104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Members, please take your seats. We will be led in prayer today by Representative Kalish."

Rabbi Kalish: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Leader Harris, for giving me a few minutes to share some parting words prior to my prayer. Today is my last day as a Member of this chamber. And as it was never my plan to serve as a Member, today is certainly my last day. While there are literally hundreds of people I feel I need to thank, including so many of you, I'd like to single out two people whose sacrificed over the past two years not only matched my own, but exceeded it. First, my partner Yacko Filer. In 2013, he went into business with me, knowing that my heart was in communal service. And despite deep and serious financial losses, he put everything on hold these past two years. And above and beyond all else, he made sure my family was okay. And of course, my wife Shulamis. Twenty-four years ago, Shulamis was warned by a family friend at our wedding that she was in for an exciting life. The last two years were certainly exciting but were mostly sacrificial on her part. The pain she endured during a bruising primary and the twenty-four hour, six days a week work on behalf of the community and district only deepened our love and respect for each other. Around fifteen years ago, I visited a rabbi in the historic Israeli town of Bnei Brak. My question for this sage was bothering me greatly and I flew to Israel specifically to speak with him. I asked, in the area of communal service, I have seen the same pattern over and over again. We have a goal. We have a plan. We start to work. The plan is a total failure, but the goal is achieved. So, take

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

me out of the equation, I said. Allow me to go back to study and put someone else in my place for the community. The rabbi stirred. He was agitated. And at ninety-five years old, he jumped out of his chair reaching for a bible. His grandson, shocked by the newfound strength of his zayde, carefully placed an old and well-used bible in front of him. He opened to Genesis, Chapter 2, Verses 4 and 5. 'These are the stories of heaven and Earth. All the vegetation stood still, for God had not allowed it to rain.' Azarashi, the foremost commentator on biblical texts, weaving together texts and explanation. Why didn't God allow it to rain? Because man had not been created yet to properly recognize the gifts of God. Your job isn't to do, he told me. Your job is to know how things happened. And then, your job is to tell the stories of how God made things happen for his people, allowing for much greater appreciation for God's love. Ladies and Gentlemen, we work so hard for our districts, for our communities, for our people. I am so grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with each and every one of you. The opportunity to collect so many stories of your hard work and your God-guided victories. Like, look what we've done the last three days. Thank you. And now, let us bow our heads in prayer. Almighty God, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, God who created the world from nothingness, quide my friends here. Guide these leaders as they embark on a very difficult and challenging new journey. Heal the wounds of our partisan and cultural divide. Continue to be Immanuel with us as you have been with the house of David. And please, oh God, shine your goodness upon this General Assembly as they toil day and night in service of

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

- your creations. And may each and every man and woman in this chamber, and their families, be blessed to see the depths of your love and kindness. And dutifully, allow them to share their stories of your love as I will mine. And to that, let us all say, amen."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative Kalish. You will be missed. We will be led in the Pledge by Representative Reitz."
- Reitz 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: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Connor and Andrade are excused today."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader 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 Representative Wehrli and Senator Bryant are excused today."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 113 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 13, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 3653."

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

Speaker Manley: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 3653. Chair recognizes Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The House Republicans will caucus in the mezzanine area."

Speaker Manley: "The Republicans will caucus in the mezzanine area. And the Democrats will caucus downstairs. And the House will be at ease."

Speaker Harris: "Good afternoon, Ladies... good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. The House of Representatives will come back to order. Harris in the Chair. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 3653, Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are we ready to go?"

Speaker Harris: "Yes."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Excuse me. Sorry. I'm sorry, Sir."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On behalf of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, I am humbled, honored, and proud to present and ask for the passage of House Bill 3653, Senate Amendment #2. As black communities across our state grapple with police brutality, mass incarceration, and prevalent crime and violence, this Bill represents a robust, transformative, bold, and vicious initiative to comprehensively reform our criminal justice system. This endeavor would not only be significant for Illinois, but will also serve as a national leading model for other states to emulate. In regards to policing, House Bill 3653, Senate Amendment 2, provides a framework composed of seven critical components. First, under crisis intervention and conflict de-escalation, the Bill establishes a statewide

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

co-responder program, revamped our search warrant policies, and enhances crisis intervention training. Secondly, under limiting use of force, this Bill establishes a statewide universalized standard for use of force that identifies and defines what is excessive and prohibited. Under this section, HB3653, Senate Amendment 2, allows... also provides a policy for the duty to intervene and to render aid. And lastly, it enhances use of force training. The third component is transparency. Under this section, the Bill creates a statewide body camera program, strengthens requirements for the reporting, collecting, and retention of police data and records. And lastly, it modifies policies pertaining to police officer integrity. The fourth component, oversight and enforcement. In this section, the Bill establishes a significantly more robust certification and decertification program for police officers. In regards to strengthening certification. What does this mean? This means better background checks, documenting continuous training completed, and continuous review of disqualifying conduct. This program also calls for expanding decertification, increasing the list of misdemeanors that qualify for automatic decertification, and also creating a discretionary decertification process based on the state's IDFPR model. And third, this also means expanding the officer professional conduct database. This would include notifications to state's attorneys and expanded requirements for departments to notify for concurrent terminations and leaving duties under investigation. Under this component, the Bill also enhances a state level patterns and practice division within the office of Attorney General

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

to investigate police misconduct. Ladies and Gentlemen, moving on. Fifth component, accountability. The Bill creates the Qualified Immunity Task Force to develop and propose policies and procedures to review and reform qualified immunity as it applies to peace officers. In regards to collective bargaining, the Bill deletes a provision of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act that allows collective bargaining agreements to override State Law with regard to peace officers. The effect of this change would be to prevent collective bargaining agreements from being used to shield officers from discipline, from misconduct, and use of force violations. Lastly, this section also removes the sworn affidavit requirement for public misconduct complaints. Sixth component, detainment. This Bill provides provisions to protect the rights of arrestees and detainees by requiring adequate access to phone calls and counsel when detained. The last component of police reform, the seventh component, officer wellness. These provisions establish statewide standards for officers to receive regular mental health screenings and assistance and also protections from mental illness discoveries. It's these seven components of our reform framework for policing that's contained in this Bill. We also took a look at sentencing reform. We know that African Americans make up 14 percent of the population in our state but, routinely, between 50 and percent of our prison population. In regards to our overly punitive sentencing policies, HB3653, Senate Amendment 2, provides reform to several measures. The Bill narrows our very broad felony murder rule to bring it in line with the majority of other

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

states. It offers alternatives to custody in that it limits time on mandatory supervisor release for lower felonies. It modifies the definition of habitual criminal to entail and require higher level offenses. HB3653, Senate Amendment 2, offers a provision to provide for more judicial discretion for lower level, non-violent offenses. In regards to resisting arrest, the Bill requires a predicate offense to charge someone with resisting arrest. Please stop charging black folks for resisting arrest when there has not been a predicate offense. Lastly, the Bill establishes investigation in reporting requirements for death in custody. In regards to prison practices, this Bill makes the following changes: It provides a provision for enhancing medical treatment practices within IDOC; the Bill ends the practice of prison gerrymandering; it modernizes our sentencing credit program; and lastly, it provides provisions to protect the rights of pregnant prisoners. Also, and most notably, HB3653, Senate Amendment 2, abolishes money bond and codifies the Pretrial Fairness Act. This initiative moves our money bond system from one that is based on an individual's ability or inability to post bond to a more fair system that relies on verified risk assessment tools to determine if an individual is a threat to the community or a concern to not return for their hearing. Lastly and finally, in regards to violence reduction, the Bill improves the victims... the crime victims compensation process and expands the eligibility for diversion court. Ladies and Gentlemen, in many regards, this Bill is a product of many, many, many years. But also, most notably and recently, it's a product of over 12 hearings that

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

we've done since September and over 40 hours of testimony.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last pillar of the Illinois

Legislative Black Caucus' agenda, the criminal justice reform

agenda. It's time to go from protest to progress. Criminal

justice reform cannot wait. I urge a 'yes' vote, Mr. Speaker."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 13, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 3840."

Speaker Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will use the four-minute timer. The first speaker is Representative Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."

Windhorst: "Representative, I appreciate the opportunity we had throughout the week during committee to address a lot of these issues in subject matter hearing. And I know that some of the concerns that we raised were, in fact, amended in the Bill and I appreciate you listening to those. I do still have concerns with the Bill and I'd like to go through some of those right now. As I'm sure you're aware, other large states such as California and New York have attempted a no-cash bail system. California, most recently, had... by referendum in November, the citizens voted down eliminating cash bail. The question I have is, how is the system for eliminating cash bail different in this legislation from New York and California?"

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

Slaughter: "Representative, all we know is that we are seeking to become the second state in America to eliminate cash bail. Many of us would believe that we have a system that is based on an individual being a threat to the community or a flight risk, but that's not the case. We actually have a system that is based on one's inability to pay. Many also believe, and I believe, that it is inhumane to subject anyone to pretrial detention before they have had their hearing. And so, we usher in a new system that is based on verified risk assessments that we believe is a more fair system. And there are two things there. In regards to fairness, we believe that the current system criminalizes the poor, criminalizes poverty. But also, we believe that this enhances public safety. Right now, if you are a dangerous, violent individual, you actually can be let out back into the community if you're able to financially post bond. And so, we believe that we have a system, as we've codified the Pretrial Fairness Act, that will address these issues and concerns. We are not concerned with how it differs from other states. What we are prioritizing and concerned with is how we're going to be more fair here, in the State of Illinois, to underserved communities and to communities of color."

Windhorst: "I appreciate that answer. The reason I brought that up was because, at least in New York, there... by the Legislature, there seemed to be large problems with eliminating their cash bail system and they moved to reform it. I'm sure you're aware, Representative Slaughter, this Body, in 2017, and effective 2018, made what I consider to be some significant reforms to the bail system. To your

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

knowledge, has there been any statewide study of what effect those reforms had on pretrial detention? Whether pretrial detention is up, down, or any change, statewide?"

Slaughter: "Can you repeat the question?"

Windhorst: "Yes. After those changes that occurred in 2018 to the bail system, are you aware of any statewide study that shows what occurred with pretrial detention? If it was increased, decreased, stayed the same after those changes?"

Slaughter: "I'm not aware. I'm not aware of any, Representative."

Windhorst: "'Cause I know it's antidotal."

Slaughter: "Oh, I'm sorry, Representative. I'd be remiss if I did not highlight the work of the Supreme Court Pretrial Commission that has done actually great, tireless work to address this issue. The Supreme Court highlighting this as an issue or an area of concern, and this commission actually meeting regularly. I came before the commission myself to also testify and collaborate with the commission to hammer out some of these issues and some of these challenges as we become, or seek to become, the second state in the country to do so."

Speaker Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Severin has given you three minutes, Representative Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Maybe I should've been clearer with my question. I'm sorry. There were some changes to the bail system that occurred in 2018 which made a presumption in the law that an individual would be released without having to post money. And there was also an addition of a \$30 a day credit for certain types of offenses toward a person's bail. I believe the hope then was that would reduce the number of

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

pretrial detainees in our state. The worry from some was that those changes actually would increase the number of people being held because of individuals who were rearrested and then held on, actually, higher bonds. So, the question I had was are we aware or has there been any study of what that law did to the rate of pretrial detention in our state?"

Slaughter: "Representative, I'm not aware of a study."

Windhorst: "I'm not either. I just want to make sure that there wasn't one that you know of that I didn't. So, I thank you.

Under this legislation, there are offenses for which a person can be detained pretrial. Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And there are criteria outlined in the statute. And one of those criteria is the commission of a forcible felony that is not eligible for probation. Is that accurate?"

Slaughter: "One moment. Yes, that is accurate, Representative."

Windhorst: "There are, of course, forcible felonies defined in the law. Not all forcible felonies, however, are ineligible for probation. Forcible felonies such as burglary, robbery, kidnapping, arson are all eligible for probation."

Slaughter: "Okay."

Windhorst: "So, under this statute, or if it becomes a statute, those individuals could not be detained pretrial if they're charged with burglary, robbery, kidnapping, or arson."

Slaughter: "Is there a question, Representative?"

Windhorst: "I'm asking if I am reading that correctly."

Slaughter: "Perhaps you may be reading that correctly, but one of the things I want to highlight because... actually, it's a two part answer."

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

Windhorst: "Sure."

Slaughter: "'Cause I think you had asked me, how does our Pretrial Fairness Act differ from, was it New York or California?"

Windhorst: "Yes."

Slaughter: "Just to go back to that, one thing is that we do allow for more discretion in our Bill. And then secondly, this is very, very important... actually, for both sides of the aisle. There is a two-year ramp up, a two-year runway that we are giving our state to look at, review. Counties can collaborate and try to understand many of the challenges before the golive date. So, to the essence of your question, being able to tease out these challenges, the myriad of challenges that do actually still exist. And so, that's a great provision, a great component of the Pretrial... the Pretrial Fairness Act."

Windhorst: "So, just so I'm clear, my reading of it is that if a person is charged with a forcible felony, such as burglary, robbery, kidnapping, or arson, those offenses being eligible for probation, that means that, that individual cannot be held prior to trial. That individual would have to be released prior to trial."

Slaughter: "Representative, the court can still choose to hold that person. But if the question is, are we interpreting it the same? Yes. And in regards to that, I will implore to the Body to understand and please process that there is a two-year runway given to address these issues and these challenges."

Windhorst: "One issue that came up this week in committee dealt with a constitutional provision, Article 1, Section 9,

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

- dealing with bail. And in that provision, we discussed the costs provision that is included. It says if an individual..."

 Speaker Harris: "Representative Spain yields three more minutes.
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Spain yields three more minutes.

 Okay, four."
- Windhorst: "Thank you. That provision says that if an individual is held without bond, that the state is to reimburse the county for the expense of that detention. Do you have that same reading of that constitutional provision?"
- Slaughter: "Representative, I'm sorry. Can you repeat that question?"
- Windhorst: "Sure. Under Article 1, Section 9, it would be the, I believe the second paragraph. It says that, this is a paraphrase, that if an individual is held without bail, pretrial, the state will reimburse the county for the expense... or the unit of local government for the expense of that detention."
- Slaughter: "I don't... no, I'm not interpreting that as the same way. And I don't actually know what you mean."
- Windhorst: "Well, it's an explicit provision in the Constitution.

 Talks about bail. It was... this was put in the Constitution to actually protect individuals from being held without bail under certain circumstances. But the constitutional provision also says if someone is held without bail, the state has to reimburse the county for that expense. And what I... the point of the questioning is to avoid the expense being sent from the state to the county, given the state's budget situation. You know, the number of pretrial detainees we may have or people incarcerated pretrial could be significant and it could be a significant cost to the state."

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

- Slaughter: "Representative, very fond of you as a former state's attorney. I know that you understand this very, very well. Your issue, your challenge, sounds perfect for a two-year golive date so that we can hammer out all of these issues. What we do know is that it is inhumane to subject anyone to pretrial detention before their hearing. In this country, you are innocent before proven guilty."
- Windhorst: "But you would agree there are circumstances where someone should be held pretrial without bond?"
- Slaughter: "I think we should continue to lean on the risk assessment to tease that out. If that's the case, yes. But we should lean on the risk assessment... risk assessment tool."
- Windhorst: "And this risk assessment tool will be something that will be developed over the next two years as well. Is that right?"
- Slaughter: "Yeah, the Supreme Court Commission has been working on that very issue."
- Windhorst: "There is a provision on page 521 talking about eligibility for programs restricted by felony. If you could explain what that provision is designed to do."
- Slaughter: "Can you... can you repeat the question, Representative?"
- Windhorst: "Yes. On page 521, there is a provision that says... that deals with... I believe it's titled, 'Eligibility for programs restricted by felony.' It's in... appears to be a new provision in the law. Would... could you explain what that provision is designed to do?"
- Slaughter: "Yes, one moment. One moment, Representative. It's a provision regarding high level drug crimes that should be assessed as lower level crimes. For the purpose of getting

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

individuals treatment and access to programs. Something that black folks have been talking about for a really long time."

Windhorst: "The reason I brought... it was the first time I'd seen the provision was in this version and had not seen it in prior version so I wanted to make sure I understood."

Slaughter: "Yep. Yep."

Windhorst: "As it relates to decertification of police officers, there is... there is an automatic and a discretionary decertification. Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Windhorst: "On the discretionary decertification, are the items that could lead to decertification prospective or retroactive? What I mean is, if this becomes law, can someone use conduct that occurred in the past to complain and request decertification?"

Speaker Burke: "Representative, you've exceeded your time, but it appears Representative Haas is yielding her time to you.

Please proceed."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Slaughter: "Representative, the Bill is actually unclear on that, that actual provision."

Windhorst: "What is your intent?"

Slaughter: "What is my intent?"

Windhorst: "That it be prospective or retroactive? Which... what is the intent of the legislation?"

Slaughter: "Representative, can you ask your next question and we will commit..."

Windhorst: "Yes."

Slaughter: "...commit to answering that one later?"

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

Windhorst: "Is there any statute of limitation for complaints?

What I mean by that is, is there any period of time by which someone must file a complaint against an officer or they lose the right to file a complaint?"

Slaughter: "Representative, I believe so."

Windhorst: "Do you know how long a period of time that is?"

Slaughter: "One moment, Representative. I'm not sure, Representative."

Windhorst: "Of course, those are two very important items to officers who... this is a new provision in law, a discretionary decertification, and the fact that we could either be using retroactive decertification or have an open-ended period of complaint is troubling. There are a couple provisions in this Bill that seem to contradict one another. I know this was the Criminal Justice Omnibus Bill combined with the Decertification Bill. Is that accurate?"

Slaughter: "That's... that's accurate."

Windhorst: "So, in the Criminal Justice Omnibus Bill, there was a provision for anonymous complaints against police officers. In the Certification Bill, there was not a provision for anonymous complaints but there was a provision for confidential complaints. Which is intended..."

Slaughter: "They're not mutually exclusive, Representative."

Windhorst: "You believe both would apply?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Windhorst: "There is also in each... or in this single Bill now, two different definitions of duty to intervene."

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

- Slaughter: "Right. Several attorneys have reviewed this Bill numerous times and those terms are not in conflict with each other."
- Windhorst: "This is a new requirement we're placing on police officers. And to place two separate definitions, one for certification, one for their duty under the law generally, I believe is unwise."
- Slaughter: "Representative, can I answer the commitment that I gave you that I would answer one of those questions?"

Windhorst: "Yes."

Slaughter: "Automatic decertification was not supposed to be retroactive."

Windhorst: "I was talking about the..."

Slaughter: "Is the intent."

Windhorst: "...discretionary decertification. Is it designed to be retroactive?"

Slaughter: "One moment, Representative. In regards to statute of limitations, there are no statute of limitations."

Windhorst: "So, a complaint could be made for conduct 10, 15, 20 years?"

- Slaughter: "Yeah, when we negotiated this Bill or discussed it with law enforcement, they never brought that up as an issue.

 Law enforcement never brought that up as an issue. This is why the board has discretion over this, in this area."
- Windhorst: "So, you... to the retroactive... retroactivity, they would have discretion?"
- Speaker Burke: "Excuse me, Representative. Your time has expired, again. Representative Demmer is going to yield time, but we

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

have many other speakers. If you could make this your last series of questions."

Windhorst: "Thank you. So, I want to make sure I understood your answer correctly. The discretionary decertification retroactive effect will be up to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board to determine if it's retroactive or not?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. They can look at retroactivity. That's correct."

Windhorst: "Is there a provision in the decertification provision that allows for an officer who has been decertified to imply for reinstatement?"

Slaughter: "I believe so, Representative."

Windhorst: "Is that a sure?"

Slaughter: "I believe so. Oh, you said can they be reinstated?"

Windhorst: "Yeah."

Slaughter: "Or..."

Windhorst: "I did not see that in the Bill is why I'm asking. Is there a place where that's found?"

Slaughter: "Yes? Is there a question, Representative?"

Windhorst: "Yes. Where is that located in the Bill that an officer can apply for reinstatement?"

Slaughter: "It was brought up by the Attorney General, but there was a conflict between management and rank and file. So, it actually was removed."

Windhorst: "Okay. Thank you. That's what I interpreted. To the Bill. Madam Speaker, it's my... in my review of this Bill, we have two large criminal justice Bills, one involving certification of police officers, one involving criminal

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

justice reforms that have been merged. That merger has created conflicts in the Bills with potential conflicts in the laws. This Bill needs more time to work out those conflicts to make sure the Bill is what the Legislature intends it to be. We have included in the no-cash bail provisions of this law certain offenses that, I believe, most people in the General Assembly would agree should require... should require a person, or at least allow a court to require a person who commits burglary, arson, robbery, kidnapping to be held without cash bail. My fear is we have ... that we have seen an increase in crime over this past 2020. From the early '90s to 2014 and '15, we have seen massive decreases in crime throughout our state and country. A massive overhaul of the criminal justice system, I believe, will lead to increases in crime and an undoing of the things that have occurred over that 20 to 25 year period of time that have resulted in a safer society that we've had. For these reasons, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Chesney: "Thank you. To the Bill. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the last four days have, in so many words, expressed the opinion that my party affiliation or the color of my skin, I am unable to properly represent people of color. And I have supported many of the initiatives, Representative, of the Black Caucus. I've even spoke out in support of them. But in order to get good legislation, I think it's important to note that much of these initiatives have come out of and from the Legislative Black Caucus are from Legislators in the Cook County area. The Mayor of the City of Chicago, the Cook County State's Attorney, the Cook County Clerk, the President

Speaker Burke: "Representative Chesney is recognized."

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

of Cook County, and the superintendent of police for Chicago are all members of color. The City of Chicago is ran by almost entirely Democrat majorities and have been so for a very long time. Representative Slaughter, I bring that to your attention because I think that good policy can certainly come out in a bipartisan way. And so, I challenge my Members on the other side of the aisle if you would consider some of our policies, some of the things that we're trying to fight to help improve the pillars of success for black and brown communities. Let's talk about school choice. School choice disproportionately improves the quality of life for black and brown communities. It doesn't help my district nearly as much as it helps many Members in the Black Caucus' district. And yet, time and time again, even though the most poorly performing schools, Representative, we can't get school choice in those areas. I'm not talking about my district. My job is to also improve the quality of life for everyone that calls Illinois home. And yet, the powerful teacher unions put a brick every time we try to advance the agenda for everyone in Illinois. Let's talk about opportunity and taxes. The Progressive Income Tax not only failed, it failed miserably. But last night, the Governor started twisting your arms to raise taxes, a billion dollars in taxes on black and brown communities. And you stood with us and we defeated the Governor's measure. One, it wasn't negotiated. Two, it happened at three in the morning. And three, I would argue a billion dollar increase disproportionately impacts people in black and brown communities. And I was pleased to see, Representative, that Members of the Black Caucus joined us in

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

leading the charge to defeat the Governor's position on additional taxation in the middle of a pandemic. But here's the part, folks, that really surprises me. Let's talk about public safety, because that's what this Bill is about. You've had a Member of the Legislative Black Caucus arrested for problems with FOID cards and Concealed Carry. Republicans agree there are problems with FOID cards and Concealed Carry. I would argue that the problems with the FOID card and the Concealed Carry disproportionately impact people in black and brown communities. And Republicans have filed Bill, after Bill, after Bill to improve the process to make sure legal firearms can get in the hands of good people. And the Majority Party continues to stop the progress on legal firearms going in the hands of good people, going in the hands of people in black and brown communities to protect them who can't protect themselves. Folks, Chicago had 774 murders, a 50 percent increase this year. And I know the Democrat Majority doesn't believe all the rhetoric that's come out over the last 4 days about police officers. I know, Madam Speaker, you don't believe what is coming out about our police officers. You know how I know this? Is because in this room we are protected by the same people this legislation's going to hurt. The same people that let us into this parking structure. The same people that make sure we're secure through the metal detectors. The same people that smile us... smile at us every day. Many Members on the other side of the aisle are saying that they are unfairly going into their neighborhoods and shooting them. I know, Representative Slaughter, you don't believe that because if you believed that, Sir, you wouldn't

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

let them protect you in this room. Ladies and Gentlemen, in less than an hour we are going to do something very historic. You guys are going to fire a person that has disproportionately hurt black and brown communities, and I applaud you for those efforts. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, you also are going to do something where you're not on the right side of history. You are going to pass a flawed Bill. A Bill that is not supported by labor, is not supported by the Sheriff's Association, is not supported by the police chiefs. Everybody that we tasked to keep us..."

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

Chesney: "Yes. Everybody that we tasked to keep us safe, they all say this makes you less safe. That it makes my family less safe. That makes you and your communities less safe. So, I ask you to reconsider and pull this Bill and let us work on a Bill that makes us all safe. A Bill that law enforcement can get behind and say, we're going to come to the table and we're going to work on sensible solutions that make everybody safe. But the way it presents right now, I'm asking for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 59, I move that the previous question be put."

Speaker Burke: "The Representative has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the question is moved. Representative Slaughter to close. Representative Slaughter to close."

104th Legislative Day

1/13/2021

Slaughter: "Mr. Speaker... Madam Speaker..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Slaughter, please..."

Slaughter: "Madam... Madam Speaker, this will be real short. For black communities all across the State of Illinois, the time is now. The time is now to go from protest to progress. Criminal justice reform cannot wait. Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the Illinois... on behalf of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, we present our final pillar, criminal justice reform pillar. We just want to say thank you for everything, listening to us, the time, the energy, the effort that you've put into it. The time is now. The time is now to go from protest to progress. I ask for a 'yes' vote, Madam Speaker." Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3653?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted... Mr... Represent... Leader Durkin, you're out of order. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting in 'favor', 50 voting 'against'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Attention, Members, Democrats will caucus immediately in the downstairs caucus room. The House will stand in recess."