ammons: "At this time the question on the floor is whether this note can be ruled inapplicable or not. I am willing to answer the questions once we get to the underlying Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm specifically speaking to the judicial note which is in regards to a separate but equal branch of government. So we are going to have influence on the structure of a separate but equal branch of government, and I believe that we should go through this. If we are going to create a new department from the Executive, I think we should ask the Governor's Office how this affects him. I wouldn't treat this any different. I would say there's no way this judicial note... there's no way it's inapplicable when it directly effects the structure of, my understanding, multiple circuits. So how... what's your justification for this being inapplicable?"

Ammons: "I'm willing to debate the Bill after we go through the notes."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Davidsmeyer: "I'm talking about the notes. I'm debating the notes."
- Ammons: "I want to vote that this judicial note be ruled inapplicable."
- Davidsmeyer: "I'm debating the note, not the Bill. We haven't even got to the Bill. I'm debating the note. How is the note inapplicable? And I'm not trying to drag this out. I just want to understand why it's inapplicable."
- Ammons: "I believe that because of actions that are already in precedent Will County, McHenry, Kane, Cook, Lake. We are duplicating what already exists. It has not impacted those jurisdictions differently and I don't believe it will impact this one differently either."
- Davidsmeyer: "You believe. But this is why we ask the Judicial Branch what the impact is. I mean that's specifically why we ask for a judicial note. You're affecting the Judicial Branch."
- Ammons: "I understand that."
- Davidsmeyer: "And you're saying in your opinion you don't believe, and that may be an argument that you can make for the Bill itself, but for the judicial note, you're saying this has no effect on the Judicial Branch."
- Ammons: "At this time those who have responded to the notes that are before you including the Judiciary who had two days to respond chose not to and I ask that this note be ruled inapplicable."
- Davidsmeyer: "The Supreme Court... this says that the procedure is the Supreme Court gets five days to respond. You just said that you gave them two days. So I believe that leaves us if

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

my math is correct, three more days. And I'm not trying to drag this out, I would encourage them to respond quickly, but they have five days to respond. So I don't believe this can be ruled inapplicable when it directly effects the Judicial Branch, a separate but equal branch of government."

Ammons: "I'm asking at this time for this note to be ruled inapplicable, Mr. Speaker."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm asking for a reason, Mr. Speaker. If I could get an answer I would gladly yield."

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

Davidsmeyer: "Just a quick question. Did you acknowledge the verification that was requested earlier?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, I did."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker. And I will say, to the note. There's no way you can look yourself in the mirror later today or tomorrow morning if you have voted against a judicial note that directly impacts a separate but equal judicial branch and they have not had an opportunity to fully respond. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons has moved that the judicial note be ruled inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There has been a verification requested on this Motion. There are 67 voting 'yes', and 48 voting 'no'. Representative Marron has requested a verification. Mr. Clerk."

Marron: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Speaker Hoffman: "There are 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', the Motion carries. And the note is ruled inapplicable. Further notes?"
- Clerk Hollman: "A state mandates note."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on the state mandates note."
- Ammons: "I believe that this note... the state mandate it says will not change the amount... it's on the record already, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The Clerk's record shows that it has not been filed."
- Ammons: "Then I ask that this one also be ruled inapplicable.

  There's... there's no issue in relationship to the state mandate note."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons moves that the state mandates note be ruled inapplicable. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And the state mandates note is ruled inapplicable. Further notes?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further motions filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 97, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on House Bill 97."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned in the opening as to why we were doing this. Let me explain what's happening.

  In Champaign County we have 210 thousand people in Champaign

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

County but we don't get to elect all of our judges. This is truly about representative democracy. We believe that the people of Champaign County should be able to elect its own judges. We are following the model that has been put forward by Will County, McHenry County, Kane County, Cook County, Lake County's to ensure not only that people of color can make it to the bench, provide racial minorities and language minorities in Champaign County who constitute less than a voting majority age on the Judicial Circuit with an opportunity to substantially influence the outcome of the election of our judges. We want to end the practice of one party rule in Champaign County. We want to make sure that there is an equal representation on the bench. And this as we have seen in Will County as of just a year ago, allowed for equal representation on the bench. That is the purpose of this legislation, that is the reason for it. And I ask for an 'aye' vote from my colleagues."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would request Unlimited Debate on this topic."

Speaker Hoffman: "There will be Unlimited Debate. Any further...
any further, Representative."

Marron: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Marron: "Representative Ammons, I greatly appreciate the working relationship that you and I have had to this point. I think we've shown that together we can do some very positive things.

And I appreciate that. Senate Bill 9 was maybe the highlight of... of my first year here. And so I was a little surprised to

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

hear about this yesterday when the Amendment got dropped in the Executive Committee because there are four of us here in this chamber that represent significant parts of Champaign County. And I felt like maybe a better approach would be a more collaborative approach to bring all the stakeholders to the table and certainly we want to work towards having better representation. That's a laudable goal. But what's... what's the rush on this? Why not come to the table and bring everybody together and have a more collaborative process on this?"

Ammons: "That's... that's a very good question and I'm glad you asked. Back in March of this year I learned that the chief judge is retiring. And he put in an article in the News Gazette and you can look it up, that he's timing his retirement to the process of selecting his own replacement so that he can insure that a Republican judge replaces him. And they ran it in the article of the News Gazette. And I looked at that and I said, well that's interesting that no one is having a problem with all 11 judges being Republican in Champaign County and not giving fair representation to the bench for the people of Champaign County. Public participation is critical on the judiciary and as well as fair dealing and transparency in the selection process. And so this reform, as it has followed Will County, McHenry County, Kane, Lake and Cook, is designed specifically to bring balance to the bench."

Marron: "Well... I would beg to differ that dropping language in an Amendment... basically 24 hours before we take a vote of completely changing the Judicial Circuits in the state would

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- be transparent. I... I just disagree with the definition there. This... in our analysis this says..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative... Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, a little quiet. Thank you. Representative, please proceed."
- Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In our analysis it... it says that this is a suggestion of Champaign County. Has Champaign County government officially taken a stance on this? Is this an official stance of Champaign County, the Champaign County Board? Has this been voted on?"
- Ammons: "I don't represent Champaign County Board. I am working in the Legislature, all of the reform issues I have driven I've driven based on my own work and research."
- Marron: "Now we've addressed, apparently, the fiscal note and I would dispute the fiscal note that there's no fiscal impact of creating a new Judicial Circuit. There's a whole new administrative apparatus that has to be built. But of course I was a County Board Chairman in my former position and so I... I understand the county budget pretty well. And understand that a part of the duties of the administration of the courts falls to the local government. Has Champaign County been contacted to the fiscal impact of the county? And... and is Champaign County able to handle the fiscal impact of administration of a new court circuit?"
- Ammons: "This is not changing the administrative personnel of Champaign County at all."
- Marron: "Well there is... there is a cost to the county it's... that is a cost in the county budget court administration budgets, jury selection, et cetera. That is a part of the county budget

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

there will be a cost incurred. And I... I think it's relevant to actually talk to the people that this is going to affect before we push it forward."

Ammons: "There is no additional cost to the county... the county will administrate its courts the way it normally administrates its courts."

Marron: "I would... I would disagree with that you're going to have to build an entire new administrative apparatus. I already asked, the questions have already been asked about whether or not we've been in contact with the Sixth Judicial Circuit or whether we've been in contact with the office... the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts or with the Supreme Court. So, to the Bill. You know certainly I think myself as well as the other... other Representatives that represent Champaign County would be willing to come to the table and have a meaningful discussion. If there needs to be changes in the Judicial Circuit, that's something that I... I would definitely look forward to being included on. But I think this is rushed. This is... this is all happening in about a 24 hour period and I... I know for a fact that nobody from the Sixth Judicial Circuit have... has been contacted. Nobody at the Illinois Supreme Court level has been contacted. There's not been any official position taken from Champaign County. And I... I think this is rushed and I respectfully ask that we put the brakes on this. And I ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "We're going to move to a three minute time limit. Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Wehrli: "Representative, in your opening remarks you said that you brought this Bill forward to put an end to one party rule.

  Do you stand by that statement?"
- Ammons: "Yes, I do."
- Wehrli: "So you readily admit here on the Illinois House of Representatives that you're bringing forth a Bill for strictly political persons to end one party rule? Is that correct?"
- Ammons: "This... this Bill is designed to bring balance to the judiciary."
- Wehrli: "What about the balance in the State of Illinois? What about the end of one party rule in the State of Illinois? Do you care about that? It's a 'yes' or 'no' question."
- Ammons: "This Bill is designed to bring balance to the judiciary in Champaign County."
- Wehrli: "But when you're in power on that side of the aisle and you use it as a weapon as we just saw, when we saw judicial notes on a piece of legislation brought forward for political purposes to... to put an end to one party rule in your county, we're supposed to sit idly by and pretend that this is democracy. You should be ashamed of this piece of legislation. This is using your position to oversee... overthrow a political party that you don't like. We see this all day every day in this General Assembly the rules are run over roughshod. There are attorneys on that side of the aisle that voted to remove this fiscal note. That is highly unethical. All we asked for was that the rules be followed. And yet all we got was, I just want the notes removed so I can run a Bill that is strictly for political purposes. It's weaponizing your

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

position as Member of the General Assembly. It is despicable, it's shameful for those that voted to remove the fiscal notes you should be ashamed. You just completely threw democracy right out the window. You... you admitted on the record that rules don't matter. That what you want to do and maintain power and increase power is more important than the jobs we were sent here to do. It's embarrassing. We should all vote 'no' on this horrible piece of legislation."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler, for an announcement."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative McAuliffe for the rest of the day."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you arise?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Mazzochi: "Representative Ammons, do you know what the political composition is of all of the judges in Cook County?"

Ammons: "This Bill deals with Champaign County."

Mazzochi: "No, Ma'am. I'm just asking do you know what the political composition is for all the judges in Cook County?"

Ammons: "No, I do not."

Mazzochi: "All right. Would it surprise you to know that they are Democrat?"

Ammons: "No, it does not."

Mazzochi: "All right. And in fact no Cook County Judge has been voted out of office I believe in roughly 28 years. And in fact, I believe the Cook County Judges right now are meeting to decide who are going to be their replacements. And they will be doing so in conjunction with the goals and obligations

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

of the Democrat Party of Illinois. Do you find a problem with that?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, was that a question?"

Mazzochi: "Yes. Do you have a problem with that?"

Speaker Hoffman: "I think... just could you restate the question.

I don't think she heard it."

Mazzochi: "Yes. I'll restate... I'll restate the question. Right now and this is the *Chicago Sun Times* five days ago, Cook County secret election balloting is underway for judges and you can't vote. Whether Associate Judges get to keep their seats is solely up to a secret vote of Circuit Judges. And those judges are selected and fully supported by the Democrat Party of Illinois. So my question Representative Ammons is, do you think it is appropriate that that is the process that is being used to keep Cook County judges solidly Democrat Party?"

Ammons: "First and foremost, those are Associate Judges. And secondly, I'm dealing with Champaign County. I have nothing to do with Cook County Judges right at this moment."

Mazzochi: "Well, I think we should have some of the same standards throughout this state when it comes to selecting judges. So if you're going to say that the standard for our Judicial Circuits needs to be we can't have a single party holding all the judicial seats. Then why wouldn't the same be true for Cook County? If in fact your Bill has merit."

Ammons: "I'm... I'm not clear on your question. It sounded more like a statement than a question."

Mazzochi: "No. My question is, if your rationale for why we need this Bill right here, right now is that it is untenable that

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

in your area you only have judges from one political party that have been elected. Shouldn't the same standards and changes be put in place in Cook County? Which likewise to my knowledge has no political diversity in the judicial bench."

- Ammons: "And I... I believe that if that's a concern of yours Representative, you can certainly file a Bill similar to this one."
- Mazzochi: "Well are... are you... let me ask you this are you gonna commit that if such a Bill is filed as a trailer Bill you will support it?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative. Representative, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Mazzochi: "I... I believe I'm going to get some extra time from Representative Weber. So, I'll continue on."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber."

Weber: "Okay. I'd like to give my time to Member Mazzochi."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

- Mazzochi: "Thank you. So, Representative Ammons will you commit that if in fact this Bill passes to give you what you want, to achieve your stated aims of having more political diversity on the bench in your county, will you also commit to supporting a Bill that does the same to provide political diversity in Cook County?"
- Ammons: "Right now Representative, I'm committed to this Bill.

  I'm committed to working with the Senate and others who may be interested on this Bill."
- Mazzochi: "Right. So I take it that's a 'no' you won't commit. So this again just goes to show why this is a really bad Bill. It's being done for naked, raw partisan political purposes.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

It is not being done to ensure we have a more functioning efficient judiciary. And frankly, I would welcome the opportunity to have a discussion on how we can improve the quality of our judges, on how we can get rid of this insider process that allows judges to essentially inherit these seats from one generation to the next. But if we're going to have that discussion let's... make the rules the same for everybody. Let's make sure every county and every circuit has to live by those rules. And frankly, the people of the State of Illinois will be better off. But unless we're willing to commit to doing that then this is a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there further discussion? Representative Caulkins is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Representative Ammons, it's been brought to our attention and already stated that the Sixth Circuit, which this greatly affects, and the Illinois Supreme Court, which has jurisdiction, were never consulted. They were never consulted about your Bill. Can you please explain why you didn't want to talk to the judges?"

Ammons: "What is important to me at this time is in response to what was stated by the current Chief Justice was to set up a partisan response to replacing himself on the bench. And my response to that was to look at what Will County did to bring about balance and diversity to the bench. That is what this Bill is about."

Caulkins: "You... Ma'am, you spoke about one party rule in Champaign County. How many elected Republicans run Champaign County?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Ammons: "This Bill deals with judges."

Caulkins: "No, Ma'am. We're talking about you spoke to Champaign County, you want to bring diversity to Champaign County. How many Republicans hold elected office in Champaign County?"

Ammons: "I can't count them at this moment. You can tell me if you'd like."

Caulkins: "Well, I presume your husband being one of them there are none."

Ammons: "There are none what?"

Caulkins: "Major office holders... countywide office holders in Champaign... the Sheriff..."

Ammons: "No, that's not true."

Caulkins: "Who is it?"

Ammons: "We have one."

Caulkins: "Who is it?"

Ammons: "It's not relevant to this question on the table."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. You spoke about the other counties that have a single county district. Cook County has a district... has a district 5,200,000 people, Will County 690,000 people, DuPage County 930,000 people, Kane County 535,000 people. The population of Champaign County 210,000. Now, I understand you want to include Moultrie... other counties in this district. Was that your third Amendment?"

Ammons: "I don't have a third Amendment. There's only two."

Caulkins: "Okay. So just... this just only applies to Champaign County?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Caulkins: "So you're going to take a county of 210 thousand people and make it its own circuit and you compare that to Cook,

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Will, DuPage, Kane, the other two counties I believe were in Metro East. How do you justify that?"

Ammons: "I believe that the people of Champaign County should be able to have a fair opportunity to reflect the judges based on the ethnic diversity of Champaign County."

Caulkins: "Who's Ronda Holliman?"

Ammons: "She's a judge."

Caulkins: "Is she African-American?"

Ammons: "She is."

Caulkins: "So you do have an African-American judge?"

Ammons: "We have one and we're grateful."

Caulkins: "Lisa Holder-White."

Ammons: "I don't know her."

Caulkins: "You don't know who Lisa Holder-White is?"

Ammons: "I have not met her."

Caulkins: "She's African-American judge on the Sixth Circuit who's been promoted to the Court of Appeals in the Sixth Circuit."

Ammons: "She's on the Court of Appeals."

Caulkins: "Judge White... but she was in the Sixth Circuit and she was promoted to the Court of Appeals. She ran and was elected."

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

Ammons: "Kitty McCarthy... you remember Judge McCarthy a woman on the Sixth Circuit for many, many years?"

Hoffman: "Representative Severin. Representative Severin yields his three minutes. Please proceed."

Severin: "Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Caulkins: "Thank you. Kitty McCarthy a Democrat, sat on the Sixth Circuit for many, many years retired, a woman. I don't understand."
- Ammons: "I think the Bill before you can vote 'no' or you can vote 'yes' on the Bill. I've expressed what my concern is and why I'm making this action."
- Caulkins: "I'm trying to make a point to the Members here, Ma'am, that this is not necessary."
- Ammons: "I appreciate it."
- Caulkins: "That there are considerations as well as the diversity issue. Do you understand the sharing of judges within the circuit?"
- Ammons: "I'm sorry, what did you say?"
- Caulkins: "Do you understand the process of sharing of judges within the circuit?"
- Ammons: "Can you be more specific?"
- Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. When a judge is not able to sit on the bench, goes on vacation, or is ill other judges from the circuit are able to come in..."
- Ammons: "We will have adequate judges for that purpose. Under this Bill we will have the judges."
- Caulkins: "Sharing of judges... and... and you understand... you understand that within the Sixth Circuit these judges do share responsibilities and would come into Champaign County when there was a need? This... this would preclude that."
- Ammons: "I disagree with that."
- Caulkins: "Well, Ma'am, it's... it's a fact. The other issue is that if you made... one of the reasons that I guess that we have a circuit with many counties because of the small

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

population, is that it allows the judges to make very difficult rulings in one county where they sit. But they have to run in the Sixth Circuit which is all six counties. So they're not really beholden to one political party in a county where they could maybe make a ruling that... that would anger perhaps the Republican Party in Macon County. That they have their responsibilities are shared among six counties. Do... do you believe by having one county, Champaign County, having its own circuit that that would politicize the bench?"

Ammons: "I don't believe that's been the outcomes in the other counties."

Caulkins: "Those other counties are huge. Those other counties are three and four... ten times..."

Ammons: "It hasn't done that in the other counties..."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. Well I think you just heard from Representative Mazzochi what it's done in Cook County. So what we have here is a system that has been carefully devised, put together in this state that allows judges to be independent. You know they do run on a political label but they don't... they don't consider themselves politicians. They can't solicit donations, can they?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, can you please bring your remarks to a close."

Caulkins: "You want to..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler. Representative Butler yields his three minutes to Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Sir. Mrs. Ammons, I... I guess I'm at a loss.

You know there is... when these other circuits were made up

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

when the single counties, especially in Metro East. Do you know how that process occurred?"

Ammons: "I do not."

Caulkins: "Well let me... let me help you with this then. That process occurred when the people in that district got together the judges, the Supreme Court, and... and the people of that area and they decided that they needed to split that circuit up. There was the conferences, there were discussions, there were plans that were made. People had an opportunity to look at the alternatives over several months in order to try to put that together. Why is that process not good for here?"

Ammons: "At this time, the consideration on the floor, Representative, is this Bill House Bill 97."

Caulkins: "I understand that but could you please answer my question?"

Ammons: "I'm going to continue to work..."

Caulkins: "Why is that process not good for us?"

Ammons: "Champaign County voters should have an opportunity to select their judges. At this time we don't."

Caulkins: "Yes, you do. You have... you have 210,000 people in your county that get to elect judges. I don't understand. Is this Bill to try to help one particular person get elected?"

Ammons: "No. Actually you'd be surprised how much work I did on my own on this process. Again, we have 210 thousand people, there are smaller communities, DeKalb and Kendall, both have less population than Champaign County. Yet they get to choose their own judges."

Caulkins: "Who does?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Ammons: "This is the action that I'm taking here today. DeKalb County and Kendall."

Caulkins: "Ma'am, the... this issue is I think... I guess this process is flawed. You know I can't... I'm trying to put my arms around why we would do this. You know when there are... what... what you're going to do is take I believe judges out of the Sixth Circuit and put them into one county. That... Do you understand what that's going to mean to the people that are waiting to get to court?"

Ammons: "My responsibility right now is to make sure that what is currently in existence can be addressed."

Caulkins: "Ma'am... to the Bill, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Quickly."

Caulkins: "To the Bill. This is a flawed process. We are now going to tell the judiciary what to do without any involvement without any advice or consent. We are going to create a judicial district in one county where it will become politicized. We're going to reduce the number of judges that are going to hear cases. And people will be denied a speedy trial. This... this Bill needs to be defeated, we need to move on. If Mrs. Ammons wants to make this a process there is a way to do it. I urge all of you, please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gordon-Booth is recognized."
Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Gordon-Booth: "Representative Ammons, can you share with the Body some of the experience that you have with working with issues as it relates to the judiciary in Champaign County?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Ammons: "So for some time we've watched this process over and over again where majority party holds all the seats to the appointments of judges in that community. It is not reflective of the demographics of Champaign County. It is not reflective of our large community organizations. And it certainly doesn't make way for more than one person to be appointed to a seat in Champaign County. The Chief Justice said on March 30, 2019 that he was timing his retirement specifically so that he can control the next selection of his replacement, and to ensure that the selection was a GOP. He put that into the newspaper, therefore gaining my attention on this issue."

Gordon-Booth: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Gordon-Booth: "I think it's important to remind this Body of an article that appeared in Governing Magazine in conjunction with ProPublica which is one of the nation's most revered bipartisan journalistic body's in terms of going around the country and aggregating important data and then reporting out to the country sort of what's happening in states and cities across this country. In November of 2018, ProPublica did a study on Rockford, Peoria, Champaign, Sinclair County, Decatur, Springfield, and the data that came back in that six month expose. They spent six months in towns all across downstate Illinois primarily. And what they found was that downstate communities had some of the worst disparities in the country. Let me say that again, downstate Illinois communities had some of the worst disparities in the country as it relates to access to justice, as it related to who gets convicted and for what. And I think that what the Sponsor is

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

looking to do is to create parity as it relates to race, as it relates to sex and ensuring that we have a judiciary and a body that actually reflects the community by which they are serving. And so I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this important piece of legislation forward. Because I would dare say that a number of other communities also might be interested in legislation like this. If we are not able to get a fair shot when folks are going into court. And so again, I want to say thank you to the Sponsor for not only this work that you've done on this particular piece of legislation but also the work that you've done as it relates to diversifying the judiciary, in terms of diversifying who gets to sit on a jury. I don't know if everyone knows your background and that at least decades long work that you've done in this space particularly in Champaign County. But I do believe that it is important that we allow the Members that serve here to be a reflection of their community. And certainly Representative Ammons is only doing what the community is asking her to do. And that is come down here be a voice to ensure that there is actually diversity in the judiciary. I please ask you for an 'aye' vote. And thank you for this piece of legislation."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Costa Howard: "First, Representative Ammons were you aware that DuPage elected their first Democrat to the judiciary this year?"

Ammons: "I was just notified of that a few days ago."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Costa Howard: "And in fact were you aware that she was not allowed to be sworn in using a courtroom but... because she's the first Democrat that's ever been elected?"

Ammons: "I was not aware of that."

Costa Howard: "To the Bill. Representative Ammons, thank you for bringing forth this piece of legislation. I believe that this is something that we should be looking at and how our judiciary is selected and chosen... appointed throughout the State of Illinois. This is something that's been of great interest to me with the Illinois State Bar Association for many, many years. I find it incredibly disingenuous first to call a Member on this floor Mrs. instead of addressing her by her proper title which is Representative. And then for those who suggest that we have Members of the judiciary who are not political. When again this same Democratic Circuit Judge that was elected that was not allowed to be sworn in to a courtroom, because the Supreme Court Justice of our district has a family member who's in that Circuit Court. Again, disingenuous comments. Thank you, Representative Ammons for bringing this forward. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Reick: "Representative Ammons, you in your comments on the judicial note said you would not speak to the... who was told what at what time until the Bill was being called, and here we are. My friend from Decatur over here asked the same question when was the... when was Judge Garman from the Supreme

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Court notified? Or how did Judge Garman from the Supreme Court find out about this Bill and when? Do you know?"

Ammons: "I... I cannot answer that, you would have to ask her."

Reick: "As a matter of fact she says in a... in a column in today's Champaign News Gazette that she found out about it in the newspaper and replied, the Illinois Supreme Court was not consulted on the Amendment to HB97, nor was the Chief Judge of the Sixth Circuit. She found out about it on Tuesday. Today is... I believe today is Wednesday. Do you... you say there are six other counties that have single... single county circuits in Illinois. There are six counties. I come from the one... the smallest of the six counties, McHenry County, which has 309,000 people in it. Champaign County is two-thirds that size. Now why is it that a county of 209 thousand people... you know McHenry County 300 thousand people... 200 thousand from Champaign County. Where do we stop? Where... where do we stop asking for single county districts?"

Ammons: "Of... of course I can't answer that. If Members in this chamber want to look at this reform for their communities I can't stop that."

Reick: "I'm not going to... I'm not going to dignify the... some of the comments that were made by another... by one of the judges that is in the county... in the thing... I think that would be offensive to you and not... not helpful to the debate. But, the fact is, is that what we're looking at is an attempt... you say you want to diversify the judiciary in... in Champaign County and that's all well and good. But aren't you also a Sponsor of a Bill that would change the election dates for countywide

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

officials in 2020 to... to ultimately conform to the Presidential years?"

Ammons: "I'm not working on that legislation at this time."

Reick: "So the legislation exists, you're just not working on it at this time?"

Ammons: "Certainly. You can look at ILGA and see that it is posted but I am not working on that legislation at this time."

Reick: "Okay. To the Bill. This fact that there are only six counties that have single county... or six districts that are single county districts, I think it shows a certain amount of restraint that is being brought when we talk..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bailey."

Bailey: "I yield my time to Representative Reick, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Time is yielded. Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Representative. I think the fact that there are only six counties which have their own circuits in Illinois points to a certain amount of circumspection on the part of the... the... people who actually devise these circuits. It's not something you do willy-nilly. It's not something you do just because you want to have something within your own borders. I fear that what we're going to do here, if we allow this Bill to pass, is to open the flood gates for other much smaller counties... much smaller counties than Champaign County. Why not Kankakee? Why not Peoria? Why not any of the others to form their own circuit? So what we're going to end up with ultimately if this is allowed to pass is probably a move to a 102 separate judicial circuits in Illinois. And that is not a recipe for sound judicial... sound judicial practice. For the sake of... for the sake of just maintaining

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

a system that has worked and continues to work, I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Batinick: "I can start it... I'll actually address all of the freshmen of the General Assembly here today. Welcome to the emotions of the last week of May. Although for some of us it was the last week June, July, August. Representative, you had mentioned and I think twice now that you are bringing this Bill to end one party rule in... in Champaign County. I'm going to give you a third chance to kind of explain that."

Ammons: "I... I think you understood what I said the first time.

This Bill is truly about bringing representation and balance to the bench."

Batinick: "Okay. Well, there's a difference between representation and balance to the bench and ending one party rule. We have areas of the state, country that are run by all Democrats that are good, that are run by all Republicans that are good, that are run by both Republicans and Democrats that are good. I guess I'm going to go straight to the Bill. I... I hope that the Sponsor of the Bill would consider pulling this out of the record. I think it is beneath this Body to vote for a Bill where the Sponsor said we're going to end one party rule. It wasn't about diversity, it wasn't about you know where the lines are with the towns, and making things... it was political. We should not be passing Bills where the foundation of the Bill is political. I respect the Representative, I hope she considers bringing... pulling it out of the record maybe having

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

a different conversation tomorrow. And I'll watch the rest of this thrilling debate. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized. He passes. Representative Halbrook."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Halbrook: "So Representative Ammons, I've passed a couple pieces of legislation out of this Body, and you've signed on with those. And those have turned out to be really good pieces of legislation that have been good for the local units of government and for taxpayers, saving them lots of money. Question I've got for you going forward here House Bill 531 had an Amendment filed 15 days ago. Can you... can you explain to the Body what that does?"

Ammons: "I don't think that has anything to do with this Bill."

Halbrook: "Well, my concern about it is... it is relevant to this Bill. Because it was filed just 15 days ago and it seeks to change the way we elect our local county officers. Just so the Members of the Body are aware of this, it seeks to put all of the county officers... county officers on the ballot in 2022 for two year terms and then have them all on the ballot in 2024 for a full four year term. I'm not really sure how this is a good government Bill and how this is good for taxpayers, and how it will burden our County Clerks with the biggest election of the cycle would be that time. We'd have a large ballot. I'm just curious why there's this last minute push to file these Amendments to these shell Bills that fundamentally changes things, and how that's good for local

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

government, and how that's good for taxpayers? I'm just... I'm just curious your response to that."

Ammons: "I won't speak to House Bill 531. I will speak to this Bill. This Bill before you came as a research initiative of my own after reading March 30, 2019's article and statement from the current Chief Judge."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any further comments, Representative?"

Halbrook: "No further comments. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, as I have said over and over again, is designed for Champaign County voters to be able to elect Champaign County judges. I'll repeat again and this is a quote, 'Judge Difanis recently articulated the only reason for the current system which is partisan concern to keep GOP in control of judiciary in Champaign County. Difanis admits that he timed his announcement in part to help Judge Bohm secure a Republican Judgemanship', News Gazette March 30, 2019. If there's any party politics going on here it is from the current system. We intend to not only fix the current system but bring a level of representation and democracy to the bench. And I ask my colleagues for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 97 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read the Rules Report."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 651."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The Clerk is in receipt of a motion in writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. Is there leave? If there is leave we will take these motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Harris on the Motion."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move to suspend the posting requirements for the following Bills so they can be heard immediately in committee: in Adoption & Child Welfare, House Resolution 422; in Human Services, House Resolution 424; in Energy & Environment, House Resolution 425; and in Executive, Senate Bill 731."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. On page 2 of the Calendar, Leader Harris on House Bill 62. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 62, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 62, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris on House Bill 62."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 62 is a shell Bill that we are transmitting to the Senate as an appropriations vehicle. The Senate today passed Senate Bill 262 over to us. The reason that we are doing this is to facilitate passage of a budget when one is prepared."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "I don't know how to... I've never had a filibuster while people are coming in for a verification. But I'm going to try to do that from here right now until we figure out exactly what's going on. What exactly... what exactly are you doing here, Leader?"

Harris: "Well in previous years I think long before when you and I were Members of the General Assembly. You know in many years there was a passage of appropriation vehicles. You know sometimes earlier in the year, sometimes later in the year. For different purposes whether for an actual appropriations that were proposed but not taken up by the other chamber, or you know, sent here and the same thing happened. Or there were appropriation Bills sent over as vehicles to the other side simply for the purpose of being an appropriation vehicle for an appropriation Bill when it comes back."

Batinick: "So, if it's a vehicle then what I'm hearing is the budget may be starting in the Senate. Isn't that a little bit unusual?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Harris: "This would actually... that's not what you're hearing.

  This would allow opportunities for budget to start in either the House or the Senate."
- Batinick: "But it's a House Bill... it'd have to be... you want to take a House Bill send it to the Senate, so this is a shell Bill. You want to take a House Bill send it to the Senate so they can amend it and then send it back to us."
- Harris: "Well you might have missed the other portion of my remarks that today the Senate took the same action and sent a Senate Bill to the House, which we now have Senate Bill 262."
- Batinick: "Senate Bill 262. Hang on just a quick second. All right. So what is... where is since I have you here on the line. What is the status of negotiations? My understanding is that the House is really not... why have you earned our vote since we have not been engaging you know... where are we now with negotiations? Oh you know what, I'm going to yield the rest of my time to Leader Demmer. It's nice talking to you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Demmer: "Representative Harris, I appreciate you bringing this...
this budget Bill today. I know this is part of the process
for us to continue to the budget talks going on. We've had a
couple of productive discussions today. As a sign of good
faith as these budget talks continue Leader Durkin, myself
and Leader Brady will vote 'yes' in favor of this. Hoping
that we can continue to work and come to some kind of
agreement on a bipartisan budget. Appreciate it. Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Harris to close."

Harris: "I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 62 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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... or 76 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 6 of the Calendar Senate Bill 664, Representative Jones. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 664, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 664, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Guess my mic... but thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. I rise to present Senate Bill 664. Senate Bill 664 was a Bill that we heard in Judiciary-Civil Committee. This Bill was not only heavily debated, we talked about this Bill and the legal consequences of this Bill. So, if I'm allowed I would like to briefly go through some of the issues that we discussed in committee and then talk about where the Bill is and where we go. It requires that Illinois Tobacco Manufacturers submit an annual report to Department of Public

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Health and it creates a private right of action. And under this question or this issue with the private right of action in the committee there were a couple of issues that were raised regarding the private right of action. Namely, the issue of Federal Law versus State Law. And the right of the state inserting a private right of action into statute. This comes about because there are some companies that from out of state that repackage tobacco products and sell them into our communities, with no enforcement and with no regard for the This Bill seeks to stop those companies who are repackaging products and selling them to our constituents and underage children. And make sure that a tobacco company or anyone can have a private right of action to bring an action... an actionable claim against any company that's doing this in Illinois to prevent them from doing this. It prevents bad actors from acting in Illinois. There is no opposition. Well actually, under the record there is one individual on no position on the Bill. The Illinois Trial Lawyers' have no position Illinois Association of Defense Counsel and Department of Agriculture. This is an initiative of Republic Tobacco. Again, part of what we're doing is making sure that we clarify that this... any company or any individual will have the right to work or bring a suit or a claim against any company that's being bad actors in Illinois. I'm prepared to take any questions. And ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Sponsor, I was really hoping for a Bill that we wouldn't have to talk in here but, I got the line that says Sponsor has committed to hold the Bill on Second Reading to address preemptive concerns raised in committee. Committee Members were also unclear as to the specific bad actors the Bill is designed to address. Now I've been told by at least one of the Committee Members that you kind of have an agreement. Where are we with that, Representative?"

Jones: "Thank you, Representative, for that question. There was an agreement to talk about this on second. We did... the process we did take this back to the Judicial-Civil Committee and discuss some of those issues. Representative Arroyo presented on my behalf, he did not go through the issues... some of the issues that was brought up on your side were the two cases that were mentioned. One was a case about the preemption specifically. The cases that were cited were Riegel v. Medtronic, and the second case was Turek v. General Mills. And then, there was also the issue of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. And the issue of the Federal Government either explicitly allowing preemption or implicitly not allowing it. And there was..."

Batinick: "This is fan... that's fantastic stuff."

Jones: "Just wanted to... to give you the breakdown of it."

Batinick: "No, I appreciate that. Is this really a business model where it's repackaging of tobacco is this... is that an actual...

I see this was brought by Republic Tobacco. Is there anybody other than Republic Tobacco that engages in this particular... is this really a common thing?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Jones: "No, that has never been alleged. Never been stated is not... has never been on the record that tobacco... Republic Tobacco is one of the bad actors."

Batinick: "Oh no... no, it says it's an initiative of Republic Tobacco."

Jones: "Yes. It's an initiative."

Batinick: "To be clear. Thank you for clarifying that. Are there... are there... we haven't found any bad actors I guess is kind of what we're hearing then."

Jones: "No, I don't have a list of the bad actors, I can get that for you. This seeks... so the issue is..."

Batinick: "You're probably not going to get it for me in the next minute and a half?"

Jones: "No."

Batinick: "so... I think you've answered enough of my questions. I appreciate that, thank you."

Jones: "Thank you."

Batinick: "Well... well I'll listen to the rest of debate."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. To the Bill. Representative Jones, I do want to say that I applaud your effort to make sure that tobacco manufacturers are going to comply with FDA requirements. And as someone who has litigated FDA requirements I agree that this goal is worth pursuing. But as we discussed in committee I retain a concern that the way in which the Bill creates a private right of action is not permitted under 21 U.S.C 337. Which means that the legislation may not achieve the desired goal. So will you commit to working with me on a trailer Bill that increases FDA

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

compliance by tobacco manufacturers in a way that is not in conflict with or preempted by Federal Law?"

Hoffman: "Representative Jones.

Jones: "Representative, yes I will. You and I had the conversation and I will commit to that to make this a better Bill."

Mazzochi: "Thank you Representative Jones for that commitment. And as mentioned even though we share a common goal, I do have some preemption concerns. But I do believe that getting more tobacco manufacturers to follow certain FDA standards is going to be ultimately good policy for the state if we can in fact enforce that. And I think that with some more work we can probably get there in a better way. So thank you Representative Jones for that. And with that while I have the preemption concerns I do not have problems with other Members supporting this Bill with the commitment for the trailer."

Jones: "Thank... thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Thapedi is recognized."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Thapedi: "Representative Jones, I, too, want to commend you for working with the committee on this issue. I know that Representative Mazzochi raised some highly significant legal issues and you were willing to work with her, read multiple cases. So I'm glad to hear that you're going to be working with her on a trailer Bill. And I encourage Members to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Jones: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Jones to close."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the committee. Senate Bill 664 just seeks to not only make sure that bad actors are not operating in Illinois but it gives not only companies but individuals a right to make sure that they're working with the Department of Revenue. And making sure that the report is on time so we know these bad actors and I can provide a list. But this is a good Bill and a good first step. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 664 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 Bill there... on this question, there are 90 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wheeler on a point of personal privilege."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have the Body's attention just for a very brief moment. We all go through the process of Session where we're away from our families. And I've been afforded an indulgence by my wife to bring my daughter down here for several days this spring Session. She's managed to be down here at least one time every month of Session. And she... you can tell she really enjoys it. I want to say thank you to all of the incredible women who are part of this chamber both as Members and as staff for the incredible example you set... for you. So, thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Keicher."

Keicher: "I want to echo Keith's words. And what my wife and I have done over time is try to expose our daughter, Emma, to

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

amazing other women who have accomplished so much in their world. And I just want to thank the staff and the other Representatives in this chamber who've been so welcoming to our family. A heartfelt God bless you, and thank you for what you do to lead our young ladies in what is possible with their generation. So, thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "To second some of the things that Representative Wheeler and Representative Keicher said and I have two special ladies with me here as well, my wife threatened me if I introduced her, but she's here anyways. My wife Brandy and my daughter Ainsley, who told me earlier that when she becomes... grows up and becomes a State Rep she's going to pass a Bill saying that dessert has to be served before dinner."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome. Representative Halbrook seeks recognition.

Halbrook: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Halbrook: "Yeah. Up behind me in the gallery is my County Clerk from Shelby County. She's the second Vice President of the Illinois County Clerks' Association and Recorders. She's here to testify on a Senate Bill this afternoon. Let's give her a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome to Springfield. Moving on to page 4 of the Calendar, we have House Bills on... or Senate Bills on Third Reading. Senate Bill 1726, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1726, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Why thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1726 establishes a full-time dementia coordinator position at the Illinois Department of Public Health. This position would be responsible for the implementation of the existing Illinois Alzheimer's Disease State Plan, which is currently not being effectively implemented due to the lack of staff and other resources. The creation of the dementia coordinator position will have no fiscal impact as it will be funded with existing dollars raised from an existing income tax checkoff program. Through this legislation, we can better coordinate care and support over the 230 thousand Illinois residents living with Alzheimer's and their 590 thousand caregivers without a fiscal impact to this state. And I will take any of your questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1726 pass?' All in favor say 'aye'... or vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Carroll. Connor. West. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Reading, on page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 37, offered by Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr. Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr. Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 37, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Walsh, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Jay Hoffman. I have Floor Amendment #2 that I'd like to adopt that would remove all the opposition to the underlying Bill and we'll discuss it on Third Reading.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 37. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 37, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr. on Senate Bill 37."
- Walsh: "So, Floor Amendment #... or basic Floor Amendment came to do the Bill and basically it retains the definitions of primary and secondary employer and then any employer that is secondary would have to report any incidences to the primary employer of any exposure to toxins or hazardous that they may have received. This is an initiative of the Illinois... the Firefighters Association of Illinois. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go directly to the Bill. This was a bad Bill. It became a good Bill. I hope everybody on my side of the aisle votes 'aye'. I did something bigger before that was going to be costly. This is a well thought out reporting requirement between different fire districts. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Reick: "Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr., would you just for the sake of... just for the sake of bringing us up to speed, would you please explain the final disposition of this Amendment as it relates to the financial responsibility of these fire districts? Please?"

Walsh: "So, my understanding is if there is any finan... it's basically based on the exposure that they would receive in the line of duty that would have... that would have to be reported to the primary employer or the full time employer and whatever costs those would be would be adjusted according to the needs."

Reick: "Did this... did this Amendment come about as a result of an agreement with various fire districts that were going to be affected as... by this... by this Bill?"

Walsh: "That is correct."

Reick: "I agree, this started out as a pretty bad Bill. It has become a pretty good Bill and I recommend and 'aye' vote.

Thank you."

Walsh: "Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Walsh to close on Senate Bill 37, a bad Bill that has become a good Bill."

Walsh: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 37 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 21 of the Calendar under the Order of Resolutions appears House Resolution 187... 387, offered by Speaker Madigan. Representative Hurley on the Resolution."

Hurley: "Madigan Hurley. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 387 expresses support in the endorsement of the Martin McGuinness Principles. The four principles call for equality, respect, truth, and self-determination for the North of Ireland. The principles should be met without further delay by an enacting Bill of Rights for the North of Ireland, enacting an Irish language Act, releasing funds to undertake inquest regarding legacy killings and holding a referendum to determine of a majority of voters wish for the North of Ireland becoming a united Ireland. I would appreciate the adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hurley moves for the adoption of House Resolution 387. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted.

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quick point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Davidsmeyer: "I just wanted to thank Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr. for his excellent work on turning a possible bad Bill into a very good Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Congratulations to him. On page 11 of the Calendar under the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 386, Representative Slaughter. Representative Slaughter. Please proceed, Representative."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment... this Bill is regarding mandatory supervised release for the Illinois Department of Corrections and the Amendment places a date in regards to the report that's due regarding this subject matter. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, sorry. Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "We were all unanimous last time. Not a big change, just a date change right?"

Slaughter: "That's accurate, Representative."

Batinick: "Thank you."

Slaughter: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill
386. This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 386. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 834, Representative Moeller. Please proceed on the Motion to Concur on Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 834, Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I move to concur on Senate Floor Amendment #2 and Senate Committee Amendment #1. Senate Floor Amendment #2 is a... was done in the Senate at the request of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce. It makes a change in deleting the word 'entire' from the requirement that any wage differential that exist must be entirely based off of one of the enumerated exceptions. And Senate Committee Amendment #1 made four different changes that were based on requests from advocates in the business community. The first allows employers to prohibit employees who have access to salary information such as human resources officers from disclosing another employees wage or salary information without prior written consent from that employee. The second provides a voluntary disclosure exception in which an employer does not violate the Equal Pay Act if the job applicant voluntarily, and without prompting, discloses his or her current or prior salary history so long as the employer does not consider this when making a hiring or salary decision. The third expressly permits employers to provide salary related information to

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

job applicants and to discuss salary expectations with job applicants. And four makes conforming changes to the section of the Equal Pay Act that prohibits wage discrimination to African-American employees. As the Body may recall, House Bill 834 was the Equal Pay No Salary History Bill that was heard and approved several times in this Body. These Amendments were implemented in order to address some of the concerns that, as I mentioned, the business community had expressed. I ask for an 'aye' vote. And would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "This is on Short Debate, Mr. Speaker. Correct?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes."

Batinick: "Representative, did anything change with the opponents of this Bill, originally?"

Moeller: "Not that I'm aware of."

Batinick: "Okay. And you... you briefly... it's a little bit quieter in the chamber now. Couple of different... can you just give me just a couple of highlights on what the Senate did?"

Moeller: "I just... I just recited..."

Batinick: "I know. Just the highlights, I'm sorry. There is a lot of commotion over here. I was actually kind of rallying some votes possibly for you."

Moeller: "Sure. Some of the significant changes that were made in the Senate pertained to providing clarification as to when employers... in what... the discussions that might... that occur between an employer and a prospective candidate. That voluntary disclosure... providing a voluntary disclosure exception in which a candidate may voluntarily disclose their

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

prior salary information as not being a violation of this legislation or this Act. Again, if it's voluntary and as long as it does not... may have an impact on the hiring or salary offer made by the employer. Another change is also to clarify when an employer uses a head hunter or online job search company, that if there... if there is accidental information that is provided, that the employer is... is not liable."

Batinick: "So, you added some protection for employers is what it sounds like?"

Moeller: "Exactly."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 834?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 93 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 834. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1551, Representative Scherer. Please proceed."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I am presenting... I move to concur... Motion to Concur to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1551. This was the DCFS Bill that our Assembly passed unanimously earlier this Session. It has just a few small changes. One being that when each individual child is returned home, that the clock is reset for their six months of after care services, rather than before when it was just any child

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

in the family. And then the other change is if a call is made from a mandatory reporter it is significant if there has been any prior reporting or a prior open service. So this Bill has been the result of many, many discussions, long hours with DCFS, a great deal of subject matter hearing. I appreciate Representative Feigenholtz and all her efforts in this. There's still much more work to do to correct the problem with DCFS but we continue to do everything we can to try to make a difference in the children's lives of Illinois. So I'd be happy to answer any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1551?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes, O voting 'no', O voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1551. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1561, Representative Crespo. Out of the record. On House Bill 1579, Representative Burke. Out of the of the Calendar, House Bill record. Page 11 Representative Greenwood. Representative Greenwood on House Bill 1652."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I move to accept the concurrence which is... it just makes the licensure application fees for servicemembers and spouses nonrefundable. I ask for concurrence."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion... Representative Batinick? Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting '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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 2029. Representative Walker. Please proceed."

Walker: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. The underlying Bill was a trailer Bill on pension survivor benefits full of technical clarifications. Senate Amendment #1 is a technical clarification of a technical clarification. This is a staff lawyers dreams. We should pass it."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "I really wanted... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, a smidgen more."

Walker: "Well the original Bill was about survivor benefits."

Batinick: "Yup. I remember that one. Thank you. Yup. That was a good Bill. And then what'd the Amendment do?"

Walker: "And it had a whole section saying who was eligible."

Batinick: "Correct."

Walker: "The Amendment said, oh, I understand that but that means SURS. Okay, fine."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Oh, so it didn't include which plan was... awesome. Thank you for that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2029?' 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? Stuart. Carroll. Connor. Hernandez. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2029. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2124, Representative Welch. Please proceed."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that the Illinois Association of Park Districts sponsored with regard to adding an additional exemption to go in a closed session dealing with specific contract employees. There was a concern by the Press Association that was addressed in the Senate. There is no objection. I would ask for concurrence."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wehrli."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Wehrli: "Representative Welch, our analysis says that the Illinois Broadcasters and the Illinois Press Association are opposed.

Does this Senate Amendment remove their opposition?"

Welch: "The Senate Amendment removes their opposition."

Wehrli: "Thank you very much."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2124?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Rep Ammons. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mah. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2124. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing down page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 2146, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The purpose of the Amendment is to broaden the stakeholder group in this public health group and it narrows the focus of the work group to one health factor per year and makes a few clarifying changes."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2146?' This is final action. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hernandez. Rita. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2146. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2154, Representative Feigenholtz. Please proceed."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendments 1 and 2 are technical in nature. One was requested by the Illinois Hospital Association to have a seat at the table and a request for extending of the effective date to January 1."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, there was a whole bunch of opposition in the original underlying Bill. What's the nature of the opposition currently?"

Feigenholtz: "What in particular are you talking about?"

Batinick: "Well, I'm looking... originally we had the Chamber of the IMA. There was some opposition to the Bill. I believe a lot of that got removed along the way and we just have a trail of notes on all these Amendments and I'm trying to get everybody..."

Feigenholtz: "I know, it's... I agree, it's very complicated. Yeah, you know what, what we're doing is putting some work groups together with the insurance industry to talk about evidence based practices and how to use them in the commercial insurance world. There were a lot of discussions about how we are going to do this. And if you... as you read the Bill, you'll see some work groups in there. And that is how we are going to rectify their concerns."

Batinick: "Okay. So with the work groups with the Senate Amendments, because I see it was 44-11 out of the Senate. Is the opposition off?"

Feigenholtz: "I... I'm... I can't answer that. I really don't know.

I think it's lessened, once we had some conversations."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Okay. Well, I guess it... I'll cut to the chase of it in the interest of time, we were unanimous 100 to 0 leaving the House, and all you did was add work groups to this Bill in the Senate, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. That should help all of us."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, can you tell me according to this analysis, there is only 14 providers in the state that are certified under DHS for the ACT/CST programs?" Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Flowers: "What... what... what are the makeup of these 14 providers and where are they located? And knowing the problems that we have across the state in regards to mental health and access to treatment, why is it that there is only 14 and how many of them are people of color, please?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, there are other providers, Representative Flowers but there... right now there is only 14 that actually bundle their rates. ACT and First Episode are a front end team based approach. The evidence based models, when these therapies are used, help avert resi... the need for residential and also avert psychiatric psychosis and some schizophrenia. So this is where the future of treatment is going so we are going to be working with both the Medicaid and the commercial side to try and come up with coding and CPT codes. That's what the work groups are going to do to encourage more participation."

Flowers: "Well, my question to you now, I know you're looking for more participation and I could only imagine that you are

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

looking for more minorities. That's what more participation means and I have a problem with that. You know, that's the reason why we are in the situation we are in today. But tell me why is there not any people of color that's having this opportunity to provide this treatment and collect this bundle of payment in the way that is being provided for this particular group?"

- Feigenholtz: "Some of the therapies that we are discussing are just coming out of the CDC and SAMHSA in the Family First modeling in the first... and you and I have discussed this. Some of the therapies that are going to be mandated or... there's a small group of therapies, they're new. They're in the clearinghouse now. And right now there is no codes for them in Medicaid but that's what we are working in the work groups."
- Flowers: "And so, you mentioned this is part of the Family First model. Now I don't see that in this analysis. But let me ask you when do you anticipate this coming online and being operable?"
- Feigenholtz: "We have 12 different deadlines in this... in this doc... in this Bill, Representative Flowers. But this is a restructuring of how we deliver mental health. We're trying to address an issue that you are very familiar with where in the State of Illinois, we have children in psychiatric hospitals that are... they're beyond medical necessity. The model in this Bill addresses the... these children on the third admission to try and keep them out of care in DCFS and move them into the Medicaid model at HFS. So, this is a long road but a better path."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Flowers: "And so, I see where this... you are updating this mental health system to conform with the Family First Act and I would look forward to having further discussion with you when we have more time. Thank you."

Hoffman: "Representative. Representative Flowers. Thank you,
Representative. Representative Feigenholtz to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2154?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 97 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2154. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2156 on page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Mah. Please proceed."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur Senate Amendment 1 with House Bill 2156. I so enjoyed our robust debate on this Bill that I'm back for more. The Amendment simply adds clarifying language that specifies that the prohibited fees are to the consumer. It removes opposition, bringing community bankers to neutral on the Bill. I request concurrence. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Representative, I so too enjoyed that debate so much that I wanted to come back for more. So, you talked about what the Amendment do and you say it took the Community Bankers off?"

Mah: "Yes."

Batinick: "But we still have Credit... Illinois Credit Union League,
Visa, Illinois Bankers, the Attorney General's not taking a
position on Senate Amendment #1 or the Bill. AARP and
Woodstock Institute considered to support the Bill. So this
was your Visa card Bill, correct?"

Mah: "Correct."

Batinick: "And this was the one where we're not allowing the value of that Visa card to essentially have a time lapse, sort of thing. Rebate card, correct? The rebate card."

Mah: "Right. It just ensures that consumers are not fee'd to death."

Batinick: "Right. And we can... I think everybody went through this.

I'm not looking forward to relit... you know, I don't think we need to re-litigate it too much. I'm not seeing anybody... I think everybody knows on this side what they are doing so, Thank you very much for answering the questions."

Mah: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is,
 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill
2156?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by
 voting '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 70 voting
 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2156. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2165, Representative Murphy. Please proceed."

Murphy: "Yes. I move to concur to Senate Amendment 1. This is a Bill in regards to math requirements. It passed unanimously in the House and Senate. Senate made one small change to add an additional option for the third year. I appreciate your support."

Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2165?' All in favor signify by voting 'yes'; all opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2165. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Villanueva on House Bill 2176. Please proceed."

Villanueva: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2176. This Amendment had... makes three technical changes to the Bill. The first one removes redundant language, basically because the subsection already states that it exempts attorneys and accredited immigration representatives. The second thing that it does is that it changes a requirement that notary's provide the notice that they are not attorneys in Spanish and English and instead requires that notary's provide notice that they are not

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

attorneys in English in language in which they advertise notary services. And the final act that is does is that it requires of the Secretary of State translate the acknowledgment into Spanish and any other language that it deems necessary to achieve the purpose of the Bill and to make these translation available on its website. The Secretary of State does not have an objection to this requirement. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2176?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2176. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Yednock, House Bill 2215. Please proceed."

Yednock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that we concur to Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2215. The Amendment just changed the... or became the Bill and it said that we can actually put the fire service history of the labor movement program online with a link and... or it can be taught inside or by an actual person, instead of online. I ask for concurrence."

Speaker Hoffman: "And I believe that the Motion is to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. On that question, Representative Batinick."

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

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, it seems like you might of made this Bill a whole bunch less onerous, is that correct?"

Yednock: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So, we are... tell us the difference between where the Bill was and where it is now."

Yednock: "Originally, we were going to have all professional firefighter servicemembers take a course in labor history of the fire service. And it was going to be done by... in person at the academy. And, what we decided to do through the Senate and discussions with... with this Body is we decided that we could have a link to the Fire Marshal's service and they could actually do it online and it would be faster and arguably, cheaper."

Batinick: "Okay. Is the course still required or do they just have it online?"

Yednock: "They could do either or."

Batinick: "Do they have to take the course?"

Yednock: "Oh, I'm sorry. All professional firefighters service,
I do believe, will have to take the course."

Batinick: "And who creates the curriculum?"

Yednock: "State Fire Marshal Service. The State Fire Marshal."

Batinick: "The State Fire Marshal service does. Okay. Thank you for answering the questions."

Yednock: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House
Bill 2215?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes, 6 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2215. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2301, Representative Meyers-Martin. Please proceed, Representative."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2301. These Amendments speak to the expansion of members of the Commissioners under the Worker's Compensation Act to include a representative of a recognized labor organization or an attorney who has represented labor organizations or has represented employees in the worker's compensation cases."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, it looks like this side of the aisle kind of disagreed with the base Bill. Doesn't sound like you did a whole bunch of changes to it, is that correct?"

Meyers-Martin: "No, not really."

Batinick: "Okay. That's all we needed to know. We can move to the vote then. Thank you, Representative."

Meyers-Martin: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Leader. Representative Meyers-Martin to close."

Meyers-Martin: "I concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2301?' All those in

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 74 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2301. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2383, Representative Parkhurst."

Parkhurst: "Thank you. I move to concur Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2383. The Amendment limits the Bill to an injury to a pedestrian in a crosswalk or a school crossing and just removed the right of way provision. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2383?'

This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2383. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving down to page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2460, Representative Davis. Please proceed."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2460 and the Amendment simply suggests that or clarifies that public agencies are strongly encouraged to develop a sustainable investment policy and provides public agencies with the flexibility to determine how to integrate

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

these factors into their investment decision making. With this Amendment, the Municipal League is neutral as well as the Operating Engineers and the Laborers and I do have to read a statement with regard to legislative intent. Reads as follows: 'In our work with various stakeholders on this legislation, we agreed to make some changes to clarify legislative intent by changing the word 'shall' to 'should', we agree that 'shall' means an absolute mandate whereas 'should' is a strong recommendation. Therefore, public agencies and governmental units are strongly encouraged to develop a sustainable investment policy but not mandated to do so. Public agencies and governmental units must consider sustainability factors in their analysis and decision making, but the development, publication, and implementation of sustainability factors is strongly encouraged, not required'. This revised language reflects our intent to provide public Body's with flexibility and again, as a result of this change, Municipal League is neutral. I can answer any questions, Mr. Chair."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Bill. I appreciate the Representative clarifying the legislative intent. I just want the Members to know that there were several 'no' votes on this legislation earlier. This has cleared up some issues but for those of us that have manufacturing and some other things that may not be considered to be sustainable practices, you just might want to be wary of that and vote accordingly. But again, we appreciate the Sponsor clearing up the intent. Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Davis to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2460?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2460. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to House Bill 2470, Representative Burke. Please proceed."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment. The Senate added some language to this Bill that addressed a situation from the Chicago Police Pension Fund folks. And they had a situation where they had an officer who had been charged with a felony related to his service and fled... fled and was never tried because he was kind of on the lamb. And they... this would address the situation where somebody... someone does that is a fugitive from justice and would allow the pension fund to suspend the payments while that person is on the lamb. So, I know of no opposition and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill on this one. I voted 'no', urged a 'no' vote the first time around. It was a technical Bill. I thought it was

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

a little bad. The good that the Senate put in, certainly outweighs the bad. So, if you're looking at what you did previously, the Representative explained what the Senate Amendment did that certainly... certainly good to do. So, I think the Senate actually did something good here. I'm going to go ahead and recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke: "Thank you... thank you, Leader Batinick. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2470?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Didech. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2470. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2528, Representative Keicher. Please proceed."

Keicher: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a Bill that's coming back on concurrence from the Senate. If you recall, this is a Bill that protected a woman who is opening a home based business and had an order of protection against her. She did not want to disclose her home based business, so we needed to select an alternate place for the service of summons in the event that happens. We have selected the County Clerks. There was a third provision in there that allowed that County Clerk to be served at a... at their discretion. They chose that that was too wishy washy, too much liability for them and asked us

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

just to go with court order or a police protection order. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative... the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2528?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2528. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2541, Representative Harper. Please proceed."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2541. This Amendment simply allows incarcerated individuals within DOC and DJJ to enroll into a peer led civics program within twelve months of their release. We formally had it at six months. It also includes language stating that an established, nonpartisan, civic organization can assist the program. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, is this Bill substantially different than the underlying Bill? The Senate Amendment?"

Harper: "No, it is not. It just made those two changes that I
 spoke of."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Batinick: "Okay. Excellent. That was very helpful, appreciate it."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2541?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2551. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Andrade on House Bill 2557. Please proceed."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendments #1. Senate Floor Amendment 1 is a page and line Amendment of various changes to the underlying Bill recommended by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce. Including the following, they wanted to clarify to make sure that the notification, which was an original legislation of intent was just to be in writing. That's really the only... the biggest change. No questions, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall

the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2557?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes',

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

O voting 'no', O voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2557. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2577, Representative Zalewski. Please proceed."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2577. This is a Bill that we had in the House originally that the Senate added language to regarding the ability for the Liquor Control Commission to authorize officers to enforce Scofflaws. We worked... Senator Munoz worked with law enforcement, all stakeholders at the table to try to come and do an agreement. These officers will be fully compliant with all applicable law enforcement training standards. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2577?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bristow. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2577. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2583, Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This concurrence, I do ask for concurrence of Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2583. The Bill came about to help former River Conservancy District in the Kankakee and the Iroquois County area. In the underlying House Bill, we made two changes. The first was for our

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

districts to change her name. And the second is to clarify that districts could enlarge the district by adding all or parts of counties. The Senate felt that the law already allowed districts to enlarge by adding all or parts of counties. But we still needed to be able to change the name. So the Bill still allows the ability to change the name when they grow into a bigger district. And with that, I do request an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2583?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed '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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2583. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 25... excuse me... on House Bill 2625, Representative Arroyo. Please proceed, Representative."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion to Concur Amendment 1...

Amendment 1 to House 2625, as amended. The Senate amends one identical to House Bill 2625 as passed the House but expected to provide a brief review of the General Assembly to withdraw the sub circuits of Will County, Kane County, Boone County, Winnebago County, Lake County, and McHenry County. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative West is recognized."

West: "Thank you, Sir. Will the Sponsor yield?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

West: "For legislative intent, can you just verify for me, I have a judge in my county who has been a judge for almost ten years now. If, when she… when the redistrict lines… when the lines are redrawn and she finds herself no longer living in the district, will she still be able to be a judge?"

Arroyo: "Any sitting judge gets grandfathered into their districts."

West: "So, any sitting judge. No... it won't... this Bill does not touch a judge that's in... under... in their seat right now?"

Arroyo: "No."

West: "Okay. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, it was loud in here and I don't… I don't know if you had a little bit of distance from your mic, I couldn't hear you. But, it sounds like what we are doing the way we draw courts versus now and is the Senate Amendment drastically different from the underlying Bill? Because, I'm hearing that it is."

Arroyo: "No, we are not trying to change any... all we are trying to redistrict something that hasn't been district... redistricted for 30 years. So this is not trying to do anything different, just to redraw."

Batinick: "So, okay. Originally, originally the underlying Bill was regarding Cook County, correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

- Batinick: "And that may be why a lot of Members of the Body that are not from Cook County really didn't have much... they weren't invested in the Bill very much. Right now you are talking... what the Amendment does and it seems like it is pretty substantial, it reinserts the provisions of the Bill with the following changes. The General Assembly shall redraw the subcircuit boundaries after every... federal decennial census. This subcircuits shall be compact, contiguous, and substantially equal in population. The General Assembly shall also redraw the subcircuit boundaries in 2021 in the 12th, 16th, 17th, 19th, and 22nd Districts. Where are those particular districts?"
- Arroyo: "I'm not sure. That came to me from the Senate. The Senate Republicans were the one that put that in there. I couldn't tell you where those districts are."
- Batinick: "Is there any way, since this is a concurrence Bill, would you be so kind at this time of day to maybe pull this from the record until we know where the 12th, 16th, 17th, 19th, and 22th Districts are?"

Arroyo: "No, I would not."

- Batinick: "Someday, we are going to be in the Majority and that will be fun. Can you ask staff, maybe, to tell you where those districts are?"
- Arroyo: "If you give me a couple minutes. But I don't have no staff around me. Everybody left."

Batinick: "This is a... as a concurrence, I think this is..."

Arroyo: "Which districts were you interested in?"

Batinick: "12th, 16th, 17th, 19th, and 22th District."

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

Arroyo: "Twelfth is Will. Sixteenth is DeKalb, Kendall, and Kane.

That's all I... that's all I can find right now."

Batinick: "All right. I'm just going to go straight to the Bill. I'm... it doesn't... did you bring this back to committee to our RBA? I see, yeah we got an 8-5 so this was partisan in committee, it was partisan in the Senate. I'm probably expecting a partisan vote here. I know... I just want to alert my Members, this went out not unanimously but almost unanimously. But I have to recommend my Members of the aisle, vote 'no'. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Arroyo to close."

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

Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2625?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 52 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present'. This Bill not receiving the Constitutional Majority... excuse me... the Motion fails. House Bill 2675, Representative Demmer. Please proceed, Representative."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with House Bill 2675. The Senate made just some technical changes, adding the immediate effective date, removed a few erroneous references. This is about the craft distiller Bill that we passed a couple weeks ago. I ask for your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2675?"

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Buckner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2675. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session: Appropriations-Human Services will meet in C-1; Healthcare Licenses in Room 122B; Higher Education, Room 114; Judiciary-Criminal in D-1; Revenue and Finance in Room 115."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 340, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 426, offered by Representative Swanson. House Resolutions 427, offered by Representative Wehrli. House Resolution 428, offered by Representative Wehrli. House Resolution 429, offered by Representative Greenwood. And House Resolution 430, offered by Representative Greenwood."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stands adjourned until Thursday, May 30 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed

60th Legislative Day

5/29/2019

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 First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 262, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 485, offered by Representative Buckner. A Bill an Act concerning finance. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 459, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1786, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2023, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of these Senate Bills, will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Committee Reports. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1321. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #3 to House Bill Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendments 2 to Senate Bill 1881. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will adjourned."