71st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come in to order.

 Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution #93,

 offered by Representative Greg Harris, is referred to the

 Rules Committee."
- Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper and happily married man. Members and guests are asked to refrain from... we haven't recognized his new status. Congratulations, Wayne. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Wayne Padget."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Eternal and almighty God, we thank you for this occasion to gather as your people and to contemplate the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for this great state. In the midst of diversity, God, give us the gift of unity, make us worthy of the mission in which you have called us as citizens of the great State of Illinois. God, grant us to live in harmony with one another in mutual respect and love. May you bless and grant to our Governor and all of its leaders the spirit of courage, the spirit of justice, prudence, and discernment. Keep them in safety and health. May they lead your way to victories over injustice, poverty, and everything that is harmful to the dignity and sanctity of all human life. May your sovereign hand be upon this state and may it prosper in abundance from north to south. This we pray, in your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Manley: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Leader Crespo."

71st Legislative Day

- Crespo et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Manley: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "I am not aware of any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle today, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Manley: "Well done. Representative Spain is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Parkhurst and Unes are excused today."
- Speaker Manley: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 115 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Harris on the Motion."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so the following Bills can be heard immediately in the Executive Committee. Senate Bill 1639, Floor Amendment #2 and House Joint Resolution 93."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Members, the House plans

71st Legislative Day

- to stand in recess while the Executive Committee meets in Room 118. Leader Willis, for an announcement."
- Willis: "Immediately following the Executive Committee, the Democrats will caucus in Room 114."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Spain, for an announcement."
- Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The House Republicans will also caucus immediately following the Executive Committee."
- Speaker Manley: "In case you didn't hear that, the House will be in recess while the Exec Committee meets in Room 118.

 Democrats will caucus in Room 114. Republicans will caucus in Room 118. And when Executive Committee has adjourned you'll be notified. The House stands in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on November 14, 2019: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 93, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 1639. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 14, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 1557, Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 1639."
- Speaker Manley: "On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 1756, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a technical cleanup at the request of the Illinois Department of Insurance. It does two things, it cleans up the PBM Act, the Pharmacy Benefit Manager Act that we passed this spring. One, incorporates by reference something that should have been incorporated in the Insurance Code. And secondly, cleans up the language of definition of an HMO, a Health Maintenance Organization, instead of Managed Care Organization, which again, is not defined in the Insurance Code. So it's purely technical. I know of no opposition. And ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I kind of was expecting maybe to do something on ethics or something like that, so... little curveball here. Is this... this is a cleanup Bill to SB689, I believe you said. Is that correct?"

Morgan: "Correct, that is the underlying Bill. And..."

Batinick: "So, what was our vote... what was our vote total on SB689?"

Morgan: "Yeah, I don't have those vote totals in front of me, Representative. But certainly this is a Bill that was a bipartisan Bill, was supported by both chambers in an effort

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

to really tramp down... tamp down some of the abuses in the PMBM world that we see."

Batinick: "Okay. So, theoretically, if you supported SB689, you would like this Bill. If you opposed it, you would oppose it, correct?"

Morgan: "Not necessarily. Honestly, this is purely technical and this is two limited things and it changes definitions. It does not touch any of the substance of the Bill and I don't see any reason why anyone would oppose it. Again, this is at the request directly and solely of the Department of Insurance's cleanup."

Batinick: "Do you remember what the nature of the opposition Bill was on the underlying Bill?"

Morgan: "No, the underlying Bill was of a totally different subject, so I have no idea."

Batinick: "I'm sorry, 689. Do you remember what the opposition was to 689, not the shell Bill?"

Morgan: "No, that's a good question. I did not carry that Bill, so I couldn't speak to all of the opposition. I think, again, the reason that it was bipartisan is everyone shares the goal of pushing down some of the drug... prescription drug costs that we see in the state."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Morgan to close."

Morgan: "Ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1756 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those 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

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

record. On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 5 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5, House Resolution 579, Representative Stuart. Representative Stuart is recognized."

"Thank you. This Resolution... actually I have to give credit for the work on this. This came from Bridget Cory, who I have with me today. She was formerly my LA and now many of you may recognize her, she works in our research staff and helps them at... helps them out. But she wanted to make sure that we were doing what we can in the State of Illinois to bring awareness to multiple sclerosis, known as MS, a disease in which the insulating covers of the nerve cells in the brain and spinal cord are damaged. Two point three million people have been affected globally by MS. Some of the signs and symptoms are double vision, blindness, muscle weakness, sensation trouble, and coordination trouble. There is currently no known cure for MS, although a lot of work is being done on that behalf. This is near and dear to me because Bridget was diagnosed in May of 2017. After loss of vision and some hand and foot numbness, was able to be diagnosed through an MRI. So, we wanted to make sure that we're doing what we can in Illinois to bring awareness. She was joined earlier today by her mother but after our long way away from the floor she was not able to still be here to see this happen. But I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart moves for the adoption of House Resolution 579. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had intended to speak on the Resolution."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed. I apologize, Representative."

Ammons: "Just earlier this year, my daughter was diagnosed with MS and she lost her vision while she was driving her... my granddaughters to day care. And I had not even heard of it. And I knew something was wrong but I didn't quite know what. And it's usually misdiagnosed until you get to the point where you literally lose your vision and the operation of your limbs. And so, this is a very important Resolution to me certainly and my family. And I thank you. I want to be added to this Resolution, Katie, and would like to figure out what we can do to help people who, in many cases, their jobs don't realize that they are suffering with a very severe illness and refuses to assist them in those circumstances. And so, I appreciate your recognition and thank you, Representative Stuart."

- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative Ammons. I apologize again, and we will all be praying for your daughter. On page 3, Senate Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 730, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill.
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ann Williams, has been approved for consideration."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Oh... excuse me, Representative Williams on the Amendment."
- Williams, A.: "Yes. The Amendment makes a small change and some cleanup language is added. I'm happy to discuss it on Third."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments? Representative Williams moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor vote... say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution... excuse me... and the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Representative Manley: "Representative Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill is a trailer to Senate Bill 75, which was a bipartisan and bicameral initiative that was to address and create some positive changes in order to address harassment, bullying, and other ethics issues. We passed it in the spring, I believe, unanimously. So, this Bill just does a couple things at the recommendation of the Executive Inspector General, for example. We wanted to clarify the intent in a few areas. First of all, we do... in the original Bill we allowed the complainant to have his or her interview recorded and to supplement evidence throughout the process. In order to ensure integrity of investigation, we reiterated this piece and this was recommended change by the Executive Inspector General and will ensure that the investigations in the final summaries are done with independence and the integrity of the investigation is preserved. In addition, there is a

requirement in the original Bill that the complainant keep

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

information confidential. We've added language to ensure that the confidentiality requirement applies not just to the complainant but also to the respondent, to ensure all parties adhere to this requirement. There is a small change regarding the amount of time that the Attorney General's Office can file an ethics violation with the EEC. And that's basically kind of the overall view and happy to answer any questions." Speaker Manley: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 730 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And in the opinion of the Chair... this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back to page 5 on the Calendar, under Order of Resolutions we have Representative House Resolution 577, Hernandez. Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the Assembly, I just want to remind you that this Resolution has to do with the point of privilege discussion I had last Session about the visit down to the border, Matamoros, Mexico, where I and Representative Mayfield were a part of a delegation where we saw very horrible conditions on how this Migrant Protection Protocol Program that the Trump administration put through Executive Order and implemented is doing to families. And these times where... what I want you to know are these are folks that are fleeing for their lives from their countries. These

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

are families and children who are living in conditions because of this program. The Resolution aims at just requesting... asking Congress to condemn this program and to also defund the program in their upcoming budget. Based on this visit that no picture, no video, no article can really give you the true living conditions that these individuals are living. And these, let me remind you, are folks that are running, leaving, leaving everything behind to a country where they can seek freedom. I ask for your support."

- Speaker Manley: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hernandez moves that House Resolution 577 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Third Reading, Senate Bill 83, Representative Kifowit. Representative, would you like to pull the Bill back to Second Reading? The purposes of your Amendment. Representative, would you like to... thank you. Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill back on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 83, a Bill for an Act concerning government. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Kifowit."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit on the Amendment."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. This Amendment is simply a technical change. As the Body would remember, we passed House Bill 120 which established the Veteran Ailments Task Force. Since then, there's been some delays on appointees. And so, this just extends the date in which the task force can function."

71st Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 83. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill, sorry."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 83, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative, did the Amendment explain the Bill?"
- Kifowit: "The Amendment explained the Bill. It's just a technical Bill in nature."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 83 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 14, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Amendment(s) 1 to House Joint Resolution 93."

71st Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Harris for an announcement."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Carol Ammons is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Manley: "The record will reflect. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Leader Willis on the Motion."
- Willis: "Madam Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1557 can be heard immediately on the floor."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Willis has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1557, Representative Villanueva. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1557, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Villanueva."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Villanueva on the Amendment."
- Villanueva: "House Amendment 1 is a gut and replace of the original Bill that now turns it into the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act trailer Bill. This administration's priorities for the rollout of legalization of cannabis continue to be and create the most equity centric law in the nation and safety for consumers. This trailer Bill contains technical changes proposed by state agencies, lawmakers, and

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

stakeholders. The proposal clarifies language throughout the Bill, adds uniformity to the terms used by state agencies, and corrects drafting errors. Some of these technical changes include turning commas to semi-colons, changing references to dispensary organizations to dispensing organizations, makes clarifications on certain terms. Also identifies what we previously had in the State of Illinois, which unfortunately was an error, and now addresses that medical cannabis patients under the age of 18, rather than under the 21, are prohibited from products other than infused products. Additional stakeholders as well are added to the Adult Use Cannabis Health Advisory Committee, the DUI Cannabis Task Force, and the Restore, Reinvest, Renew Program. Additional technical changes include conflict of interest changes in terms of current Members and leaving that language alone. But then new Members that are entering the Body in future Sessions. This also addresses municipality in county taxes, identifies and clarifies language around public consumption use. It also identifies and clarifies language around employer drug policies, cannabis paraphernalia, and also issues... clarifies certain issues around expundement, particularly around electronic notification for individuals and helping to bring certain counties that are already using email as a form of electronic communication. It does not make it the soul means of communication, it is just an option. And with that said, I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Wehrli, would you... can we adopt... okay. I like that you're finishing my sentences with your... that's great. Representative Villanueva moves the adoption of Floor

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1557. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Villanueva, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Villanueva on the Amendment."

Villanueva: "Yes, Floor Amendment 2 reinserts inadvertently deleted concerning the Administration of Public Education and Prevention that was originally requested by the Medical Society. This addresses the Medical Society's concerns and removes the opposition... their opposition to the Amendment. This Amendment also addresses the definition or further addresses the definition of public places where consumption is prohibited. Addressing the concerns raised by the Illinois Association of Park Districts to ensure that no parks or wildlife areas are inadvertently left out of prohibited places. Additionally, this Amendment adds ethics language to conform with a two-year revolving door prohibition on Members and family having ownership interests that currently exist under gaming law. Originally, the Cannabis Taxation Act would only apply to Members during the two-year period after the enactment of the law. This issue was raised by Republican Members, our colleagues on the other side in the Senate and the House, and we are adding this to address their concerns. This Amendment also removes language that was originally requested by the Prisoner Review Board, altering the expungement process as it applied to certain cases and again working with stakeholders, particularly our

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

colleagues on the other aisle, to identify the issues and work with them in terms of this language. And finally, this also... this Amendment also clarifies the intent that incubation relationships can begin pre-application and continue through the operations post-licensing. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Villanueva moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1557. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1557, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hollman: "Representative Villanueva."

Villanueva: "This trailer Bill and trailer to the trailer Bill, with our Amendment, has really been an effort to be able to clarifying language and to provide additional information for folks upon the enactment, obviously, of the Cannabis Taxation Law on January 1. We talked with a lot of stakeholders and state agencies in the industry with our colleagues across the aisle to identify the issues and concerns that came out of the Bill earlier this spring. And we worked as much as we could, and we continue to work and are committed to continue to work to address additional concerns that will come up as we see the... the execution of the industry starting in January. So, we wanted to make sure that we addressed as many as

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

concerns that we could that fell into the technical category and not in the substantive, with the belief and the hope that we will able... to be able to actually move some more substantive issues in the spring. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote from my colleagues."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Hey, Representative, thanks for going through so much.

I was paying attention to it. I'm not sure all my colleagues could absorb everything that you did at such lightening pace."

Villanueva: "Yeah."

Batinick: "So, I just want to cover... this basically strengthens the cannabis legislation, so I assume that there might be some people that oppose the original cannabis legislation but support this because the parts in this Bill. I want to go through some of these things and make sure that they're in there."

Villanueva: "Yes."

Batinick: "I think you said Floor Amendment 2 takes care of the cannabis prevention program. And trust me, it wasn't just the Med Society that wanted that inserted back in there. Can you quickly explain again what exactly was accidentally taken out and put back in?"

Villanueva: "So previously, in the prior Bill, an error was made that actually had the public education campaign under the Department of Public Health. With the additional... with the first Amendment, we were moving it into the Department of Human Services. And what we came to the point of with the Med

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Society is that... sorry, I want to make sure that I'm getting this correctly. That it'll stay with the Department of Human Services, which was always the original intent, but obviously wanting to make sure that the public awareness and public education campaign was still going to happen and to the best of everyone's ability still be able to roll out in a timely manner."

Batinick: "Okay, so that is still in there."

Villanueva: "Yes."

Batinick: "Now, you had... some of the business groups in support because of some of the employee-employer relationships and testing. I'd like to focus on that next."

Villanueva: "Yes."

Batinick: "What exactly was added in this Amendment that makes it better for the employers that want to test their employees?"

Villanueva: "It specifically clarifies reasonable and nondiscriminatory issues. So, we wanted to make sure that people had a clear understanding, that employers had a clear understanding of what reasonable meant in terms of their zero tolerance drug policies and drug free workplace policies. So, we just wanted to clarify language."

Batinick: "Okay. And then lastly, can you explain to me what the rule is on State Reps and State Senators and anybody else regarding getting into the industry in the future?"

Villanueva: "So, for Members that were here when we passed the original cannabis Bill, which are the majority of us, if not all of us in this chamber right now, currently have a lifetime ban on being able to have a stakeholder... stakeholder ownership in the medical cannabis industry. What we worked on with..."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Batinick: "Now, quick question... is that us and our spouse or just us?"

Villanueva: "And immediate family members."

Batinick: "Okay."

Villanueva: "Additionally, what we worked on with a lot of our colleagues is to add additional language that would reflect on future General Assembly Members that would be joining us in the future and provide an additional two-year revolving door. So as individuals come into the General Assembly, they have a two-year ban post leaving the General Assembly to... in that situation in terms of the conflict of interest."

Batinick: "And that is their family members as well, I presume?" Villanueva: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. And do children get defined as a family member?"

Villanueva: "Yes, immediate family members."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for answering my questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Thank you very much. I want to just ask a quick question here in regards to the discussions with the business community that were ongoing for this Amendment... on this trailer Bill, really. There's a commitment looking forward to next Session regarding the Workplace Privacy Act. Are you aware of that?"

Villanueva: "Yes. Yes."

Wheeler: "And I just want to make sure we put that in the record that that is something we are going to look forward to dealing with in the spring?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Villanueva: "We're working with a variety of stakeholders to address issues that have been continuously identified. What we wanted to do particularly with this Bill was to provide clarifying language and technical changes. So, that would be a more substantive issue that we look forward to working with those entities to be able to come up with some good language in the spring."

Wheeler: "Perfect. I appreciate your answer to the question. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... the underlying or the original Bill that we're trailering today is something I did not support. However, this Bill makes a Bill I did not support better. Therefore, I will actually be voting 'yes' today and encourage others to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Tarver."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Tarver: "You know I like you. Representative, just a couple quick questions for you. And I think you kind of know where I'm going to go with my questions. One, is this trailer Bill primarily technical in nature?"

Villanueva: "Yes."

Tarver: "Are there any substantive changes?"

Villanueva: "The only substantive... substantive change... sorry, I'm like battling a sinus infection... is the two-year revolving door ban that we've added for new General Assembly Members that will be coming in after this General Assembly term."

Tarver: "Okay. And just one additional question, when you talk about the stakeholders that you all met with, and I should've

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

asked you this earlier, do you consider the City of Chicago Black Caucus as one of those stakeholders?"

Villanueva: "Yes."

Tarver: "Is there anything in this Bill that allays any of the concerns that they've articulated publicly and privately about the original Bill?"

Villanueva: "Those are more substantive changes that we are interested in addressing in the spring and were not, unfortunately, technical or clarifying issues that we could really identify with the hopes of moving this forward. Those issues will also be handled through the roll out and implementation at the department level. But again, we're hoping to work with all stakeholders in the spring to be able to continue to address issues."

Tarver: "You know, the first time I spoke on this Bill I voted in favor of it but I was very critical of the original Bill. I still share those same reservations. I am happy to see this moving. I am happy to see you all working to get to a better place. I can't support the Bill today as it stands because I can't go back to my community, which is all City of Chicago, and explain to them that they were unhappy with the first rollout. This improves it but it doesn't really get there where they need it to be. So, I want to commend you for a job well done and... and to all the others as well. I look forward to working with you in the future. I can't support it today but I surely hope that it passes for you. Thanks."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Bryant: "Thank you. So to the Sponsor, I just want to say first of all, thank you for hearing us yesterday. Just want to confirm the language that we had concerns about that... that were involving expungements, that has been removed?"

Villanueva: "Yes."

Bryant: "Thank you. And then, in addition you, I believe, added back in the language, I think, Representative previously indicated that... that the Med Society had, that's been restored?"

Villanueva: "Yes."

Bryant: "So, since yesterday's hearing... we've also heard again from law enforcement, some concerns that without this, without these changes, that arrests that are made might be later questioned if that law enforcement individual was found to have cannabis in their system. And then of course after coming out of 20 years of serving in the Department of Corrections, I don't think we want our law enforcement individuals to be found to have it in their system or additionally corrections employees to have that in their system. So, while I still don't support recreational marijuana use, I am going to support your Bill today because I think the changes that you make are important. If we've got it, then we need to make it right, but I would also entertain later repealing this whole Act. Until then, I'm happy that you're making parts of this right. So, thank you for hearing us and for acting on that."

Villanueva: "I appreciate that, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Morgan."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I just wanted to note a few things. The Sponsor touched on them but I just wanted to thank her again and all the stakeholders that worked on this legislation. There are a few aspects of this Bill that make it easier for medical cannabis patients and they're important and I urge an 'aye' vote. In particular, we're addressing 18 to 20 year olds who are suffering from very severe debilitating medical conditions who really do need access to this medicine. And also, fixing something that was a vestige of the original medical cannabis Bill that allowed law enforcement to have access to information on medical cannabis patients directly based on their license plate, not even their driver's license. So, these are two important pieces to the thousands of medical cannabis patients in Illinois. And I thank the Sponsor and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Welter."

Welter: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, hello."

Villanueva: "Hi, Representative."

Welter: "So, on this trailer Bill here where are the business groups, the chamber and those folks?"

Villanueva: "They're... they're in support."

Welter: "Okay. How about law enforcement that you've heard from?" Villanueva: "Law enforcement is also in support."

Welter: "Okay. That's good. To the Bill. There's been much time spent on the cannabis Bill this last spring. I just want to make this completely and abundantly clear, the Bill that we're voting on today doesn't mean that you're reaffirming or that you believe in the legalization of cannabis. We're here because we need to make technical changes and we worked with

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

community stakeholders to make sure that we're doing this as right as we possibly can. So, when you look at those who are in support of this trailer Bill and pushing for this Bill, we've got the business community looking for some changes so that we can make sure that our employers are protected. We look at law enforcement who is also supportive. And then we look at what we're doing for the ethics part of this, and this is very important with everything that we have going on down here. We're not diminishing it or taking anything away, we are actually adding another layer of ethics to this legislation. So, if you did not support the underlying Bill, and I understand why you had some concerns on that, there is no reason not to support this. The folks who are behind this, who have worked on this, who have collaborated with this is doing what we believe is best. It is a step forward. So, I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to please support us in voting for this legislation."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Representative, thank you for the work that you've done and all the people that have worked on this. I was not a supporter of the legalization of recreational cannabis. I continue to be opposed to that, but it is the law of the land now. And much like I think the Liquor Code that we deal with practically every Session here in the General Assembly, I think we're going to have to continue to come back with this legislation and address it year after year. So, now that it is the law, we're taking an opportunity to correct some of the provisions and strengthen this law to make it better for the citizens in

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

the State of Illinois. So, I just want to say thank you for listening to the concerns that we had on the expungement issue, which was a big issue for this side, for listening to law enforcement, listening to business about the concerns they have, and especially strengthening the ethics provisions in this and tightening these up. So, thank you. I would urge an 'aye' vote as well."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Villanueva to close."

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

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1557 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting in 'favor', 20 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Leader Willis on the Motion."
- Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the posting requirements be waived so that Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1639 can be heard immediately on the floor."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Willis has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Senate Bill 1639, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time on a

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Harris."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris on the Amendment."

Harris: "Madam Speaker, could we adopt both Amendments and debate the Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1639. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "I would also like to adopt the third Floor Amendment and then we can debate the full Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1639. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This piece of legislation is addressing some of the issues that were brought forth in recent federal investigations and other

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

issues that we have all seen in the news in the State of Illinois. It is one of a... two pieces of legislation, a companion Resolution will also be coming along next. We heard them both this morning in the Executive Committee meeting. And during the Executive Committee meeting there was a very spirited discussion, and I'm very happy to say that both Bills also came out on leave, which I think is a good sign. But during the discussion on this Bill, there was a great deal of questioning, particularly by Representative Wheeler. The content of this Bill had been thoroughly vetted, had... they and their side been given adequate chances to review and understand the implications of each of these rather complicated topics. And interestingly, Representative, when we got to our caucus in discussion we heard the same thing from a lot of our Members is this needs more review. So, the Amendments that were filed today remove those portions dealing with the statement of economic interest from this Bill today and refer those to the commission that will be formed later. So what will remain in this Bill are items about transparency of information that is already required to be filed by the state and also new requirements on lobbyists as far as their disclosure. So let me just briefly say what those requirements for lobbyists that are being added are, is it requires lobbyists who are state lobbyists to disclose each local government entity that they are required to be registered to lobby. It would require them to disclose if they hold any elected or appointed office. And it would have each lobbyist disclose with whom they hire or contract for purposes of lobbying and the clients to be lobbied by those

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

sub-lobbyists. The Bill also requires the Secretary of State to create a publicly searchable database that would bring together information from lobbyist disclosures, campaign contributions, and the statements of economic interest of state officials and employees that already exist but are maintained in separate databases. So that's a summary of what the Bill does. Madam Speaker, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Durkin: "Leader Harris, you did... I was at the committee hearing this morning and I heard all of the back and forth between you and also Members of the committee on very important issues. Issues that have been brought front and center to the Legislature based on misdeeds of a former Member. Economic interest is one thing which we feel very serious about on this side of the aisle, about making it more expansive, more transparent. What happened between the time of the committee until you placed your Amendment on the floor with your caucus?"

Harris: "Could you repeat your question?"

Durkin: "What happened? Why'd you strip out the economic interest section?"

Harris: "As I said in my opening, we listened in the Executive Committee to people who said they believe this is an important thing to address, the statement of economic interest, to make it stronger. They said that they did not have enough time to review and vet the language, offer their suggestions. So

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

listening to the comments that were made, I said at the time, we're going to go listen very carefully what you said. We did, we are taking that part of the language out."

- Durkin: "So I guess that we have to wait for the commission to act or to issue some report, which would be at the end of March, before we do anything with economic interest statement reform, correct?"
- Harris: "There is already a economic interest statement in place.

 And we would expect the commission to review not only this,
 but other topics that interrelate with it, like the definition
 of what a lobbyist is, how different lawyers would report
 different kinds of their income or what debts they may or may
 not have to disclose. A lot of those are very important
 topics. All of them would be within the realm of the
 commission."
- Durkin: "Do we really need a commission to be able to come up with a commonsense solution that is, I would say, practical but also the right thing to do? We've got some smart people in this chamber. And matter of fact, I introduced a Bill last week... let's see... that would be House Bill 3954 that has three Democrat House Members as cosponsors, which is a statement of economic interest reform which very much replicates what judges have to file and that's been around for a week. So I guess the point is I'm not... I'm a little disappointed of the fact that we have not bringing Resolution to this part of ethics reform considering the world that we are existing in, in Illinois, when this building is burning down and we're going to punt this section over to a group of... we don't know who they are. It'll be a commission. A commission that I've

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

seen... commissions come and go over the years. And many of us look at those commissions with jaundice eyes because generally they don't produce positive results, the results that we think are important. So, let me... I got a few other questions. This is actually a question for the Clerk. Could you give me a status of House Bill 3954?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill...

Durkin: "3954."

Speaker Manley: "...3954?"

Durkin: "House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "House Bill 3954."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3954 was referred to the House Rules Committee."

Durkin: "What day was it referred to the Rules Committee?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3954 was referred to the House Rules Committee on November 12."

Durkin: "Okay. Thank you. Another inquiry of the Clerk. Could you give me just... I just wanted... remember I'd mentioned House Bill 3954 is our statement, our reform statement regarding economic interests, which I stated earlier, which expands and it goes into the area of what judges currently do that has Democrat Members as cosponsors. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, could you give me the status of House Bill 3947?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, status of House Bill 3947."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3947 was referred to the House Rules
Committee on October 29."

Durkin: "House Bill 3947 should be the easiest, most commonsense, as we refer to, low-hanging fruit Bills that should have been passed this week which would ban Members of the Legislature,

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

spouses, and also children living under the roof from acting and filing as a lobbyist in State Government. And that Bill currently sits in the Rules Committee. Question, Leader Harris. Does this... does your legislation ban lobbyists... Legislators from lobbying activities in the State of Illinois?"

Harris: "It does not."

Durkin: "Is there a reason why we have not embraced that idea?"

Harris: "I think that the idea is that... that idea, the ideas that were in the judges' Bill that you referred to, others that might have been brought forward by Members of your caucus, our caucus, by either caucus, in the Senate, local advocacy groups, good government groups, we want to bring all those together in a commission, in a setting, in a public venue, and craft together a comprehensive set of solutions, not fixing one small problem or attempting to close one loophole, but to do it in a comprehensive way."

Durkin: "Leader Harris, I think on this particular issue, what we have come to know about what Representative... former Representative Arroyo did was appalling, offensive, and the fact that we are not going to at least put a stop to that before we leave is very disappointing. Last but not least, status of House Bill 3955, Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, status of House Bill 3955."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3955 was referred to the House Rules

Committee on November 12."

Durkin: "Thank you. House Bill 3955 is... this is the banning the ex parte communications that Legislators have with agencies regarding the issuance of contracts. So you can't have a

71st Legislative Day

Welch:

11/14/2019

particular Senator who runs a particular committee regarding transportation muscling IDOT, Tollway, or other agencies for favoritism towards their donors. This just requires that it be documented and that it would be memorialized in the record. I think... again, low-hanging fruit. We have a Democrat cosponsor on this, but I want to mention on the previous Bills were 6 House Democrats were cosponsors. So, Representative Harris, I know we'll get into the commission but I think that today's Bill that we are addressing doesn't get the job done. A number of us are contemplating how our vote will go on this. We believe reform is important, but I just wish we could've done more in this limited time that we have had together. We have done amazing things in short order over the years, but I can just say, last year within 36 hours, we crafted a budget and a capital Bill because the priorities of both sides were met. That hasn't happened with this particular issue. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Welch." "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Welch: "Thank you. Actually, to the Bill. I just want to briefly respond to the last speaker's comments because I think ethics is important to all of us. I think it's something that we as Democrats and you as Republicans, this is all something that we can agree on and something that we all care about. And this morning in the Executive Committee, I treated this topic as such, as a very important topic. On the question of this Bill that we're talking about right now, every single Republican in the room had an opportunity to speak. My notes

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

also say that someone even spoke more than once. Unlimited debate. No one was cutoff. Very sensitive to that issue. I even asked the Leader who was present in the room if he wanted to speak even though he's not on the committee. He indicated he did not. The point is, is this was an important topic being heard on the last day of Veto Session and they... we wanted everyone to be heard. I even asked methodically if anyone else wanted to be recognized, wanting to make sure that everyone had an opportunity to speak. This is not a perfect piece of legislation, but Leader Harris heard the concerns that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle expressed during that Executive Committee and he made changes. And I think that's important to recognize that he heard them. And I know him, he's going to continue to work on this issue when we return. We all know him to be an honorable Representative. This is just a first step. It's not perfect, but it's a good first step. And to be disappointed, to indicate that this is being rushed when everyone's had on opportunity to be heard on this issue, I think that's wrong. I think we all need to come together here today and recognize that this is not perfect, recognize that there's more work that we, together, need to do because together we will be better. And we need to support this Bill here today. I would encourage everyone to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1639. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wehrli."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Leader, when did you file this Bill, the original underlying Bill?"

71st Legislative Day

- Harris: "It was filed last night."
- Wehrli: "So it wasn't filed when the Quinn report came out on the Blago stuff when we needed ethics reform then? Wasn't filed then?"
- Harris: "Well there were a lot of other Bills that were filed and adopted back then."
- Wehrli: "How about when Homer came up with his report in 2014.

 Was this Bill filed then? Were we going to do ethics reform then?"
- Harris: "I think that there were Bills filed then and other ethics changes that were passed then."
- Wehrli: "And how about, you know with all this FBI stuff, now we're finally going to come around and do some ethics reform, right? Now people are going... may potentially go to jail, we're going to get serious about ethics reform?"
- Harris: "Representative, I think what we're trying to do here is look at each of these cases... and there have been wrongdoers on both sides of our aisle, there have been in the other chamber. What we learned from each of these occasions though is ways that we need to move to strengthen the protections we have and how we need to make this process more accountable and transparent to the people we represent. I don't think when we... when Governor Blagojevich came along, we tried to do as much as we could then. Clearly, there were people who found other ways to go about their business outside those laws. What we pass as a result of this, I'm sure that eventually there will be someone who will run afoul of those things. But it does not absolve us of the responsibility right now to take this moment and to work to close those loopholes to

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

strengthen what we have and be sure that we're doing the best job we can do."

Wehrli: "While I'm certainly grateful that you listened to the Members of this august Body on this side of the aisle in Executive Committee, I find it somewhat disingenuous to say that you're listening to us when you left that meeting or that committee with a 12-0 vote. We were ready to come up here and vote on it, and then you guys go to caucus. And there's pushback on the statement of economic interest. And then the change occurs. So my question is, who's hiding what over there?"

Harris: "Oh, come on. In your... in that Executive Committee meeting, you guys made your comments. I listened to you. I think I clearly said to some of your colleagues, I've listened very carefully to what you've said and I've heard you. I went to our caucus. I listened to what they said. The fact that we react to what we hear from Members on our side and your side I think is a good thing, that we don't just like get webbed to something and just ram it through for the sake of doing that. I actually think that's a good thing. And I just really resent that you think something shady went on there."

Wehrli: "I... I would just like it to be clear that you're not making these changes to benefit this side of the aisle. These changes came out of your caucus in your caucus meeting. So let me just ask you this, under this Bill, as you present it now, would it apply to what former Representative Arroyo did and would it have changed his behavior there or the outcome there?"

71st Legislative Day

- Harris: "I think that the things that he was arrested for were already illegal, so apparently that did not change any behavior. I don't know what any changes we might make in State Law that would've changed his behavior or anyone else's."
- Wehrli: "So under lobbyist disclosure, which is now really all that's left of this piece of legislation, would former Representative Arroyo had... would he have been forced to disclose his lobbying activities under the proposed legislation?"
- "Well this... this comes down to then a question that I Harris: think should be a very important one for the commission is, how is lobbying defined across the State of Illinois? The State of Illinois has a definition in our statute on what lobbying is, what lobbying isn't. There are some who would say that one of the things we should look at is redefining that definition because there are some people who come around this building, who come visit us that they're not lobbyist, they are consultants who help with things. Should we broaden the definition to catch some of those folks? There are very few cities, towns, municipalities in the State of Illinois which require lobbyist registration or have a definition of what a lobbyist is for their local purposes. So trying to catch who might be a lobbyist outside of this building, who would lobby other government entities is hard to do if there's no definition of even what constitutes that category. So another thing we might do as part of the commission is develop a statewide standard definition that would go across different municipalities and would require a central

71st Legislative Day

- registration. So there are a lot of different pieces to this issue."
- Wehrli: "Okay. Would your proposed legislation have prohibited former... a former removed Member from picking their successor?

 Are we addressing that?"
- Harris: "The different Acts that we're looking at are Government Ethics Act, the Lobbyist Reporting Act, different parts of the Purchasing Code. And we will look at all different suggestions that come forward in those. Whether they will prevent a person in the past from doing something or would have or prevent a person in the future from doing something, if they're hell-bent on doing something wrong, I just don't... I just don't know."
- Wehrli: "But the short answer for today is no? Right now, former Representative Arroyo can pick his successor. We're not... his successor, we're not changing that in this piece of legislation, correct? Yes? No?"
- Harris: "The legislation does not address that."
- Wehrli: "Okay. Thank you. I have an inquiry of the Clerk. Can you please give me the status and the date filed of House Bill 332?"
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us the status of House Bill 332?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 332 was referred to the House Rules Committee on March 29."
- Wehrli: "And what date was that filed?"
- Clerk Bolin: "The Bill was filed on January 11."
- Wehrli: "Can you please give me the status and date filed of House Bill 361?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, status of House Bill 361."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 361 was referred to the House Rules Committee on March 29."

Wehrli: "And what date was that filed?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 361 was filed on January 16."

Wehrli: "Status and date filed of House Bill 874, please?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, status of House Bill 874 and date filed, please."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 874 was referred to the Rules Committee on March 29. The Bill was introduced on January 23."

Wehrli: "Thank you. So these are just three Bills that deal with ethics in various forms. One of them is an omnibus ethics Bill that raises penalties for a whole host of things. That Bill was derived by looking what other states do with their governmental elected officials and what the penalties are for bad behavior. That Bill has languished in Rules and has had no chance of a hearing. So with... on that backdrop, could you tell me, what's the penalty for a lobbyist if they fail to disclose things underneath this new legislation? Is it a monetary fine? Is it time in jail? Is it... what's the penalty?"

Harris: "It would be those penalties which are already in statute for violation of the Lobbyist Disclosure Act."

Wehrli: "Can you tell me what those are?"

Harris: "The monetary fine, I'm told, is up to \$10 thousand and their license to lobby could be revoked."

Wehrli: "Okay. So there's no criminal offense that would go over to the court system?"

Harris: "Not right now."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Wehrli: "So, to the Bill. Clearly, this is a last-ditch effort to appear to be doing something on ethics, which I applaud that we're finally going to do something on ethics. I remain a skeptic because this chamber has a long and storied history of history of saying we're going to do something on ethics. And I mentioned them, the Quinn report, the Homer report. These things have come and gone with no changes to our ethics. But welcome aboard the ethics reform. There's plenty of room for everybody. This state is a laughing stock because of how we conduct business and how we hold each other accountable. It is incumbent on all of us to raise the bar in which we all operate. This is a start, but welcome aboard. I'm going to vote 'yes' on this. I look forward to the debate on the task force, but I certainly hope that the task force actually get something accomplished and we don't just kick the can yet again."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was in the Executive Committee today and heard the concerns that were raised. And I commend Leader Harris for being receptive to those concerns. These are far-reaching changes that are being proposed and we do need to be careful of unintended consequences. We have a commission that will be in place that will be able to assess not only the statement of economic interests, disclosures, but many, many other suggestions that people had to strengthen our ethics laws. We just had an example this week of how positive changes can come about through bipartisan commissions. We just passed a pension consolidation effort that was the result of much collaboration by many people. We

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

can do the same with ethics. So I commend the Leader for bringing forward this Bill, and I look forward to the work of the commission."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

"Thank you. Leader Harris, we had a discussion in Executive Committee this morning and I'd just like to draw the full Body's attention to this. This Bill was filed overnight, immediately released by the Rules Committee, assigned to the Executive Committee and ready for a vote. I think we're familiar with how that can happen around here. Things can move quickly sometimes. But I want to show you the opposite side of that coin. I filed, on October 29 of this year, House Bill 3947. That's 17 days ago. This Bill would make it impermissible for a Member of the General Assembly to be a paid lobbyist in the State of Illinois. It's a pretty straightforward concept. It's directly related to the widespread federal corruption probe that's running through our state. So I introduced the Bill. I made it publicly available for inspection for comment. I went out and got cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. There were Democrats and Republicans who've cosponsored it. And in questions from the press, folks from both parties have indicated support for that. In fact, a lot of times the response has been, I can't believe that's not illegal already. So my question for Leader Harris is... you're also the Chairman of the Rules Committee. Besides introducing a Bill that's timely and relevant that addresses an important public concept, making that language

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

available to the public, recruiting bipartisan cosponsors, what does a Representative have to do to get a vote on a Bill out of the Rules Committee?"

- Harris: "Representative, I think what we're trying to do here is move all of these ideas, both ones that we personally think are good or ones who we personally might have problems with. And I think in your Bill, I... as I look at that, there... the problem would be that it would ban Members of the General Assembly from talking to any of their local elected officials, even if there's no compensation. And I think that's a flaw. But..."
- Demmer: "Wouldn't it be great if there was a mechanism in a Legislative Body to debate these issues in a public forum, provide Amendments or alternative language, and come to a resolution?"
- Harris: "And I think that as we move forward into next year, we're moving this into a reform commission and that's exactly what I hope will happen, not... involving not only Members of the Legislature, but also Members of the Governor's Office who has a great deal of involvement in these kinds of issues, also the Attorney General, also the Secretary of State who enforces and implements these issues."
- Demmer: "In this Bill is there any behavior that, if enacted, would no longer be allowed?"
- Harris: "In this Bill there are requirements that would have to be met. It does not outlaw..."
- Demmer: "But no behavior that's currently allowed? Nothing that would no longer be allowed?"

Harris: "That's correct."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Demmer: "Okay. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. It's very important have thorough, thoughtful, and deliberative discussions about ethics issues. It's also important that when we see glaring problems that we act quickly to address them. I didn't introduce a lobbying... a General Assembly lobbying ban 12 hours ago. I didn't get the treatment of getting it assigned to a committee immediately, scheduled for a hearing immediately, any Amendments to it processed immediately. In fact, the Bill that I introduced has been languishing for 17 days in the Rules Committee despite bipartisan support for it, and despite widespread public support, and frankly, widespread disbelief that the practice is even currently allowed. When we look at what this federal corruption probe has brought to light, it's a combination of things that we need to do immediately and a larger cultural discussion we have to have to reform the entire way that we do business here in Springfield. What this Bill proposes today, though, is simply to add paperwork to it. I think it's clear to the people of Illinois, the cure for corruption is not more paperwork. The cure for corruption is not another searchable database online. Those databases exist today, yet the kinds of behaviors that are, in some cases, indictable and in other cases unethical still persist at various levels of government. This cannot be another opportunity for us to keep our heads down and hope the storm blows over. We're in the midst of what's probably the most widespread federal corruption probe ever to be undertaken in our state with serious issues, serious ethical lapses. Lapses that will land some people in jail, other people having resigned their

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

positions. This is a very significant issue and we owe it to the people of Illinois to show them that we're taking it seriously. When we walk out of here today, if this is the only Bill we pass, when we walk out of here still today and constituents ask us, is it still allowed for a Member of the General Assembly to be a paid lobbyist? Yes. Is it still permissible for a Committee Chairman to squash a Bill with bipartisan support because a campaign donor or a somebody they have a side deal with doesn't like it? The answer is still yes. Is it okay for a Chairman of a powerful committee to lobby the very agency whose budget they control and not have any public record of it? The answer is still yes. Is it allowed for a Member of the General Assembly who resigns from his seat amid a federal corruption indictment to still exercise a weighted vote choice to choose his own successor? The answer is still yes. When we answer yes to all of these glaring problems, do you think the people of Illinois will believe that we're taking ethic reform seriously? Or do you think instead they'll say, typical Springfield behavior again. They've done window dressing. They've thrown paperwork at the problem. And they put together a blue ribbon commission whose report will be ignored, whose recommendations will end up on a shelf somewhere gathering dust until the next shoe drops in this investigation, which it surely will. Let's take a real stand to make progress on the issues that we know exist and show the people of Illinois that we're going to deal with these issues in a frank, straightforward, and above board wav."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Caulkins."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

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

Caulkins: "Leader Harris, thank you. I watched your meeting today. It was 10 months ago that I met my fellow freshmen. We came here together full of hope, full of change. We wanted to do what's right. We were looking forward to making Illinois better, bringing our positions, bringing our backgrounds, and trying to reform the process that has garnered this state, the reputation of the second-most corrupt state in the nation. This is a very disappointing day. It's our last day in Session. I have to say, this reminds me... this process of Penn & Teller. All of a sudden, out of nowhere appears a Bill that is going to take the place of some very substantive legislation that's been addressed or has been filed that could allow this House to take substantive steps to correct that perception. And I'm very disappointed. If I could ask you about House Bill 3948. I know that that Bill has been brought up before, and this is the Bill that would ban Members of the General Assembly, their spouse, and their immediate live-in relatives from lobbying local government units. Would you support that Bill, Sir?"

Harris: "I'll have to read through the specific language of how it's written. I would also say to you, Representative, that I've raised the same issue I raised a few moments ago, that while it is easy to talk in sound bites about a lot of these issues, it's very complicated to put them into legislation without unintended consequences. So as you talk about banning somebody from being a lobbyist, the question is, what is a lobbyist? Is it just for the purposes of State Government?

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Does our definition right now capture all those people who might have worked, calling themselves some other name, but still deriving the influence and the benefit of the job? How does it affect folks who might be registered at a local level? Or what happens in communities where there's no definition at all? So I think we've got to go through all those questions and answer them sequentially, carefully, and thoughtfully."

Caulkins: "And you just addressed the issues, Sir. That Bill has never been given an opportunity to be addressed. Those questions have never been asked or given an opportunity to be asked. A bipartisan effort has never been given an opportunity to come to light or we can all come together and agree on what the terms of lobbyists are. But I think we all agree, we should all agree, that as a Member of this Body we should not be lobbyists. And I think that's the point. And... it's very ... it disappoints me that we find ourselves here, in the last hour of the last day, talking about a commission that we've done over and over again that the people of this state, the people of the United States recognize that this state does not seriously take the opportunity to address the corruption that exists here. To the Bill, please. This Bill is an attempt to move this issue off the table until next March at the earliest. It is imperfect. It is a way to avoid having to answer the questions to take the action that we need to take to cleanup this Body, this building. I will vote for your Bill because it is something rather than nothing, but I cannot overly state my disappointment that this is just another shadow on this Body. Thank you for your time."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just going to the Bill. I'll first thank the Chairman of the Executive Committee this morning for what he accurately depicted as an opportunity for us to discuss the Bill without time limits, without the ability to... or to... just the ability to have an open discussion with the Leader, Leader Harris, about what's going on in the Bill. And I want that in some context for everyone who's here because the language that we're referring to was filed around midnight last night. There was no staff analysis available for the Republicans in the caucus... in the... it's our caucus room, but in Room 118 during the Executive Committee. So going off of the language that we had to read, we did our best to provide real, thoughtful concerns and actually provide suggestions to Leader Harris about that Bill. And I think there was some good give and take on that. And, Greg, I think you'd agree with that. But I want to share the concern I have that when we do that and we realize there's things we can improve on a Bill and a caucus meeting occurs and things get pulled from the Bill, I would've appreciated that before filing the Amendment we could've spent a few minutes together, probably eliminated some of this debate, maybe made the Bill a little bit better, taken just a little bit of time to collaborate on an Amendment that we could be seeing right now instead of the one we have in front of us. I think we all agree, ethics is not a partisan issue. We all want, and our state deserves, a collaborative, balanced approach to ethics reform. We deserve it. Illinois needs it. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I'm actually proud that our Leader is on the floor today while we're discussing ethics reform. But I'd like to know when are we going to end this culture of people don't count and insiders do? When are we going to start tackling the structural source of corruption in this state? I saw the initial version of the ethics proposal and your task force and your statement of economic interest provisions and I'm like, okay. It's weak tea, but it's a start. It's not the beginning of the end. It's not the end of the beginning, but it's at least a start. But this really is just pathetic. We've got a Governor under federal investigation, a Chief Justice married to an indicted Chicago Alderman, Legislators indicted, the FBI actually raided an office in this building, people are potentially wearing wires, and this is the best we can do? So, congratulations. We're going to pass a Bill today. So everyone can go home on your side of the aisle and pat themselves on the back and say, yes, I did something for ethics reform. But let's be clear, you're still protecting your insiders. Now while we're on the topic of ethics and reform, let's talk about some of our proposed reforms that you refused to take up that were targeted at what drives corruption in this state. HB322 and 323, to repeal red light cameras. Status, Rules Committee. HB361, penalties for ethics violation. Status, Rules Committee. HB2310, giving our assessors more power to investigate property tax fraud. Status, Rules Committee. HB2514, here's a tax that even Democrats apparently didn't like, a revolving door tax for lobbyists. You work for a state for a while, write some rules, then you cash in when you leave

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

the place and go to work for the place you regulated. Stuck in Rules. HB2508, making sure the signatures match when you pull a ballot. We can give students two hours off to go vote, but we can't make sure our signatures match and require an ID when they don't? HB2513, making sure you took the dead people off the rolls, still stuck in Rules. All these Bills have been there since January. You could've done it and you didn't. So this Body's priorities on display during this Veto Session have been awful. Republicans did the legwork for you. We attempted to address these problems that are driving corruption and not a single Bill we filed has been given its fair shot. And when you won't take up our Bills, you're not addressing the endemic disease of corruption here Springfield. You don't need a task force to know that lawmakers shouldn't be able to simultaneously serve as lobbyists. And to say you're confused about the definition, when we get all kinds of problematic Bills all the time and you guys promise to fix it with a trailer Bill, is absurd. You don't need a task force to know we need more transparency when it comes to potential conflicts of interest. This doesn't require study. It just requires a 'yes' vote, and you won't bring it to the floor. So instead you've run out the clock. And you're going to pass a fake law to make you feel good, but in the real world you've made us a nationwide laughingstock because you won't clean house. We're trying to be serious in dealing with it, and we don't understand why you won't join us if you're truly acting in good faith and not to protect some people who aren't on the floor today. And to the people who count on us to do right by them, I don't

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

care which side of the political aisle you're on, you should not give this Body more power. You should not give us more money because we've given you nothing to say you should trust us to do the best for what's... you need here in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

McDermed: "Does this Bill address anything with respect to disclosure by lobbyists of their income and their sources of income?"

Harris: "It does not."

McDermed: "Okay. Do you know whether Governor Pritzker still supports this Bill now that it's such a weak output from the Illinois General Assembly?"

Harris: "I hope he will."

McDermed: "Even though he's called for some ethics reform and this is the best we can offer him, you think he's still on board?"

Harris: "Well, I know the Governor is totally on board with the idea of a thoughtful, comprehensive approach to reform in the State of Illinois. And I think as many speakers have said, this is a first step."

McDermed: "It's a teeny-tiny first step and the word comprehensive should not be associated with this Bill in any respect. Is there any reason to think that the Secretary of State, who has some significant duties under this Bill, will be able to do this any better than they've been able to do Real ID, which has been a complete debacle?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Harris: "I believe the Secretary of State's disclosure division has a very stellar record. They've always been responsive to us. Their Web sites are reporting, always seems to work. Yeah. I think it's a different division than Real ID."
- McDermed: "Okay. Let's hope that's true. And now I have a question... I have actually three questions for the Clerk. I'd love to know the status of House Bill 878."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative, we can get that information on our laptops. We're not going to be checking statuses."
- McDermed: "Okay. The reason that I am asking for the status of my ethics Bills, which are 878, 879, and 2688, is because all these Bills were filed in January and now reside in Rules Committee. And I think that people in this ... on this floor and people at home need to understand that these ethics Bills were to be worked on by like a subgroup. And there was to be an omnibus ethics Bill come out at the end of Session. And all of us who had ethics Bills on both sides of the aisles were asked to work with this group, and that later on in Session, we would be coming up with some ethics responses. And now it's the last day of Session, to the best of my knowledge, this group has never met and never discussed Bill one. So my question to the Sponsor is, why should any of us who've been working on ethics Bills... actually I've been working on them all the five years I've been here and not a one has seen the light of day outside of Rules Committee... why would we trust that this so-called commission is going to be any different than anything else that has happened in the last five years and in particular, this year, when we were supposed to be working on an ethics omnibus? Why should I

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

trust this? Why should my voters and my constituents at home trust?"

Harris: "I just want to remind you there are a lot of working groups and task forces whether it be on sexual harassment, ethics, and discrimination where we have all worked together, where there has been a very good work product at the end. Certainly, we'd do the same kind of thing on Medicaid and hospital assessments. So I think we have good records of working together on issues. And I hope that this commission, as it goes forward, will model those efforts and be very productive."

McDermed: "I'm going to beg to differ with you, at least with respect to ethics. That's never happened. And a good behavior... a good predictor of future behavior is past behavior. So I don't have any faith. And I don't think any of our voters at home have any faith that we're going to do this. I think that the... we're not really talking about... well everybody else is talking about it, so let's just talk about it. The commission has a due date of March 31. Now how many continuances of commissions have we already passed today? Yeah, we've already passed some today. So is there any reason to think that once we're past the Primary in March, with this March 31 due date, is there any reason that anybody here in this room or anybody at home that's listening to this thinks that there won't be continuances of this so-called blue ribbon commission until after the November election? Why do we think that would happen?"

Harris: "Was that a statement or a question?"

McDermed: "It's a rhetorical question..."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Harris: "Okay."

McDermed: "...because everybody knows it's not going to happen. What's happening here is some window dressing, it's some wallpapering of a big, ugly, festering wound on the State of Illinois. And if anybody thinks that this is an actual good faith, hardcore attempt to address the ethical violations in this state, they're gravely mistaken. This is just one more kick the can down the road effort of this General Assembly. Nobody on our side of the aisle is fooled by it. I don't think any of the voters in my district are fooled by it. I would love for it to have some results. I ain't holding my breath. The federal bus is backing up and this isn't going to stop it at all."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Greg. Just a... you mentioned that this legislation here, this Amendment has some definitions. Can you help me out here? What's the definition of a lobbyist?"

Harris: "The state has a very good and comprehensive definition of a lobbyist. I think the references I was making was to the fact that there are different definitions in other municipalities and localities around the state, and some don't have them at all. Going back to the state's definition, there are some who would say that there are people who come down here and call on us, pushing different positions who are not registered as lobbyists but who refer to themselves as consultants or some other name. And we might want to consider

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

broadening the definition of what a lobbyist is to be sure we encompass all those who do certain kinds of work."

Skillicorn: "And what's the definition of a lobbying entity?"

Harris: "Okay. So, lobbying entity means any entity that hires, retains, or employs, or compensates a natural person to lobby State Government as provided in subsection (e)."

"Thank you. And just above that is actually the Skillicorn: legislation's definition of a lobbyist, which I believe your name is on, so I thank you for that. So earlier this morning, we were talking about the legislation that was filed last night... and I'm pulling up a previous Amendment here... and it had that disclosure. And frankly, I thought this disclosure a very, very small step, something that wasn't comprehensive enough. But when I read this, I was prepared to vote for it. So when I'm reading about having to file economic interest above \$5 thousand and list out assets, it actually asked if a Legislator was a lobbyist on this disclosure. I supported that. I thought that... this is... I thought was small, but I could make a compromise and go, okay, this is a first step. I can support this. I was very disappointed when I heard of this Amendment took this disclosure out. Very disappointed because, Greg, this was good work. I think we could've voted for this today and passed it. And I thank you for that, but I'm disappointed that was taken out. So, the next part is that this task force, when is it supposed to report to Legislature?"

Harris: "March 31 of 2020."

Skillicorn: "And is that before or after the Primary?"

Harris: "What day is the Primary?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Skillicorn: "March 17."

Harris: "Then it would be after."

Skillicorn: "Okay. So it is possible that former Representative Arroyo's replacement could be seated and possibly win a Primary before this report even comes out?"

- Harris: "I do not know how their appointment process is going to go. I know that on our side the Speaker has strongly indicated that if Representative Arroyo... former Representative Arroyo, in his role as committeeman, were to participate in the selection of an appointment that that person would be prevented from entering the House or that actions would be taken to remove him because I think the Speaker wants to be absolutely sure that whoever would come to us to fill that seat would not have any shadow over them."
- Skillicorn: "And it's pretty clear that one of the things that former Representative Arroyo was doing is he was acting as a lobbyist while he was also a Legislator. So is there anything in this Amendment that we're voting on today that would prevent that?"
- Harris: "And again, you get the definitions, Representative, of different kinds of lobbyist. Currently, a Member here cannot lobby in this state for compensation. But at the local level, it would be different and different, yet again, in areas where they don't even define what a lobbyist is. So all of these things, in my view, if you're just asking my personal view, as we move forward, I think these things need to be tightened up."
- Skillicorn: "Thank you for expressing that. And it's pretty clear that some of the unethical behaviors that Representative...

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

former Representative Arroyo was doing is that he was acting as a paid lobbyist while he was a Legislator. Greg, do you consider this a bold and progressive reform?"

Harris: "I think of this as a tiny, first step to a long overdue process that will take place over the next couple months to go through all of these Acts in a comprehensive and careful way and bring back a wide variety of fixes."

Skillicorn: "And to the Bill. I just want to list off a couple ethics Bills that I have introduced. First one is HB3956, next one is 3957, and the last one is HB3958. All are currently sitting, referred to Rules Committee, and they're not moving. It sounds like there are over a dozen Bills that my colleagues have filed, yet they're not moving. Governor Pritzker has said that this is a number one opportunity and here... number one thing to do with Veto Session. Literally, while we were driving down to Veto Session two weeks ago, we were listening to the radio about former Arroyo being arrested, yet we have now completed two weeks. This is the last moments... this is the eleventh hour of Veto Session, people. And we amended a Bill that had real reforms to just get a... a task force. So ... and really the question comes down to Legislators that are lobbying. So I'm going to ask is there anyone in this Body that is a paid lobbyist? Please raise your hand. If you're a... lobbyist. Please, I want to see it. I'm asking everybody. Everybody. So, I'll repeat the question. Is anyone here a paid lobbyist? Please raise your hand. I'm seeing no hands. So maybe there's no conflict of interest, everyone is operating in an ethical manner. We will see. I'm going to call out for Governor Pritzker to call for

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

a Special Session. We cannot wait until after the Primary. Think about this. There is going to be former Representative Arroyo, who might work on putting someone into his chair and then running the Primary Election, yet he is under indictment. We are not going to have a report from this commission until March 31. Governor Pritzker, you're listening. We need a Special Session. We need to come back in a week and get this done. This is unacceptable. We cannot wait until March 31 to do something. We... who else is going to get arrested before March 31, people? Laugh all you want. This is ethics. People don't trust this Body. So, Governor, it's your call. If you ignore this, you're ignoring a serious problem. And who else is going to get arrested before that day?"

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Stava-Murray." Stava-Murray: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm disappointed that this ... to the Bill. I'm disappointed that this Bill is in narrow scope as it is and I wish that we were doing more sooner. I think that I'm also disappointed at the partisan rhetoric that we're hearing quite a bit from across the aisle. And I think it's a bit rich, no pun intended, that for some Members who just yesterday voted against lowering insulin prices and whose constituents were very displeased with that vote and they themselves have economic interests that perhaps conflict or maybe legal conflicts of interest with campaign donations. We need to be looking at comprehensive reform, not only about lobbyists and revolving door policies, which I'll note is also not a partisan issue as my predecessor is already a lobbyist. So this isn't something that's on one side of the aisle or the other, but we need comprehensive reform that

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

also includes election reform and campaign finance reform and ensuring that our votes aren't tied to contributions that we receive. So I think there's many reforms. I'm disappointed that we don't have the statement of economic interest portion in this Bill. I think that when we do... someone's referred from across the aisle dismissively, a bunch of forums on the internet, but as a constituent before I was in office, I looked to those forms to see where my Representative might have interest that aren't the voters. And so, I think we do need these forms. We need the information available to the public to see who we're really representing at the end of the day. And I think that as government employees many of us believe that we should just represent the people. And yet, these conflicts of interest persist and need to be looked at more comprehensively."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. We have spent a lot of time today in this debate talking about low-hanging fruit. I think that the proposal that is in front of us right now doesn't even rise to that level. I think we're picking up dead apples on the ground. I don't think this thing does anything, but I'm going to vote for it because you know why? I want to put the stamp, the imprimatur of where we are now with ethics reform in this state because in the next week to 10 days to month, when the front page of the Tribune shows somebody else from our chamber being marched into Federal Court, I want to be able to tell my constituents straight to their face that this is the kind of ethics reform that your Legislature demands. Task forces. Let's look at it. Let's

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

look at all the Bills. There's plenty of things out here that we could've done. We've got over 30 Bills that we have proposed in the last year that deal with ethics reform. We've heard where they are right now. They're all languishing in Rules Committee. We know what's going on here. There are people protecting other people. And you know something? I'm tired of it. I am not going to stand by and be happy with what we're voting on today, but you know something? If I don't vote for it, it's going to come back and haunt me come next year. That's because that's the way things work around here. We always deal toward the next election. We're always dealing toward where can we get an angle, politically, economically. The people of this state look to us and they lack trust. They lack trust. They look at us and they see a handout. Somebody grease my palm. I can do something for you. That's not why we're here. That's not why I'm here. I hope it's not why is here, but unfortunately, that's anybody else perception that we get from people in our districts who look at us and say, you're part of that mess down there, and why in the hell don't you fix it? Well today's actions are a tiny step toward something that will probably never be fully envisioned, never fully done. Yeah, I'm going to vote for this Bill simply because I don't want to have a mailer come at me in July saying I don't back ethics reform, but I am not going to be silent in my district saying exactly how dissatisfied I am with this Bill. The people of Illinois deserve better and they have gotten nothing but worse from us. Both sides of the aisle need to look at this thing and say, okay, who's next? Where's the hammer going to fall next?

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Maybe we go back to being a territory. Maybe that's what will solve our problems because I'll tell you what, we don't seem to be able to solve them here. We shovel them off to task forces. We shovel them off to groups that issue reports that are left on shelves and to gather dust. Nothing's going to come of this. Nothing's going to come of this because we have an election on March 17 and that's more important than getting the job done today. I'm disgusted by this. I'm disgusted by the fact that we have to do it. I'm disgusted by the fact that we actually have to be standing here talking about one of our former Members being frog-marched into Federal Court for doing something that no person with any common decency would even dream of doing. You know, it was said many years ago that if men were angels they wouldn't need government. Well, unfortunately, men are not angels. We do need government. But, unfortunately, this is not the government we need. Thanks very much."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since we're not calling status of a Bill, but House Bill 3939 I just filed. It prohibits commissions on gaming. It was filed in October. House Bill 3818, the same Bill, was filed in the 100th General Assembly, January 8, 2019. Also prohibited commissions on gaming. 99th General Assembly, House Bill 6621, January 10, 2017, also prohibited commissions on gaming and gaming contracts. It's no secret, every reporter that's called, I've talked to him, and, yes, I am registered as a lobbyist that I do at the City of Chicago. But I don't lobby the council. But I over... I over disclose. I'm basically a paper pusher, but under the

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

definition I have to. So, I resigned my City of Chicago job and took a large pay cut so I can be a full-time Legislator. But your Comptroller and our Comptroller stopped paying me. So I had no choice but to go and work for a company to do building permits. I am okay with voting with Leader Demmer's Bill that says no lobbyists. I'm okay with that. It's right, we should... I'm okay with that, but I have House Bill 38... but the hypocrisy of some Legislators that own companies that have state contracts. State contracts. I see Legislators introducing legislation regarding their business. How is that ethical? Their own business. They pass legislation that affects their own business. How's that ethical? House Bill 3862. House Bill 3862 basically should be done for every Bill. I'm going to put Bills together that's called grand slam Bills to prevent grandstanding. I can't take credit for that, someone else said that. But you keep filing Bills that say you're for term limits. Why am I still seeing your face? Why do I keep seeing your face every term? What's the hypocrisy? Don't our state deserve better if you file a Bill? Live by those words. If you believe in term limits, I don't want to see you here in January. But I'm going to be nice. House Bill 3862 allows you to actually finish out the term. So stop with this hypocrisy. Here, I want to be full-time Legislator. I haven't made... I did a little building permits. I didn't make much money. Everything is listed on the Web site. Every dollar. But that little dollar I make, it's worth the sum of your belt buckles. So don't tell me... some of you work for hospitals, some of you law firms, all that stuff, everyone. I want to be a full-time Legislator, but you won't even give

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

me a raise. You wouldn't even give me a COLA, a simple thousand dollars. I want to be a full-time Legislator. I'm not a millionaire. Jesus Christ, I had to drive Uber but it wasn't enough. So I had to fill... I had to go and ask for a company to allow me to do building permits for them and I signed up as a building expeditor, but I said you know what? I better register as a lobbyist too, just in case. Just in case. I didn't have to, but I did. So if you want people, honest people... I'm... consider myself... I don't want... a simple COLA. That's all I ask. I have no problem being a full-time Legislator. You want to do it? Cut all businesses out. I'm okay with that. I don't sit on Human Services Committee and work for a hospital that affects something on the Bill. I don't see people there. I don't work for tech... I don't own my business and pass Bills that affect the business. And Jesus Christ, there's people over there that are worth hundreds of millions in dollars and grandstands because he gives up a thousand dollar raise. Jesus Christ, give up your whole damn pay. Give up your whole damn insurance. Don't tell me that you got other people that when I leave here I can't work and do something. No, you need to allow middle class people to be full-time Legislators. But don't sit there with the hypocrisy of introducing Bills and then I still see your face every term. Every legislation that we introduce, I say we put my language into effect. If you sponsor it, you live by that law. You are binded by that signature that you signed that piece of paper for sponsorship. You truly want to be honest? You want to be ... you want State of Illinois to trust you? Then live by your words that you introduce. Don't just stand there

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

and grand slam... grandstand, all right? So I expect not to see your face here next Session in January if you sign on legislation for term limits and you've reached your term limit. Live by your words. Thank you, Madam Chairman."

Speaker Manley: "And now our final speaker, Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Does every seat have a speak button? Okay, it's rhetorical. It's yes. I'm referring to the cat-calling and some of the incidents that happened when Margo... when Representative McDermed spoke. There was some shouting, some cat-calling afterwards. This is a serious issue. I don't think that was taking it seriously. If they disagree, what Representative McDermed had to say, they have a speak button. You've been extremely generous during this debate by letting everybody speak out. And in the future, when we're having an issue like this, I think you should use your speak button to speak and not cat-call or shout at people and shout at other Members. And I do believe she is owed an apology. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Leader Harris to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Madam Speaker. And thanks to everyone who's spoken during debate. And to the point that folks made on the other side of the aisle about one of our Members who has... we've all seen him being arrested in newspaper. We've seen him leaving under a cloud. Sadly, we're in a situation where both sides of our aisle, in the last several months, have seen Members who have had to leave and resign and go out under a cloud. And on both sides of the aisle have folks who are embroiled in legal situations outside this chamber. And that's not a good thing. We've both seen

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

in... most of our living memories, each of us has seen a Governor who had to leave office or who was convicted of ethical crimes after leaving office. After each of those occasions, you're right, the Legislature has stepped forward and said, we're going to go ahead and we're going to try to fix those things within our power that we've seen and we've noticed. And we're going to try to fix them and we're going to try to make things better. And that's exactly what we're doing here because, yes, those things that have happened and the things that people are accused of doing, they were as surprising and disturbing to me as they were to you. But to someone to say, well we're not going to do it. We're going to try to politicize it. I think that's a mistake also. So we're in this unusual situation here on processing this Bill. And we see it all the time in Springfield. If you move something really fast, people get up and complain, oh my gosh, you're rushing things through. Where's the process? If you slow things down, if you stretch it out, people here say, oh my God, you're trying to kill it by just dragging it out and kicking the can. I wish there was a perfect way to accomplish massive change to massive laws that intersect with all different parts of our election law, our purchasing laws, our Administrative Procedures Act, our lobbyist laws, our disclosing laws, our campaign finance laws, our election laws. But these things also need to be get done very carefully because they're so complex and interrelated. So I appreciate everyone's speeches. I appreciate everyone's concern about this. I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1639 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 5 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today with great news and recognition of November as being Adoption Awareness Month. Adoption is an amazing thing, a miracle that we participate in. And many of us here, Representative Williams, Representative Sommer, Representative Ford, Representative Moeller, I know that there are a lot of Members here whose lives have been touched by adoption, celebrate today. In the State of New York, today Governor Cuomo will be signing a Bill similar to the Bill that we passed in Illinois. That in Illinois, we have provided 16 thousand adult adoptees a copy of their original birth certificate, which overall has been an incredible experience for many of us here, our families and honoring birth mothers and first families and also adoptive families for opening their hearts, their homes, and their lives to children in New York. We have ... in Illinois, I think we have given away 16 thousand birth certificates. We have held the trophy as being the largest expansion in the country, but starting tomorrow the State of New York is going to likely take that trophy away from us, and I am happy to give it to them and all of the New York adoptees. But, I also want to recognize the challenges we have here in the State of

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Illinois around foster care, child care, and adoption. And I know we've all been reading the newspaper of some of the challenges we have and I want to thank everyone who's been participating in the working group. Everybody's been giving their heart and soul to some very difficult situations on the Adoption & Child Welfare Committee. And I just want everyone to celebrate this wonderful, wonderful day and the children and the way we form families in Illinois through adoption. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, as so often happens for our staff members, they often move on to different roles after they've been with us for a certain amount of time. And we want to acknowledge one of our valued staff members, Miss Abigayle Dompke, who's going to be moving on to a higher position in the Governer's Office. And we have loved her dearly for a very long time and we will miss her dearly. And we want to wish her all the luck in the world on this new adventure and hope she comes back to visit us."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you for your work, Abby. Chair recognizes Leader Willis."

Willis: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Willis: "I hate having to stand right now and make an announcement like this on the House Floor, but once again the U.S. has been caught up with a school shooting. Santa Clarita High School in Santa Clarita, California had a shooting take place earlier this afternoon. When I last checked, there were two confirmed dead and seven others wounded. The gunman is in

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

custody at this time. These are the times I hate standing and asking for a moment of silence on the House Floor, but I am going to do that of this Body because I know you all have hearts that are in the right spot. But this just, once again, shows that we need to take gun violence seriously. Look at it, it is not something... it should not be a gun ownership or a non-gun ownership issue. It should not be a Republican or a Democrat issue. It should not be a Second Amendment thing. It is a public health issue and we need to look at it and find a way to stop having to stand on the House Floor for moments of silence like this, but I'm going to ask this Body to please give us a moment of silence for those affected by this mass shooting at Santa Clarita High School. Thank you."

- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Members. On the Supplemental Calendar #1, under Order of Resolutions, we have House Joint Resolution 93, offered by Leader Harris. Leader Harris. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris on the Amendment."
- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Joint Resolution number...
 oh, I'm sorry we have a Floor Amendment. Could we adopt the
 Amendment and debate the Bill... and debate the Resolution once
 amended?"
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to House Joint Resolution 93. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the companion to the Bill that we just discussed. As amended this would create a Joint Commission on Ethics and Lobbying Reform that would work through March 31 of 2020 to take public input, to gather information data, to analyze Bills from all the different chambers, to take testimony from members of the public as well as different executive agencies. In this amended version there would be two Members appointed by each Legislative Leader. There would be two Members from the Office of the Attorney General and two from the Secretary of State. In order to address some concerns that were raised about that giving to partisan of a advantage potentially, it would be required in the Amendment that the executive... Inspector General of the Secretary of State and the Inspector General of the Attorney General's Office, who are largely nonpartisan officers, would be designated as one of their appointees. In addition, there are four Members to be appointed by the Governor. In the previous version it said up to two Democrats and two Republicans could be appointed. In this new version, the Governor could appoint up to four Members of the Republican Party if he chose. At most two Democrats if he chose."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Durkin: "Representative Harris, we just went through the… you talked about the Amendment. So, what is actually going to be the total number of Members that will be seated? I can't do the math that quick."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Harris: "That would be 16."

Durkin: "Sixteen, okay. I think there were some concerns that were raised in the committee about the disproportionate number of Republicans 'cause we wanted to make this bipartisan, bicameral. Has that been solved with this Amendment?"

Harris: "It potentially could be solved. It's not a guaranteed solution."

Durkin: "I've read through the Resolution, there's a lot of whereases and a lot of resolves. It sounds very nice, sounds very official but what's going to make the difference is how this commission operates. I was critical of the date in which we were using for reporting. I think we can get this done within a matter of weeks. You know that's been debated before. It is what it is, the Majority Party can... you know, it's up to them to make those decisions. But I got some procedural questions about the commission. I think this is going to be important for... these people are going to walk in and say, what the heck are we supposed to do, how do we start? Is there anything in this report that states that there has to be an organizational meeting? Are we expecting them to have an organizational meeting?"

Harris: "I believe under the Open Meetings Act there are requirements of how meetings have to be... and to be subject to the Open Meetings Act have to be organized initially. It doesn't say that in this Act but I believe it references the Open Meetings Act."

Durkin: "Are we expecting them to adopt rules of process and procedure?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Harris: "I believe that that would be..."

Durkin: "'Cause that is not... we don't delineate, we don't indicate that within the Resolution."

Harris: "It does not delineate it in the Resolution."

Durkin: "But... would counsel be able to... do you believe that that is something that they will be required to do? If you're good counsel over here, young fellow over to your left."

Harris: "With a young fellow from your side talking to him?"

Durkin: "Fine... fine chaps."

Harris: "Find chaps."

Durkin: "Hey, Justin."

Harris: "I think that that was something they would work on."

Durkin: "All right. The question is, counsel over there, it's whether or not the… they're going to be required to adopt rules of process and procedure. Do you expect that to happen? Is that something covered over Open Meetings? Or Robert's Rules? I'd like to make sure these guys know they have some direction and some reference."

Harris: "So... Mr. Cox is telling me it is not required that those be adopted by the Open Meetings Act, but I would think that one of the first orders of business would be for the commission to adopt some operating principles and procedures stating when and how often and how meetings were run."

Durkin: "That would be great. And I think for purposes of intent,

I want to make sure that that is what we are asking them to
do to set up some type of process of how to move forward. I
think that we can cover that. Is there anything in here that
prohibits me from appointing myself to the commission?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Harris: "Not that... unless you're a registered lobbyist with the State of Illinois, no."

Durkin: "I didn't raise my hand when it was asked earlier."

Harris: "Okay, well, then you're good."

Durkin: "How about the Speaker? Same rule apply to him, he could serve on the commission?"

Harris: "That is true."

Durkin: "A President and the Senate Minority, okay... Minority Leader. So we, in theory, could do that. A couple questions, now we... this commission is going to be asked to issue report by the end of March but they will also be allowed to issue interim reports, correct?"

Harris: "That's my understanding."

Durkin: "And what is the need for that? And what is the basis of that?"

Harris: "I think we wanted to be sure not to foreclose an option.

It's not required, it's permissible."

Durkin: "And would the purpose of the interim report to be if we...
if they come to a quick conclusion on a matter, it says to
the Legislature you can move forward, we're comfortable with
this and they want us to be able to jump in and take those
recommendations and move as quick as possible."

Harris: "Yeah, you could also... that could be a case. You could also see a case where earlier toward the middle of the process there comes agreement on a handful of issues and rather than wait for final report, perhaps they would issue recommendations at that point."

Durkin: "If there is dissent, any dissent within this commission, will a report still be issued?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Harris: "It's my understanding that the way these things usually work... and this is not spelled out in this Bill... that there are reports and there are minority reports if there is a disagreement."
- Durkin: "I just wish we would have some type of at least provision in here. It's too late, but I know that we can't expect them to agree on anything, but one thing is whether or not they will be able to issue a dissenting report either in the interim basis or with the final report."
- Harris: "There is nothing here that would prohibit that. And as I said, in my experience with these things those are usually very standard things. That some people... and sometimes there may be more than one dissension report for different reasons."
- Durkin: "Right. I would just hope that can articulate that in some way to this commission that they have that option if they go down that path."

Harris: "Understood."

Durkin: "So, we're talking 14 Members or 16 Members?"

Harris: "My lawyer, who is my accountant, says 16."

Durkin: "Sixteen, okay. Do we... are we just going strictly on majority votes to determine whether or not a report is going to be issued?"

Harris: "That's not spelled out, but that... and under most of our rules and under Robert's Rules, the majority would rule."

Durkin: "All right. Last question... well, yeah, last question. If there is a tie with the commission on a particular interim report or the final report what happens?"

Harris: "They would not issue one of those reports."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Durkin: "Okay. All right. I think that's all I have for purposes of the commission and how they're going to operate. I said earlier that I'm always suspect of some of these commissions. And when we have issues at hand that we can address quickly as a Body, we're better off taking care of them at this moment. We don't have that option. We're going to have to just rely on these individuals to do what is... what we should've done this past week. I think... again, and I'll go back to my earlier statements and I'll just close by saying, folks, I am going to support this but we have missed, we have missed an opportunity to restore faith in Illinois. We have missed an opportunity to tell our constituents that we take the issues that are going on in this chamber and across the hallway seriously, and we're not going to wait and delay. I'm going to support this begrudgingly, but folks, we're walking out of here with missing an opportunity for us to ensure the public that we can police ourselves and we can actually do something that's ethically proper, which has been lacking for months, without having to ask people from the outside to take months to study the issue. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "Members, the Chair is going to go to a three minute timer. Chair recognizes Leader Hernandez."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Resolution. I think it's really important and I thank the Leader for the Resolution. It's very important... that we put this commission together and that we work in a bipartisan effort. We, right now, live in a time that the public deserves from us, that we take it very, very serious. That we take the steps to ensure that the integrity of our elected roles, that we are held

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

responsible. We need to restore the trust and faith of the public. So, I really truly appreciate Leader Harris for bringing this Resolution. And in all seriousness, we really deserve to give the public back some response to this horrific time, I feel, that we're having to deal with. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, Leader Harris, I'm glad you got to get a restroom break between these two pieces of legislation, so. Just real quickly I want to make a statement in response to some of the comments on the previous legislation. It often gets referred to as a Springfield issue or Springfield ethics or a Springfield problem. This isn't a problem for my community, this is a problem for the entire state, from Chicago to Cairo, and we're all responsible for it. The problems happen in Chicago. The problems happen in Southern Illinois. And, please, when you refer to this don't denigrate my community by saying it's a Springfield problem.

I have a few questions of the Majority Leader, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Butler: "Thank you. Greg, can you walk me through this Amendment real quick 'cause I don't think I quite understood what you said. So, there's two Members appointed by the Speaker, two Members appointed by the President, two Members by both Minority Leaders. And now we've changed it from this morning to where the Attorney General... two Members from the Office of Attorney General, one of whom shall be Inspector General... Executive Inspector General for the Attorney General, correct?"

Harris: "Yes."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Butler: "And then the other person, the appointee of the Office of Attorney General, is that... so that's a staff member of the office?"
- Harris: "That would be either the Attorney General himself or his designee from his staff."
- Butler: "Okay. And the same thing for Secretary of State..."

Harris: "Yes."

- Butler: "...Executive Inspector General and then... and then staff?"
- Harris: "And then whoever it is, the Secretary would designate, yeah."
- Butler: "Or the secretary, okay. And I... I think I must have misheard you 'cause I thought you said that the Governor could appoint up to four Republican Members?"
- Harris: "Four Members appointed by the Governor with no more than two of the appointments from the same political party as the Governor. But no more than two."
- Butler: "Okay. So what... I thought what I heard you say earlier was there could be up to four Republican Members appointed by the Governor."
- Harris: "The way I read it, he could appoint as long..."

Butler: "All four."

- Harris: "...as long as he... he could choose no more than two Democrats but he could choose four independents or four Republicans or a mix."
- Butler: "Okay. So to the questions we asked in committee this morning, how is someone's party affiliation determined to know whether or not they are a Member of the party of the Governor or opposing party or things like that?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Harris: "And you know I've talked to lawyers, I've talked to different people in the political world, there's not a hard and fast way that anyone is identified me to determine other than self-disclosure. You know, who is a Republican or a Democrat."

Butler: "Well, we have..."

Harris: "There's some who say you could go back and look at voting records, but then there's a question of how many records count."

Butler: "Well, we have... so, we have boards and commissions that are in place currently that are... that are subject to a partisan makeup. You can only have X amount of Republicans, you can only have X amount of Democrats."

Harris: "And I think in those cases it's a self-reporting kind of things or a self-policing kind of thing."

Butler: "I'm not sure about that."

Harris: "Well, but when..."

Butler: "When I've talked to the State Board of Elections, I'm..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Butler, Representative Murphy is going to give you his three minutes. Please continue."

Butler: "Thank you. Thank you. Obviously the State Board of Elections has the partisan breakdown because they can look to see if you voted in a Primary. So... I mean, I'm really concerned about this issue because someone can say they're Democrat or Republican but they... how do you... how do you know if we don't have a hard and fast rule on this?"

Harris: "Well if you recall in committee that question came up and I said... I assume you would go and look at their voting history. And I... somebody in the committee, I can't remember

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

if it was Republican or Democrat, said well, how many elections do they have to vote in?"

Butler: "Right."

Harris: "I don't know what the right standard is."

Butler: "So, for example... you know... I mean, if you look at my voting record, and it's commonly referred to as a four of four, I have four for Republican Primary Elections on my record. Sangamon County, however, the really unique thing because people were urged to vote in the Republican Primary during Governor Rauner's terms. The Unions urged crossover votes to go vote in the Republican Primary. So, somebody in Sangamon County may have a very unique voting record when it comes to determining what their record is. So, I would say having some sort of standard, maybe having a four of four might be the way to go, but that's... I mean, this is one of the flaws I think of this that probably needs, hopefully some more help maybe in the Senate tonight, who knows. The cochairs of the commission, who appoints the cochairs?"

Harris: "The Democratic Leader of both chambers... Majority Leader."

Butler: "So, the Speaker appoints one cochair and the Senate President appoints another cochair?"

Harris: "Yes."

Butler: "Is that correct?"

Harris: "Yes."

Butler: "Is the Senate President a registered lobbyist?"

Harris: "Not in the State of Illinois."

Butler: "Not in the State of Illinois?"

Harris: "Not in the... he is not registered as a lobbyist for the State of Illinois."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Butler: "But he is a registered lobbyist in Illinois?"

Harris: "He may be a registered lobbyist who lives in Illinois,

who lobbies else... who may be registered elsewhere."

Butler: "He's registered with the City of Chicago as a lobbyist?"

Harris: "I don't know that of my own knowledge."

Butler: "Okay. So, we're allowing someone who's a lobbyist in the State of Illinois to appoint the cochair of this commission?"

Harris: "He is not a lobbyist under the Illinois Lobbyist Act."

Butler: "Okay. Again, like I said in... in committee this morning, we have the Property Tax Task Force that has four cochairs evenly divided among the caucuses. I think this is a really good opportunity to... for us to work in a bipartisan, maybe a nonpartisan manner, and have equal representation. This does not ensure equal representation. If this is a politically slanted commission, it will be a politically slanted report and it will be viewed that way by the public. We won't get to the root cause of the problems. There needs to be more balance. I... you know, again, I will vote for this cause this is a step forward, but hopefully we can address some of those situations."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Willis."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Willis: "Leader, this Bill is intent to actually look at, very comprehensively, issues and problems that we heard debated over the last hour that people wanted to have a knee-jerk reaction to. Is that not correct?"

Harris: "Well, I think we want to look at all the ideas that have been put forth in legislation, look at what others states

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

have done, bring in outside experts to testify and also hear from members of the public."

Willis: "Thank you, Sir. To the Bill. We have sat here and I have listened and many, many... everyone in this chamber has listened to all of the things that are wrong with ethics reform right now in the State of Illinois. We have to start somewhere and this is somewhere we have to do. I happen to sit on Legislative Ethics Commission and we oftentimes have seen where people have gotten caught into a unfortunate situation because of unintended consequences. Not that anybody is purposely doing anything wrong, but somebody put through a piece of legislation and didn't look at all the ramifications of what it would have. We've seen that happen many times here in this chamber, where we've had to come back and do clean up because we had unintended consequences of a Bill that we thought... everybody that puts through a Bill thinks it's the best Bill in the world, and they put it through with the best intentions, and then we see those unintended consequences. This is a place where we can look at that, we can take our time, we can compare what's going on in other places, we can really look at where we have flaws in our system. And my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you've brought to point many, many flaws that I totally agree with you on that we have in the system. But we need to make sure as we put them into statute that we don't have unintended consequences. That's what this Bill will do, it will give us a task force that I have the upmost faith in that will be as bipartisan as possible. And it doesn't necessarily mean that we have to have 100 percent equal numbers. I think that if everybody

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

comes together with the ultimate goal of making sure that we put into place true reforms that will affect everybody in this chamber and in elected office, I think we can have wonderful results. And so, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and those on this side of the aisle to have faith. Have faith that we can go through and do what we need to do and do it the right way. Instead of rushing it through, let's put some time into it, let's get the right people on this commission, and let's go forward with some true reforms that can help everybody. And I urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you so much."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, being put on a three minute timer... I mean, I believe that there's no more important issue that this General Assembly will face in ethics reform, and to limit debate on such a important topic for all of Illinois is disheartening."

Speaker Manley: "Would you like me to take the timer off?"

Wehrli: "Actually, yes."

Speaker Manley: "Then I will do that, Sir."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? So, we discussed in Executive Committee this morning the composition of JCAR. You're familiar with that, are you not?"

Harris: "Yes, I am."

Wehrli: "Why... we do some really good work. It's a bipartisan, bicameral and that committee does exemplary work because there is no majority. We are forced to work together to come up with solutions in a bipartisan, bicameral way. Why not scrap all this... things that are in this and put that system

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

in there to where there is no power play, there is no Supermajority? There's no majority, it's just everybody in a room working things out. Why not do that?"

- Harris: "Yeah, this... what we got here is a result of the fact that in the recent election the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, who were elected by vote of the people, both happen to be Democrats."
- Wehrli: "But why even include them? Why not just... this... we need to police ourselves. And we need to get outside testimony, but this is on us. It's not on the Attorney General. It's not on the Secretary of State."

Harris: "Actually..."

- Wehrli: "It's not on the Governor. It's not on the Judicial Branch. It's on us to do this."
- Harris: "Actually, Representative, these laws that we are going to be looking at affect the Executive Branch as well as the Legislative Branch. As well, they are implemented and policed by those agencies. And so, their participation is very valuable in the process."
- Wehrli: "I would agree that their participation in the process, but they can provide testimony, but they should not be telling us, the Members of the General Assembly, what is ethical or not. That's on us to establish that standard, which I would argue to this point so far has been pretty low. So, we have had task force in the past. So I'm not sure if you were here under the Blagojevich administration but Quinn had a task force that brought back some ethics reforms. What happened with those suggestions?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Harris: "Some were adopted. Some... I was here actually, and I'm just trying to remember the disposition of all of them. Some were adopted and some were not. Same after other incidents we've had down here where we've made some incremental progress and I hope this time we can make some more major progress."
- Wehrli: "Well, we need major progress because if you repeat... if you read newspaper reports at the time under that, that... we were... this Body was generally criticized for not doing enough on ethics reform. And then in 2014 Legislative Inspector General Homer, he left but he also left a letter of changes to strengthen ethics and reporting in Illinois. Did anything come out of that report?"
- Wehrli: "Well, it's... if you read the newspaper reports of that time, very little was actually acted upon at that point in time. And now we have Tom Cullerton in the Senate, Martin Sandoval in the Senate, we have the Luis Arroyo incident, we have example after example, and that's just what we know. I think everyone in this room and in this building understand that there's probably more indictments coming down. So, I'm glad we're finally going to act, but a previous speaker said that we were supposed to have faith. And believe it or not I do, I remain an optimist to this day and I will hopefully carry that forward. But, when we had opportunity to act in the past... and I mention them, the Quinn report, the Homer report... we did nothing or very little. So, when you say have faith, it's really hard to look at a task force and say, oh, this is really going to solve it. That on the backdrop of

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

we've had weeks and months to look at some of these things and we've just simply chosen not to. That's not acceptable. So well I'm going to support this. I... I remain an optimist, but let's get back to a point where it's a common conversation, where it's not dominated by partisan politics. Where it's not pushed out past a Primary strictly for campaign purposes. Let's mirror the JCAR model. It works, everybody's happy with what comes out of JCAR, usually. And it's something that should be exemplified here and not turned into some partisan bag of tricks that we're not really sure if I should have faith in it or not. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Grant."

Grant: "Thank you, Madame Chair. To the Resolution. As a freshman Legislator this past summer, I experienced what little our task forces actually produce. I am not going to be grandstanding, I'll be here just a little bit of time. We have limited opportunity here and our hands are tied, but you know fully well that this House Resolution to create a commission is nothing more than a way to slip ethics investigation under the rug. I wish I could be optimistic."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. On October 24 I introduced a Resolution, as well, to address the growing concerns that we all have here in the House on the ethical lapses of the House and the Senate, lobbyists, and many others. But, today, we again are being reactive and debate a Resolution that was filed in the final hours of our Veto Session. My Resolution, House Joint Resolution 87 that I discussed the last week of the Veto, has true bipartisan

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

cosponsors, support, and input from both parties. The public and the media has had a chance to review it, they've had a chance to weigh in, and a Resolution that is actually chaired by one Republican and one Democrat. Instead of debating my Resolution, which was again filed on 10/24, before the ball dropped in our House, you unfortunately introduced a very partisan and much weaker version. Your Resolution actually states in it, 'required to rise above partisan divides.' I agree with that statement, but this is not drafted with bipartisan or bicameral intent. It will be made up of a majority of Democrat Members and chaired only by Democrats. My Resolution states that public officials should be held to a higher ethical standard. My Resolution also clearly outlines the operational questions that Leader Durkin had at the beginning of this debate. Your language says that the trust of the citizens in their Government at all levels has recently been tested. Recently been tested. And Resolution I sponsored, HJR87, there is to be a 90 day turn around window for the task force to complete its work, with the aim of having recommendations for us to actually make true change when we come back in January. It's not conveniently going to be done after primaries. Ethical reform must start in this chamber. And I am happy that there is something, but extremely frustrated with the partisan language of this Resolution. And unfortunately, I feel it's going to be one of those commissions that is going to fail and do nothing to protect those that we swear to protect. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. One of the McDermed: things we've heard several times since we've been discussing this Resolution is that important things need to take time and because this is so important we need to take a little bit more time and we need to be more deliberate about that. Well, perhaps that's true, but we also know that when something is important, for example, a Capital Bill, for example, legalizing recreational cannabis, things can move pretty darn fast around here. How many trailer Bills have we passed this week for things that we passed quite quickly that came together in less than 24 hours last spring and now we're fixing them up with a little bit of a trailer Bill. If this issue of ethics were really important to the Majority Party in this chamber, if this issue were really important, if ethics were really important to the Governor, the attention would be placed on it that was placed on some of the things that were on their agenda and we would pass it. I think the fact that we're putting together a Resolution and a task force tells you exactly how important this is, which is not at all. But here's the thing, what's going on with the ethics, or the lack thereof, in the Illinois General Assembly is not lost on the FBI working out of Chicago. It's not lost on the U.S. Attorney. They're not going to be impressed or deterred or delayed in the slightest by this window dressing. So, I don't know who we think we're persuading that ethics is important with as little bit of something, something here, dominated by the Majority Party that is causing all the trouble in the first place, but it's not the U.S. Attorney, it's not the FBI, and it's certainly not any of our voters. Now I need to

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

address the bullying and the shout down that occurred the last time I spoke about ethics in this chamber, which was that just vote 'no', we'll handle it when you're gone. Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is true that I have announced my retirement because number one, I believe in citizen Legislature. I have term limited myself. I'm not a hypocrite, it's true. It's the right thing to do, I'm doing it. The other thing is, in 2021 I will be 70 years old. Guess what? I think it's time for a new generation to lead. How about you?"

Speaker Manley: "And now we have our last Speaker, Leader Bourne."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Leader, I have a few questions just about the text of the Bill. Number one, I'm looking through the membership of the commission and I'm seeing that there is the Executive Inspector General for the Attorney General's Office and the Executive Inspector General for the Secretary of State's Office. Is there a reason that those two members were included and the Legislative Inspector General was not?"

Harris: "The way the Bill was presented in committee this morning, it had two members from the Attorney General and two members from the Secretary of State. So, there was a concern expressed that that would allow too much of a partisan appearance to it. So, it was decided to put in the inspector generals who are more neutral and are independent... more independent arbiters. Plus, have a different view of operations of those departments."

Bourne: "I don't doubt that they will be valuable members to the commission. My question, though, is why are they included and

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

the Legislative Inspector General is not included in the commission makeup?"

- Harris: "Nor are other inspectors general, nor is the Executive Inspector General. They were included because those two executive officers were included in the original language."
- Bourne: "Yes, but if we are tasked with policing ourselves, the person who carries that out is the Legislative Inspector General. My question is, she's not a part of this yet two other inspectors general are. Is there a reason... is the Legislative Inspector General who carries out these very changes, is she not an important voice in this conversation?"
- Harris: "She was not an inspector general within one of the two executive agencies that were discussed during the Executive Committee meeting this morning."
- Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. Is it in... I'll back up a little. My colleague, Representative McCombie, mentioned that our caucus presented a bipartisan commission, a task force to look at ways that we can improve our ethics laws. We have introduced 30 ethics Bills and we thought a task force was an important part of that. There's a lot of really easy low-hanging fruit that we can pass that we put forward, but should we continue studying this? Absolutely. In our commission, it's been mentioned it wasn't lopsided one way or the other politically. But, we also said that we thought it was important that members of the Legislative Ethics Commission were not appointments made by the four caucuses to the commission because as Members of the commission we are tasked with carrying out the Ethics Act and we think it should be members outside of the commission who are advising what changes should

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- be made. Is it your intention, with this commission, that members who are selected by the Legislative Leaders will not be Members of the Legislative Ethics Commission?"
- Harris: "That is a question that is up to the Leaders. The language is silent on that."
- Bourne: "Is it your intention that they be not members of the Legislative Ethics Commission or is that something that you have contemplated?"
- Harris: "My... the things that this Bill contemplates would be to allow the Legislative Leaders to pick their two designees. It does not go beyond that."
- Bourne: "Do you think that... I guess my question is, why... why would we not spell out that it should be members who are independent of the Legislative Ethics Commission?"
- Harris: "That issue has not been raised. I have not given it a lot of thought."
- Bourne: "I think that speaks further to we have had these Bills presented for a while on our side. We've thought through a lot of these issues and this Bill was presented with very little time to fine tune it and make it a better Bill. My final question, I've looked through who we will be hearing from in the commission. Do you know or have any intention of who these experts will be or if there will be a way for... it says in here that we want to seek input from the general public as well. Do you anticipate a formal way that the general public will be able to submit their suggestions or ideas for strengthening our ethics laws?"
- Harris: "I would hope so. And just... again, you... to get the details of how each of these commissions are structured or how

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

different choices are made. I think one of the commissions you're discussing about that was proposed on your side did not subject itself to the Open Meetings Act. And that was very important to us because we wanted it to be transparent and open to the public. It should not be a meeting that could potentially be held behind closed doors. So, I think as you look at each of these things there are different items you have to weigh."

Bourne: "I'm just checking on that really quickly. I have our commission open and I'm told that it was subject to the Open Meetings Act. To the Resolution. Is it important that we have a study group to look at how we can strengthen our ethics laws? Absolutely. Should it be partisan and lopsided so that the... whatever comes out of this task force will be scrutinized rightly or wrongly by all of our constituents who see it as partisan task force rather than a deliberative and thoughtful nonpartisan suggestion on how to strengthen our ethics laws. I think we're setting ourselves up for failure. This task force could come up with wonderful suggestions that we put into a Bill, but by making a task force so partisan and lopsided we are already setting ourselves up not to succeed. It was mentioned on the other side of the aisle that we need to have faith in what this process will come up with. If we are setting up a partisan and lopsided process, it's very difficult to go back to our constituents and tell them to have faith. They don't trust what comes out of this Capitol building and they're certainly not going to trust a commission that is so partisan and lopsided and cobbled together the last minute of Session. We have to do better for this state.

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

And to say that we can put together ethics reform suggestions without talking to the person who this Body unanimously put in as the Legislative Inspector General to come forward to us with suggestions on how to make this better is, again, a testament to the fact that we are not serious about who needs to be in these meetings, about how it needs to be structured, and about the... ultimately what suggestions will come from it. I just hope that everybody is patting themselves on the back and saying, here we go, we did a great job and passed a task force. Because that's all this is, I'm afraid, is making us feel good for what we're passing, but it doesn't seem to be a serious attempt to get to the root of our ethics problems."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 14, 2019: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is Senate Bill 222."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Hammond."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Hammond: "Leader Harris, to follow up on my colleague, Chairman Bourne of the Legislative Ethics Commission and some of her comments, I would ask you, would you be willing to insist that members of the Legislative Ethics Commission not be part of your task force commission?"

Harris: "Having not given that a lot of thought, that's not something I can commit to."

Hammond: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Harris: "I said not having given that a lot of thought or heard this question until we got here on the floor, I know it's an important one, I can't make a commitment without thinking it through."
- Hammond: "I would stress, Leader Harris, that I think it is extremely important that the Legislative Ethics Commission members be allowed to operate separately and apart from this task force commission. I think it is extremely important, but I would also say that I also think it's extremely important that this task force commission request that the ethics commission members, and perhaps together with the Legislative Inspector General, come before them and that they be fully heard on what they think is important to be included in anything moving forward. But I also think it is extremely important that they not be active members of this commission."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris, would you like an opportunity to close?"
- Harris: "Yes. We've had a very detailed and good conversation about this. I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of HJR93.

 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', 4 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And the Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Representative Swanson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Swanson: "Trying to lighten up here a little bit, Madam Speaker. Today I'm honored to have from my district four members who just came from the Governor's mansion, bringing home the silver for their community, Williamsfield, Illinois. They were honored with the 2019 Governor's... if you could stand, please... the 2019 Governor's Hometown Award. Their project was a playground barn raising project and it's an amazing project. I had a little blood, sweat in on that project. And it's a centerpiece for the school playground and also the community playground. It's something well deserved. They thousands and thousands of dollars to create a playground that resembles a barn and has the slides and all the great things. It's just a great project. And I would just like to recognize the team for all they did and congratulations on bringing home the Governor's Hometown Awards Trophy for 2019."

Speaker Manley: "Congratulations. Chair recognizes Representative Walsh."

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

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Walsh: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today is kind of a sad day for me. It's our last day of Veto Session. But our LAs are very important people throughout the course of our careers down here and our activities. And today, my LA, Judi Serra, is... going to be her last Legislative Day but is retiring at the end of December. And I just wanted to say thank you, Judi, for all you've done for me over the last three years that I've had you and a friendship for the last eight years that

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

I've been down here. You are a true sweetheart and I wish you the best in your retirement. And I hope everybody can congratulate her with me."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please excuse Leader Durkin for the remainder of the day."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 14, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the Floor is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 222."

Speaker Manley: "Chair Recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Following up on the awesome words of Representative Larry Walsh, today is my administrative aides last day as well. This is the third one that's gotten married and left me. She'll be moving on to better pastures in Colorado. I know she's watching it on her computer right now. So I would love to have a big round of applause for Allie Betzer. Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you for your work. Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "So, while we were on break between the two weeks of Veto Session... we all know the FFA programs. We know how great

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- of a leadership program it is. And I've got an amazing example of what FFA does in my district. The Pittsfield FFA entered a national contest for the best FFA in the nation and they actually won. It was a Facebook driven contest and a lot of votes were out there. But now they are and should be... and I will probably come back as a Resolution for this... but they are recognized as the best FFA Chapter in the nation. And I'd like to give them a warm congratulations."
- Speaker Manley: "Congratulations. Chair recognizes Leader Wehrli."
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, I would like to take this time to actually congratulate my legislative assistant. Many of you know Nicole Downey. But she got married over the summer as well. She married that guy right there, Wayne. So, I'm somewhat questioning her judgment maybe just a little but congratulations to both of you."
- Speaker Manley: "All the best, Wayne and Nicole. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Manley: "Okay. I knew I should've pretended like I didn't see your light on."
- Batinick: "I was just wondering what my schedule looks like in,
 I don't know, January, February, March, April, May?"
- Speaker Manley: "Well, let me find out about that. I'll get back to you."
- Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Chair recognizes Leader Willis."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the posting requirements be waived so that Senate Bill 222 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 222 can be heard immediately on the floor."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Willis has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. On Supplemental Calendar #2, we have Senate Bill 222, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 222, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Rita on the Amendment."
- Rita: "I'd like to adopt Amendment and then we'll debate this on Third Reading."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Rita moves the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 222. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 222, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Rita."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Rita: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 222 is an initiative of the Illinois Gaming Board. It does two things. Corrects a finger... the language dealing with fingerprinting. Makes it stronger language that the FBI would like to have this changed so that they conduct a fingerprinting on gaming applicants. It also fixes the language with cross-referencing for sports betting and gaming on applicants so that the applicants can remain confidential. I ask for any questions or..."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Representative, I just want to follow up with your initial comments there. We already do these things for casinos and video gaming terminal operators. Is that correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Wheeler: "So now we're making that applicable to the new Sports Wagering Act that we passed?"

Rita: "Yes, and the language when we passed the sports wagering was a little bit different. So it just... it makes it..."

Wheeler: "So now we're making it uniform across the board..."

Rita: "...uniform all across the board and have the strong language that the FBI required or asked for."

Wheeler: "And I... I think it adds, from our friends at the Gaming Board, the owners and managers for the Sports Wagering Act are added to the list of officers upon whom fingerprint checks made be conducted. Is that also correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Perfect. Thank you. This is a good Bill. Appreciate your sponsoring it..."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Rita: "Thank you."

Wheeler: "...and urge your support, everyone else."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Ann Williams."

Williams, A.: "Hi. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Williams, A.: "Representative Rita, this is dealing with gaming issues, correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Williams, A.: "Was the language in this piece of legislation also included in the discussions of the cleanup, the tax restructuring for the City of Chicago Casino? Was this part of the prior..."

Rita: "In... this was part of a lot of discussions over the last few weeks and then the last couple days. This was part of this discussion, yes."

Williams, A.: "Okay. So just to clarify, there is nothing in this

Bill that addresses the request by Mayor Lightfoot to
restructure the Chicago Casino?"

Rita: "No."

Williams, A.: "So there is nothing in this Bill that would ensure that Chicago could develop and locate a thriving casino proceeds from which would go to capital projects from throughout the state?"

Rita: "You're correct."

Williams, A.: "So despite the fact... to the Bill. So, Members, despite the fact that we worked closely with Members on both sides of the aisle and the Governor's Office to fix the downstate and suburban fire and police pensions and did some consolidation work that I think was absolutely indispensable,

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

we are finding ourselves in a position, if you represent the City of Chicago, where our police and fire pensions are out there with no support, without the revenues we need to responsibly fund the pensions for our hard working first responders, pensions that they have earned and that they deserve. My concern is that if we keep moving forward with little pieces here and there we're going to miss the big picture. I think it's important to keep in mind that the revenues that the Chicago casino would bring to the long overdue capital projects is by far expected to be the largest chunk of revenue to go to those projects. So if we don't pass the Chicago casino fix that the Mayor requested, we all stand to lose a significant portion of funds to go to our capital projects. These are capital projects that our communities need. These are capital projects we've been waiting for literally for decades. I am very reticent to move forward with gaming fixes, as important, as critical as they are, without addressing the elephant in the room, and that's how are we going to move forward with a Chicago casino in a way that takes care of our first responders and their pension needs like we did the downstate police and fire pension needs, and fund the capital projects. I would urge all Members, particularly Chicago Members and those that are concerned about pension parity throughout the state, to give a serious thought to whether we want to send the message that these fixes are more important than the big fix that we really need to address. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Thapedi."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Thapedi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If this Bill receives the requisite number of votes, I ask for a verification."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Thapedi has requested a verification. All Members will be in their seats and voting their own switches. Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?

Representative, is... this is not Mayor Lightfoot's Bill? This is not..."

Rita: "No, this is from the Illinois Gaming Board at the Governor's request."

Flowers: "Okay. So the Mayor has been down here talking to everyone, calling, negotiating, trying to do the best she can for not only the City of Chicago, but the State of Illinois. And as it was so clearly articulated by our previous speaker, trying to help the firemen, help the police officers, help the communities in the City of Chicago. And this is not the Bill?"

Rita: "You are correct."

Flowers: "Please explain to me what happened and why not."

Rita: "Well, as we mentioned in caucus, we were working through the issues. Senate Bill 222 was a request of the Gaming Board and a request of the Governor to have this Bill considered for adoption to pass... for its passage."

Flowers: "So was a feasibility study done on this Bill?"

Rita: "Not that I'm aware of."

Flowers: "And so... was a feasibility..."

Rita: "No, no."

Flowers: "So was a feasibility study done for the Mayor's Bill?"

Rita: "Yes."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Flowers: "And so, why is it that this get preference over her Bill and there is no feasibility study?"

Rita: "So this is just cleanup language for the Illinois Gaming Board so that they can implement the Gaming Act that we passed back in the spring. This is two requests out of a number of requests from the Gaming Board and this is something that they've asked if we'd vote this forward before..."

Flowers: "Was the Mayor willing to deal with some of the issues of the Gaming Board?"

Rita: "In the negotiations the Mayor was willing to work with everybody."

Flowers: "That's not the question that I asked. Was the Mayor willing to negotiate and work with the Gaming Board? I'm just trying to figure out the reason why is House..."

Rita: "Yes."

Flowers: "...Senate Bill 222 as opposed to Senate Bill 516."

Rita: "I guess I don't understand your question."

Flowers: "Well if the Gaming Board has not done a feasibility study and the Mayor of the City of Chicago has, the Gaming Board did not come down here and... to lobby and talk to us and explain to us what it is that they were going to do, but the Mayor did.

Rita: "So..."

Flowers: "And so, I am asking what is it about this Bill that supersedes the one that the Mayor of the City of Chicago came down here to negotiate for and on and talk to us about that's in the best interest of our community and the City of Chicago and the infrastructure parts of the Bill that would've gone along with it?"

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Rita: "So there were the number of parts of the gaming Bill that we were discussing. The main part was the Chicago request in terms of the way the taxes were done on the Chicago Casino. That was one request. Another request was from the Gaming Board. They had a whole list of them, but two of... out of the two requests, all the different requests that we've received while working on the gaming Bill were the one... one dealing with its fingerprinting and how their language was written in the gaming Bill. And the other is on the cross-referencing of applications so that they could remain confidential. So, these were just two parts of a big talking picture of a number of requests that were asked to be considered in the Veto Session and/or part of one Bill."

Flowers: "My final question to you is why is it that Senate Bill 222 is on the board and not Senate Bill 516? Because you could've done the same thing with Senate Bill 516."

Rita: "So, Senate Bill 222 was called. We had 516 that was filed with an Amendment and we didn't go to committee to hear that Amendment. And so, that we're going down the Calendar and this was what was come up on the Calendar to take before for your consideration."

Flowers: "And thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Spain."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Spain: "Representative Rita, we've had a lot of discussion over the last several weeks and even all through the summer about the issues for the anticipated casino in Chicago. Are you

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

saying now that any changes that could be considered in the future are now off the table?"

Rita: "No, no. When we come... you know, depending when we adjourn and when we come back, all the requests and all the different parts will be considered as we go through the next general... the next Session."

Spain: "Is it fair to characterize this issue as one that is sincerely very complicated and just requiring additional time to come forward with a proposal that will work?"

Rita: "Can you rephrase that... I only heard part of that."

Spain: "We've seen another gaming proposal. We've seen a number of Amendments, but here was are on the last day of Veto Session. We may just earnestly be running out of time to resolve an issue as complicated and that Mayor Lightfoot has requested some fair consideration for changes."

Rita: "Yes."

Spain: "Okay. In the meantime, is there risk if this... what I would call a technical cleanup Bill, if this Bill is not passed, is there any risk to other casinos in the state or the implementation of the Capital Bill?"

Rita: "According to the Gaming Board, that is true that it could have some risk in terms of applications and how the fingerprinting process would go."

Spain: "So this could potentially create additional delays for the roll out of sports betting, which we see other states moving forward much more quickly than we have, or the new casinos that have been contemplated in other parts of the state."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Rita: "That is... that is my understanding from what the Gaming Board has indicated."

Spain: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. This is a simple cleanup Bill. We're here at the very last day, hopefully close to the last hour, of the fall Veto Session. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill and promise that there will continue to be, at least from many Members of our side, earnest engagement in working through some of the difficult issues about the Chicago casino. We have not had the opportunity to visit with Mayor Lightfoot in a private caucus meeting. I think many of us would be interested in speaking with the Mayor and understand that this is an issue that is important to the entire State of Illinois. This is a technical cleanup Bill. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I'll be brief. I just wanted to say that I do agree with Representative Williams when they talk about the Chicago delegation taking a vote that benefited the rest of the state. And as a downstater that... whose communities will benefit from that legislation, I think it's important as a sign that we start to move against some of the regionalism that we see often. And I would just say if they want me to vote against this Bill, I'd be happy to do so. I don't think it'll cause further delay in the Sports Wagering Act because frankly the Gaming Board has had almost six months to get rules in place, while Iowa and Indiana seemed to been able to do it very quickly themselves. And I don't think this is going to be the thing that keeps them from passing those rules. I'm urgently waiting for those

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

rules to come up and have been for some time. So, as I said, I'm willing to vote 'no' on this Bill in a show of courtesy to my colleagues from Chicago."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Harris for an announcement."

Harris: "Let the record reflect that Representative DeLuca is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. How many votes does this Bill take to pass?"

Speaker Manley: "Seventy-one."

Batinick: "It does take 71. Okay. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, this is technical cleanup that without puts all of our vertical capital Bill projects in peril, correct?"

Rita: "The Bill is some... yeah, technical cleanup."

Batinick: "And it puts all of our vertical capital projects in peril. Is that correct?"

Rita: "Well, according to the Gaming Board, they need to have these changes so that they can move forward with the applicants and the fingerprinting... that they can't process the fingerprinting. And then if the applicants have done a cross-reference, they could be subject to being FOIA-ed."

Batinick: "Okay. To the Bill. I know my colleague from Peoria hit upon it. We're willing and able to do something that makes sense for the City of Chicago and for the state. I think it would be nice if the Mayor would come and speak to our side. If the Mayor is listening right now, the casino needs to go

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

where it's going to bring the most revenue in for the state, which is downtown. But on this Bill, the entire state needs it, including the City of Chicago. So, I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you. Will the speaker yield for question?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

McCombie: "I feel like this is getting kind of bigger than it really is. Can you just clarify that this is a... just a law and order Bill and it is... if you did not support the vertical capital that this is not entangled in all of that. Is that correct?"

Rita: "It's a technical Bill in nature for two requests from the Illinois Gaming Board. One dealing with fingerprints and one dealing with the applications and how the applications are..."

McCombie: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To be perfectly honest, you're right, this is a simple, technical Bill. And the reality is this could jeopardize the vertical capital projects. But you know what else is going to jeopardize the vertical capital projects? Not having a Chicago casino. The Chicago Members took the vote that didn't help our police and fire on the promise that they would be made whole later. We took a leap of faith, but this Body, as someone said a moment ago, needs to stop the regionalism and take the leap of faith that will allow Chicago to move forward appropriately and responsively with a casino that will fund the projects that are going to be built all over this state. I respectfully ask the Sponsor to pull this Bill from the record."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I harken back to my seatmate, who turns another year tomorrow. Happy Birthday, Kelly. And her... and her remarks about... this is important. I'm not saying this isn't important, but I also think that we took, again, a leap of faith in securing and consolidating downstate pensions to preserve police and fire. When we go back home to our Chicago districts, we continue to hear about the fear of property taxes going up. I'm very concerned about other initiatives that we have been supportive of. This is a very, very important component to the Capital Bill that this Body supported in a bipartisan way. Representative Rita, could you please answer my question? Would it be impossible for you to amend this Bill with the Chicago casino language?"

Rita: "Well, we could do that but this has an immediate effective date. And it was talked when we were going through... when we were crafting and going through the Bill that the City of Chicago's request did not have a immediate effective date."

Feigenholtz: "So if you amended you couldn't change... you couldn't have two special effective dates if you amended that Bill onto this, yes or no?"

Rita: "My understanding that the immediate would occur."

Feigenholtz: "For both of them?"

Rita: "That's my understanding, but I am not an attorney here."

Feigenholtz: "I'd like to ask the Parliamentarian for a ruling on that. I'm not sure that that is accurate."

Speaker Manley: "We'll take that under advisement and we'll get back to you. Please continue."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Feigenholtz: "Are we going to stand at ease because that was a very important question, Representative Manley?"

Speaker Manley: "I was told we were going to take that under advisement and like it if you could please continue."

Feigenholtz: "I'm happy to continue. Thank you, Madam Chair. You look wonderful up there, by the way."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you."

Feigenholtz: "So again, Chair Rita, I know you have really, really worked hard on trying to craft a gaming Bill. I know how hard gaming Bills are. I know that they sink under their own weight often, but this is something that we have been discussing for a very long time. If the Chicago casino does not happen, it has very serious ramifications for my district and the district of everyone in the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois will also lose a great deal of revenue, which means there's going to be other cuts that we cannot afford and that nobody in our caucus is going to want to go home and talk about after we adjourn. I implore my colleagues who are looking at this piece of legislation and trying to put something in it that will help them or remedy something, I implore you to reconsider as a lifelong Chicagoan, as somebody who represents a district that's disproportionately affected by property taxes where people are telling me they're leaving my district and they're really not happy. We will get to your issues. You have my commitment and the commitment of the rest of the Members of the City of Chicago. We will stand with you shoulder to shoulder, but I really am waiting for that parliamentary ruling because I would love to see that Bill go up on the board because I believe if we worked hard enough we

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

could get it done. I'm glad that Representative Thapedi has requested a verification. I, too, implore my colleagues as... although the issues in this Bill are very valid, it's also a lost opportunity on those of us who represent Chicago and encourage a non 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "So I... I'm... this is going to sound facetious and I'm sorry if it does, but did the rules change and we're allowed to decide which Bills get called on this side of the aisle?"

Speaker Manley: "I'm not sure what you're asking."

Bryant: "I mean, right now the Majority Party kind of gets to decide which Bills get called in here, right? We don't get to... the reason I'm asking is this, several of the speakers have kind of indicated that almost like it's this side of the aisle's fault that a Chicago casino Bill has not been called, yet I don't think we have the ability to call that Bill. So the other... there were some other statements regionalization. So I just kind of jotted down a couple thoughts about this. So first, if a Chicago... a casino Bill wants to be call... I mean, if you want it to be called, then have it called, right? I mean, up or down vote on it. There were some statements about piecemealing things but we just ran a couple Bills through where cannabis was piecemealed, where ethics was piecemealed because there was an argument that those were important things that needed to be done. I would argue that this is probably an important piece of

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

legislation that the FBI says that we need. I would also say that if you want a Chicago casino to pass, then a couple things which need to happen, which is the Members of this Body who represent Chicago probably need to commit to voting for that Bill before it gets called and maybe there would be enough votes for that. And then the other thing is this, the Mayor of Chicago was here and lobbied one side of the aisle, but didn't bother, that I'm aware of, to talk to our side of the aisle about it. Maybe there are some regional issues or some folks that maybe... maybe there's some issues that you think are regional that aren't regional at all, but we need to be talked to if you want our votes. Respect is given when respect is given. So, I would just say to folks on the other side of the aisle, those of you that are accusing of this being regional or the Bill not being called that you want, call a Bill for an up or down vote. But, in this case, I would say to my colleague on the other side of the aisle who has wanted some fingerprinting for another issue, I'll support fingerprinting on this issue. It's not a constitutional issue. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Our final speaker, Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I... I just want to address the Chicago casino situation a little bit. You know, I was identified as the point person for the House Republican Caucus a year and a half ago on gaming issues. And throughout this whole thing, since the spring Session the City of Chicago has not approached me once, not a phone call, not an email, not a meeting, to talk about the Chicago casino. I think what you've heard our folk say is we're willing to help. We want

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

a Chicago casino. Put it at the Thompson Center, we'd love to see that. But what this Bill... if we don't pass this Bill, what this Bill does, is holds up Williamson County, it holds Danville, it holds up Waukegan, it holds up South Suburban, it holds up Rockford, and it holds up sports wagering, which are all vital parts of the Capital Bill. The revenues garnered from those fees, those licenses are a vital part. And Chicago is a huge part of that as well. Chicago is a 4 thousand position casino, twice as large as anything we have in this state and that location's identified by the Mayor may or may not work. Let's look at some other locations for the casino to make it work. Let's continue to have these discussions. And I would urge the city... I would urge the city, if they want to do this, they need to talk to the Republicans 'cause the Mayor was here and she didn't come knocking on our door. Now, Bob, I just want to ... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Butler: "Representative Rita, to get back to the initial point on this, this is a simple cleanup Bill to make sure that we can move forward with a lot of aspects of gaming, correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Butler: "So, to everyone, I want to read our analysis, the Republican analysis, which is always very good. Floor Amendment #3 amends the Illinois Gaming Act and the Sports Wagering Act. At the suggestion of the Illinois State Police, adds fingerprint checks compliance language in the Gaming Act. At the suggestion of Illinois Gaming Board staff, adds applicability language to the Sports Wagering Act. No opposition. I would urge an 'aye' vote. This is a simple Bill

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

to get passed and we can talk about the Chicago casino thing moving forward."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these last few days, we've been working long hours, meeting with a lot of people, trying to get this Chicago piece fixed. When I hear that we're not doing something for Chicago, I've been working very closely with Mayor Lightfoot and her administration team to try to figure out what we could do to get over the goal line. We still have that in the works. We're going to continue to work. We filed Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 516 today. But this Bill just takes two technical fixes that the Illinois Gaming Board needs. One dealing with the fingerprinting to make sure that they're done correctly and they're able to do it. Another dealing with the confidentiality of the applicants. These are two parts of many requests for the Illinois Gaming Board that we believe that needs to be passed. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Thapedi has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 222 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 7 voting 'opposed', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received... pardon me. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Batinick, Representative Representative Representative Bourne, Representative Brady, Representative Representative Bryant, Representative Butler, Representative Representative Carroll, Representative Caulkins, Representative Chesney, Representative Connor, Representative Crespo, Representative Davidsmeyer, Representative Davis, Representative Demmer, Representative Didech, Representative Representative Evans, Representative Flowers, Representative Frese, Representative Gordon-Booth, Representative Guzzardi, Representative Hammond, Representative Barbara Hernandez, Representative Representative Hernandez, Representative Hoffman, Representative Keicher, Representative Mah, Representative Manley, Representative Marron, Representative Mason, Representative Mayfield, Representative Mazzochi, Representative McCombie, Representative McDermed..."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Thapedi withdraws his request for verification. On this question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 7 voting 'opposed', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Spain, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Spain: "Madam Speaker, thank you very much. Please excuse Representative Sosnowski for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Adjournment Resolution. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #94, offered by Representative Harris. be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 14, 2019, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 8, 2020, perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 13, 2020, perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, January 16, 2020, perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 22, 2020, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 27, 2020, perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 28, 2020, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 28, 2020, or until the call of the President."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you. First, Madam Speaker, let me apologize for whistling but I needed to get your attention. So I apologize for that..."

Speaker Manley: "I'm used to it."

Wehrli: "Well played."

Speaker Manley: "Could you..."

Wehrli: "Under Rule 4..."

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

- Speaker Manley: "One second. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Please hold one second. Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted."
- Wehrli: "So, I was going to make a Motion under Rule 49. I asked for a recorded vote on the Motion to adjourn. I have five Members on my side of the aisle requesting a recorded vote. We should not be adjourning right now. There's much work to be done, whether we're talking about a Chicago casino or these ethics Bills. There are many Bills in which we could address, we have questions unanswered. There's a dark cloud over this State Capitol due to a federal investigation that continues to expose the lack of ethics around here. We need to stay here and address these ethics. We should not adjourn until we have solid ethics reform in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 609, offered by Representative Bryant. House Resolution 610, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 611, offered by Representative Gong-Gershowitz. House Resolution 612, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 613, offered by Representative Wheeler. House Resolution 614, offered by Representative Wheeler. House Resolution 615, offered by Representative Wheeler. House Resolution 615, offered by Representative Ammons."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Members, I need you to pay

71st Legislative Day

11/14/2019

special attention to this. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 28. This is a recorded vote. Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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 that Motion, 53 voted 'aye', 43 voted 'nay', 1 voted 'present'. In the opinion... and the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands Adjourned."