2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report. The First Special Session of the House will come to order. With leave of the Body we will use a Quorum Roll Call from the regular Session as the Quorum Roll Call for the First Special Session. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 21, 2020: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1857; Floor Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1863; approved for consideration, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 848. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 21, 2020: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 264; do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 685, Senate Bill 1530, Senate Bill 1805, Senate Bill 1864, Senate Bill 1937, Senate Bill 2099; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1569, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1857, Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1863, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2052."
- Speaker Manley: "We're going to proceed to the Order of House Bills on Second Reading. Pardon me, Senate Bills on Second Reading. Senate Bill 1863, Representative Burke. Please... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: Senate Bill 1863, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #5 has been approved for consideration."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke on Floor Amendment 5."

Burke: "Madam Chair, Floor Amendment 5 is the Bill. I would hope we could adopt it and debate it on Third Reading."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "What's the status of the note on this Bill, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "A fiscal note has been requested on the Bill as amended by Amendment #5 and has not been filed."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke, would you care to debate the Amendment on Second Reading?"

Burke: "Yeah, that would be... that would be fine."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Are we waiting for the… you're holding it on Second then that's fine, but we're going to wait… we want to wait for the Bill to be filed… or the fiscal note to be filed before we debate it."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The House Republicans request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Manley: "The House Republicans will caucus in the same spot you were in yesterday. I'm not sure the direction. And the Chair recognizes Leader Willis for an announcement. She is not there."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Here I am. The Democrats will caucus while the Republicans are in caucus. We... (recording malfunction.)"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Clerk Hollman: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately. The Rules Committee will meet immediately."
- Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson for the Committee on Rules. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 21, 2020: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2052."
- Speaker Manley: "Returning to the Calendar on Third Reading is Senate Bill 1857, Representative Burke. No running. Leader Burke, I understand there's Amendments. Would you like to return the Bill to Second Reading and then talk about the Amendments?"
- Burke: "Yes, let's move it to Second and adopt the Amendment."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, will you return the Bill to Second Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: Senate Bill 1857, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Burke."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke on the Amendment."
- Burke: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Floor Amendment 2 is a gut and replace Amendment and extends various sunsets and deadlines that were scheduled to expire. It extends them all for one year. There's varying dates at which things expire

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

and this just extends the date for those expirations by one year. No substantive changes to the underlying statute."

- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin. Chair recognizes Representative Lilly. There's a lot of hand-waving going on out there now. Any questions? Representative Stava-Murray, do you have a question?"
- Stava-Murray: "Yes, I do. I was just wondering if we had an estimate of the total amount of dollars that will not be returning to local taxing bodies as a result of doing this one year extension."

Burke: "Which specific extension are you..."

Stava-Murray: "Well I just meant like all of them together. Did we have like a total?"

Burke: "I don't know that any of them would prevent monies... that extending any of these would prevent monies from going back to local governments. There's 16 different Acts that are being extended, if you've got a specific one maybe we can go through it."

Stava-Murray: "No, I was just wondering the total amount because I think I had a TIF come to me last year and there was a certain amount that the local governing bodies were expecting back because the TIF was ending. And so I was just checking that. Okay."

Burke: "This is not a TIF extension."

Stava-Murray: "Oh, what is this one?"

Burke: "This is regulatory sunsets."

Stava-Murray: "Oh, got it. Thank you. Sorry."

Burke: "I think that's a different Bill."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Stava-Murray: "Perfect. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Any further questions? Representative Burke moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1857. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Burke."

Burke: "This is an extremely limited Amendment. It only pertains to the extension of the Capital Development Board Revolving Fund. And it... there just needed to be a small fix to... to that one sunset extension."

Speaker Manley: "Any questions? Representative Burke moves that Floor Amendment 3 on Senate Bill 1857 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1857, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke."

Burke: "I hope I explained Amendments 2 and 3 adequately in our prior discussion, but I'm willing to answer any questions and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 185'...

Representative Batinick."

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

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Batinick: "Hello, Representative. Boy you're a long way away. I just want to get everybody woken up on our side here. So you adopt a couple of Amendments and what we're doing is, is we're extending the sunsets on a whole plethora of Bills that we normally do individually... correct our Acts, correct?"

Burke: "Correct, 16 different ones."

Batinick: "You want to give us a sampling of what we're doing here?"

Burke: "Sure. We're extending the dates on the Notarization Task Force on Best Practices and Verification Standards to Implement Electronic Notarization. The extension of the... I think it's a reporting date for the Criminal Diversion Racial Impact Data Collection Act. Protection of individuals with disabilities in the Criminal Justice System Task Force Report. The sale of the Thompson Center. The tax credit for student assistance contributions to college savings plans. Provisions for the Clerk of the Court Act, the Criminal and Traffic Assessment Act, the Illinois Holocaust and Genocide Commission Acts... the Act, and the Task Force on Children of Incarcerated Parents, as well as a couple of other small ones."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. We're awake, appreciate it."

Burke: "This is a tough Bill to wake people up with."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Demmer: "Representative Burke, I really appreciate seeing this.

This is a good bipartisan Bill. A Burke's theme initiative.

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

I do have a question, does this Bill still name a state microbe?"

Burke: "Unfortunately no, we'll have to take that up in Veto Session."

Demmer: "Veto Session. Perfect. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1857 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. With 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 2 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the requisite amount of votes, is considered passed. Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Inquiry of the Chair. Yesterday one of our Members sought to be recognized for a point of personal privilege. I think it was Representative Wheeler. He was in a... I guess in all sense denied to make a point of personal privilege as it was told to him that it would be taken under advisement. I'd like to know whether or not you have reached or anyone has reached a conclusion of why he was denied that ability. And I want to know that whether or not our Members on this side of the aisle, the Republicans, will be able to be recognized for points of personal privilege the balance of the day and also tomorrow."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Durkin, I promise you a response as soon as I can."

Durkin: "I hope I can... maybe I can get a response right now. All right."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Speaker Manley: "The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leader Harris on the Motion."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, I move the posting requirements be waived so the following Bills can be heard in the Executive Committee. Senate Bill 3066, Senate Bill 531, and Senate Bill 671."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris 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 the Calendar, under Second Reading, Senate Bill 1863, Leader Burke. Out of the record. On the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 2052, Representative Welch. My understanding is you have some Amendments. Would you care to return the Bill to Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, could you please return the Bill to Second Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #3... House Floor Amendment #3 contains bipartisan TIF extensions. TIFs in Democratic districts, TIFs in Republican districts. All letters are submitted. I ask for approval."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Welch moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2052. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Clerk... and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Seminally House Floor Amendment #4 contains bipartisan extensions and communities on both sides of the aisle. All letters are submitted. I would ask for approval."
- Speaker Manley: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Welch moves to the adoption of Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 2052. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House. Senate Bill 2052 as amended is the TIF extension Bill. If you are a Member who have had a community that requested extensions, all letters have been submitted. They are contained within this Bill. I would ask for approval."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

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

Batinick: "Hey, Representative Welch. So basically what we're doing here... often it seems like with TIFs we do them onesie, twosie, or we have them one at a time. How many TIFs extensions are in this particular package?"

Welch: "You know, I got so many numbers in my head between this Bill and the debt extension Bill, I'm not sure."

Batinick: "Do you have an approximate number on that. Several?"

Welch: "It's several."

Batinick: "It's several. Okay."

Welch: "We have requests on both sides. It's an omnibus TIF Bill."

Batinick: "An omnibus TIF Bill. Have we done anything like this in the past? Just curious."

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

Batinick: "Okay. We seem to have people that tend to support these and not support these. Some that go back and forth. Just giving it a little bit of time for my Members to get their sea legs under them in terms of what they're going to do in this particular Bill. So if you have an issue with TIF, you might not vote for this particular Bill. But if you're okay with the concept, you're probably going to get a yes, correct?"

Welch: "I think we should get a unanimous vote, but we'll take a few noes."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. Thank you for your indulgence, Representative."

Welch: "Thank you."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn." "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Skillicorn: considering this... there's two issues I have with this extension. One is considering this lock down crisis, I'm very worried about property values. So you have many, many commercial properties where you're going to have businesses don't come back and those property values are going to go down in value. That's going to effect the increase increment on these TIFs. If we are borrowing against an increment that doesn't exist, that's going to fall on homeowners and that's a big thing that I've got a concern about. I've gotta go back to my constituents and ask and say, what did I do to stop the increase in property taxes? Because we all know when commercial value goes down, the property values and ... specifically property taxes are going to go up for individuals. Well that's our constituents. So I'm very concerned about actually extending this when we have a situation where commercial values are going to deflationary and the residential houses are going to have to make up the difference. The second thing is, is during this COVID crisis we're really going to be extending more corporate welfare? This is a big deal and we need to have some serious reforms to this and this is the moment that we can fix this for the best. We need to have a system that works for businesses but doesn't tax senior citizens and people that can't afford to stay in their homes. This is a travesty to the people that are just struggling to get by and all of a sudden we're going to extend this so municipalities can hand

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

out corporate welfare. So I'm going to urge a 'no' vote to this. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Hammond."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Hammond: "Representative, just a couple of questions for clarification."

Welch: "Yes."

Hammond: "When these TIF extensions are requested from these communities, does it require letters of support from the majority, if not all, of the taxing bodies within that area?"

Welch: "These TIF extensions require letters from all of the taxing bodies in the area."

Hammond: "Thank you, Representative. And then the other question is, are these all extended for the same period of time or are they specific to the community's needs?"

Welch: "Whatever your community requested is what's in the Bill."
Hammond: "Thank you, appreciate it."

Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2052 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting in 'favor', 14 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Proceeding to the Order of Senate Bills on Second Reading. We have Senate Bill 264, Representative Harris. Out of the record. Representative

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Harris, I'm not controlling your microphone. Would you like us to read the Bill?"

Harris: "Yes, please."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. Senate... you want us to read Senate Bills 264?"

Harris: "Yes, please."

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

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 264, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Continuing on. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 685 for a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 685, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please hold... Third Reading. Senate Bill 1530. Mr. Clerk, please read this Bill for a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1530, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1805. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1864 for a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1864, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #4 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1937 for a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: Senate Bill 1937, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 2099 for a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2099, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Under Supplemental Calendar 1, under the Order of Resolutions, we have Resolution 848, offered by Speaker Madigan recognizing Leader Hernandez on the Resolution."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have House Resolution 848 which commends the essential workers. The Resolution basically just, again, commends essential workers who sacrifice... whose sacrifice makes the health and safety of all

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

remain possible, mourns the loss of those who have died in the line of duty as a result of COVID-19. It further offers a deepest appreciation and heartfelt support for the medical professionals, first responders, and all essential workers who remain on the job to keep communities and the state strong. I hope that all Members support this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford, do you want to speak on the Resolution?"

Ford: "No."

- Speaker Manley: "Thank you. The Members will observe a moment of silence. Thank you, Leader Hernandez. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' for Senate Bill 1530."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. The record will reflect that. The Chair recognizes Representative Ford, take two."
- Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect the Senate Bill is 1857."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. The record will reflect that. On the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1863, Leader Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1863, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 5 and 6 have been

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke on the Amendment."

Burke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can... so the... there's Amendment 5 and 6. If agreeable, can we move it to Third Reading and debate on Third?"

Speaker Manley: "Yes, Leader Burke, we can do that. Leader Burke moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1863. 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: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Burke."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke."

Burke: "If we could move for the adoption of Amendment 6 and debate it on Third, I'd appreciate that."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Burke moves for the adoption of Amendment 6 on Senate Bill 1863. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1863, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1863 is... makes a change for the upcoming November 2020 Elections. It

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

introduces a robust vote by mail program along with some other changes that will balance public health concerns with robust participation in elections. It will make vote by mail more user-friendly, efficient, secure, and accessible. As we adapt to public health guidelines and new technologies, it's important we're doing everything we can to protect our residents and ensure that they have access to voting. As this Bill has been designed, we've had input from clerks from across the state. And I'd like to thank the efforts of many people, especially Katie Stuart and the other Members of the Women's Caucus who participate in our elections working group. It is ... excuse me. It is ... really, I think looking at the ability to deliver, as many other states are doing, access to elections. Recognizing that we're in a pandemic and that people may prefer to vote remotely rather than go to inperson voting, either through early voting or through Election Day voting. And I would note that numerous other states have done this. So there are several states that already have a very robust vote by mail program and those have been in effect and phased in over several years and they've had time to perfect those. But other states are doing more as we are seeking to do. The states of Michigan, Georgia, Iowa, and New York are also looking to do something similar to what we're doing ... or what we're seeking to do in this Bill, which would to have the local clerk's mail vote by mail applications to a universe of voters who have voted in prior elections. We're trying to balance increased access to voting with the recognition that there are some economic constraints

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

on the clerks. So we put... we really thought hard about how best to do this and have worked through a lot of the details with the clerks. We also have provisions to ensure more accurate and better counting of the votes. And we've created some additional opportunities for voting in addition to voting by mail, with better early voting, as well as the option for local clerks to establish curbside voting programs, the option to establish drop boxes for ... excuse me... for mail ballots, and the option for clerks to establish special early voting hours for people with health conditions or COVID related health concern... conditions. We've also tried to bring in younger people into the process. We are encouraging recruitment of election judges. We're allowing election judges who are ... people who are 16 and older to serve as election judges and really encouraging high schools and schools to allow their... not only allow but encourage their students to get involved in that process. There is a lot of great stuff in here that we talked about in committee. I won't go through every single element right now, but I welcome any questions and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Floor recognizes Leader Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Leader Burke. I will try not to question you as long as I questioned you this morning. So I appreciate the opportunity to ask some more questions. And I think all of us on this side of the aisle understand the importance of the integrity of our elections, the need to make sure that all our citizens have access to the best tools they have possible to vote in this unique time

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

that we're living in. So... but we do have some certainly some concerns about this legislation. And so, I'll just ask you a few questions to clarify. I know some of my colleagues have questions as well. So, first of all, just to start off, this legislation deems Election Day 2020 as a state holiday. Is that correct?"

Burke: "Yes. Thank you for reminding me about that. For only... only November 2020."

Butler: "So only... well this Act itself is repealed on January 1, 2021, right?"

Burke: "All the provisions, correct."

Butler: "And this... this piece of legislation, which has been out there for over a year now, this Bill, has gone through a couple iterations of the omnibus Bill. And just so for my own clarification, the only thing contained in this legislation has to do with this program for the 2020 General Election vote by mail program, correct?"

Burke: "That's correct."

Butler: "Thank you, Margaret. So, could you... what is... define the state holiday. Who will be off on the state holiday?"

Burke: "Well currently General Election Day is already a holiday for state offices and employees. So this would extend it to schools and the University Civil Service. So the idea is that, as we've seen, nursing homes are not an acceptable place for polling places and a lot of election authorities in the past have used nursing homes. And schools are actually... the facilities are good for polling places. So the thought would be to be able to use the schools but provide cleaning of those

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

schools for the area that was used and then be able to have a place, an accessible place for people to come in, vote, have that as their polling place."

Butler: "Okay. So a couple questions. You mentioned a State University Civil Service Act employees, and we had a conversation offline on this so I just want to... for intent, it is not your desire as the Sponsor of this Bill to have a holiday for state university students? You... what is the idea behind this?"

Burke: "Let me just double check real quick on that. Yes, they can still hold classes."

Butler: "So the intention is to have an educational day on Election Day yet the... so, what are... who are the civil..."

Burke: "An educational day at the university level, not at the local school level because we anticipate a lot of the local schools will be used for polling places."

Butler: "Are universities used as polling places?"

Burke: "Some are, yeah."

Butler: "I think a lot are. Okay. So can you clarify for me who will be getting a application under this program?"

Burke: "The application will be mailed by the local election authority."

Butler: "No, who will be... who is eligible to receive an application... a vote by mail application on this?"

Burke: "It is anyone who applied for an absentee ballot or voted in person during the 2018 General Election, the 2019 Consolidated Election, or the 2020 Primary Election."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "Correct, just an application."

Butler: "Okay. And do you have an idea how many voters that is in Illinois?"

Burke: "It's around 5 million."

Butler: "Okay. Back to my... I thought of the question on the previous point. Are schools... will elementary and high schools be mandated to participate as polling places under this legislation?"

Burke: "If they're requested by the election authority."

Butler: "So if the election authority says to a school board that we're going to use your school they have to agree to it?"

Burke: "Correct."

Butler: "Okay. I'll let some of my colleagues talk about the drop boxes. Do... and I haven't seen the fiscal note yet. Do you have a cost... overall cost on this program?"

Burke: "I don't have it in front of me, but we've had... just one second."

Butler: "I'm here all day... and all night. Leader Manley, you're doing a great job up there as always, so."

Speaker Manley: "I appreciate that. Thank you."

Burke: "So I've been told the note has been answered, but I can't bring it up on LIS, but since committee we have..."

Butler: "Maybe Leader Spain can read it for us when he gets to his points."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "When it's his points... but we have heard from various clerks. And so, the biggest county population wise obviously is Cook County and the Cook County Clerk has estimated that the cost to Cook County to do the mailing of the applications will be \$300 thousand."

Butler: "Okay."

Burke: "For her jurisdiction."

Butler: "So I have a text here from the Clerks Association from two hours ago... and so, the idea would be that our local election authorities would get reimbursed for these costs through federal dollars. Is this correct?"

Burke: "That's correct. Through CARES Act and Help America Vote Act."

Butler: "So how the funds and CARES Act... CARES Act, if I remember correctly when we were in one of our working groups, CARES Act has \$14 million initially targeted for Illinois."

Burke: "That's correct."

Butler: "Okay. So I have a text here from the Clerks Association saying they're trying to come up with a total cost scenarios but comfortable saying that CARES Act definitely won't cover it all. And that's at \$14 million. So I think..."

Burke: "The CARES Act should by far cover the application process no problem."

Butler: "That's not what the Clerks Association is saying."

Burke: "Well I don't know that they're saying..."

Butler: "Okay."

Burke: "There's 5 million people in the possible universe and..."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Butler: "So as Leader Spain just pointed out to me, the fiscal note that was filed by the Majority says that approximately \$16.7 million."
- Burke: "Correct. I'm just reading it right now. So the State Board of Elections anticipates that it would spend approximately \$16,759,400, which would include the matching funds as well as the money from the Federal Government."
- Butler: "Okay. And those are upfront costs that would be born by our 108 election authorities and then with the idea that they will get reimbursed, correct?"

Burke: "That's correct."

- Butler: "Okay. So can you go over the... and you don't have to highlight maybe as you did in committee today, but can you give a couple top level highlights of the timeline and the requirements that our clerks and election authorities will be under in this Bill?"
- Burke: "Sure. And I'll just note real quickly on the fiscal note that it appears that they've included in their cost everything that is permissible in the Bill. And so, there are some election authorities that are not going to do, for whatever reason, all the things that are permissible in the Bills. So I think this is an extremely generous estimate. In terms of..."
- Butler: "Can you... hold on, so what is permissible? I'm not quite following you."
- Burke: "So for instance, included in their amount they have the purchase and installation of ballot drop boxes. That's permissible, not every election authority is going to do that. So my point is that this is a... yeah."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Butler: "I gotcha, okay. So a few highlights of the timeline of what our clerks will be required to..."

Burke: "Sure. So I'll hit the highlights as you said. So the first one is August 1, 2020, at which time everyone who applied to vote since the 2018 General Election and registered or changed their address after the 2020 Primary, but before July 31, 2020, is mailed a vote by mail application. And then there are some other dates in August that the election authorities need to do to do some certification. The next big date is September 2 when the election authorities would update the State Board of Elections on the applications received and outstanding. In September 15... and the State Board of Election provides that information to the Secretary of State and then in the middle of September the Secretary of State institutes their first follow up reminder, or as we're calling it 'CHASE program', to those who have not yet requested the vote by mail application. September 24 ballots can begin going out. In the beginning of October there is a process for the election authorities to again update the State Board of Election about who has requested ballots. And the State Board of Elections will then update the Secretary of State and then they'll send notices to the remainder of folks who have not requested a vote by mail, reminding them that they can request the vote by mail. And then... then we come to Election Day."

Butler: "Thank you. A few other items. So one of the things that we talked about this morning in committee is the fact that election authorities currently have to have a verification of their voter registrations every two years. And in the Election

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Code it says, however, the county clerk shall at least once years conduct a verification of voter in every two shall cause the cancelation registrations and registrations of persons who have ceased to be qualified voters. As we talked about this morning, this pandemic has caused many people to move, I believe, especially when it comes to university students, and potentially reestablish their residency back in their home community. We have 108, I think it's 108, election authorities in Illinois and we have no assurance in this legislation that those 108 election authorities have actually followed the law that they shall have verified their roles. And what I asked this morning was... was if we could at least get the Auditor General to quickly do something with the county clerks to make sure that the county clerks are following the law before they even have this put on top of them. So what assurances can you give me that the 108 election authorities have followed the law to make sure that their voter rolls are absolutely correct?"

Burke: "So those election authorities are bound by State Law and Federal Law and are... I'm sure trying to do their best to make sure that they have up to date election rolls. Now, as you said, people may be moving, may be moving more than normal due to this pandemic crisis. But people move all the time and in the normal course of business, the clerks strive to do their best to keep those rolls up to date. So your suggestion about the Auditor General may be something that we look at down the road. I don't think there's time to do that right now. And this... this Bill is specifically limited to the 2020

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Election so we'll have time to do a recap once we've gone through the program, and if that is something that we notice is a problem then we can look at it."

Butler: "I don't think... I think we do have enough time before some of these requirements are to at least ask the Auditor General to do a... hopefully a quick study and ask of 108 election authorities. It shouldn't take that long to ensure that they... they have verified their rolls. Just a couple other questions, one on the processing of ballots, which... can you tell me what Section of the Act that was in, please?"

Burke: "So, that's in Section 2B-20 on Section 6 starting near the bottom."

Butler: "Do you have a page number, please?"

Burke: "Oh yeah, sure it's page 6."

Butler: "Thank you. That's the tabulation provision?"

Burke: "Right, it spills over to page 7. I think maybe the Section you're looking for is subsection (c)."

Butler: "So, can you walk me through subsection (c) on what the idea is here?"

Burke: "Sure. The idea is that if there is a dispute about whether the signature matches or not that there be a panel of election judges. So these would be a panel of three, no more than two from the same party, and these folks would be people who have been provided to the election... a list of names provided to the election authority by the local party. And there role would be to... to review those and if there is a... if there is a dispute about whether or not it's the correct signature that they would review it. And if there's unanimous agreement

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

that the signature is not the same as the signature on the voter file, then the ballot will not be counted... or excuse me, rejected."

Butler: "So this is the only portion that has to do with tabulation before Election Day? No?"

Burke: "There's no tabulation before Election Day, no."

Butler: "Okay. All right."

Burke: "Processing but not... not tabulation."

Butler: "Excuse me, sorry. Processing, yes. My mistake, processing, sorry. So this has to do with process... and this ensures that you'll have representatives from both parties there during processing."

Burke: "That is allowed, yes. So... but I think we're talking two separate..."

Butler: "So usually, in most instances when you go to the court house and ballots are counted and things, there's an opportunity for both parties to be present to make sure that... to make sure that proper protocols are followed. To... both parties have the opportunity to watch that."

Burke: "Yes, that's correct."

Butler: "They won't be denied. That's what your saying?"

Burke: "They will not be denied. They should not be denied."

Butler: "Okay, gotcha. The last question I have is... so under the Governor's... under the Governor's Restore Illinois Plan, we are currently in Phase 2, correct?"

Burke: "That's correct."

Butler: "So... and these phases can take a long time to go through as we know. So, by Phase 4... Phase 4, which maybe we'll be in

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Phase 4 by the fall. Phase 4, says gathering of 50 people or fewer... under phase 4. Phase 5 under the Governor, as we all know, is basically until we come up with a vaccine basically. So under... if we're under Phase 4 in November with gatherings of 50 people or fewer, will vote by... or excuse me... vote rallies, get out the vote rallies be allowed? Will people be able to be bussed to the polls under... under that in large numbers, or?"

Burke: "I don't know and I don't think there is anything in this
Bill that addresses it. I think that's something, as the
Governor lays out guidance for the different phases, that
we'll have to get clarification on."

Butler: "Very good. To the Bill. So look, I... as I stated earlier, vote by mail, I think, is a very important part of our elections in Illinois. I voted by mail on this past Primary. I hadn't voted by mail for a while, I wanted to test it out and it was fine. And it's great in Illinois that we have a no excuse vote by mail and Illinois has led the way on that over the years. We aren't a lot of other states where a lot of these discussions are taking place where you need an excuse to vote by mail or you need other reasons to vote by mail. And I think we have a good system in place that all we need to do is provide the money to the county clerks and allow them to roll out what they do currently. I think this is a vast expansion of that and goes beyond, I think, what we should be doing on vote by mail. I think we can encourage people very much to participate in vote by mail this year and have a robust program without having this legislation in

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

place. And the other thing I would say is that often times my side gets criticized for bringing up some of the problems with elections when there are legitimate cases that you can look at, as of today. We have problems in Wisconsin of... thousands of absentee ballots, having issues with them. We have an issue in Paterson, New Jersey just from a few weeks ago with... 16,747 vote by mail ballots were received but the counties official results pays only 13,557 counted. I mean these are... these are legitimate concerns, and we do have concerns about the integrity of elections. And I don't think this legislation addresses the integrity of our elections hardly at all. In fact, I think it makes it looser with some of the things we're going to talk about here in a bit. So, Leader Burke, I thank you for your time and your leadership. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. I just wanted to take a minute to thank all the great women that joined the committee that we formed through the Women's Caucus to work through this. We were all trying to schedule around the numerous different other working groups on all the other topics, but we all felt so strongly about that because we want people to vote. We want everyone who can and everyone who is legally allowed to vote, we want them to vote. Turnouts in Illinois, if you look at presidential years, in 2012 and 2016 it was 69 percent and 68 percent. I used to teach math for quite a long time. That's not even a C grade on most grading scales. So I'm not really happy leaving our state with a grade of under a C, which is

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

by most intents and purposes, average. States that have more robust vote by mail systems have shown higher voter turnout and that is what we are trying to accomplish with that. If you look at the off-year elections, the turnout's even worse. 2014 it was 49 percent and 2018 it was 51 percent. So what this is all about is trying to make sure that as many people ... that everyone who wants to vote has the opportunity to vote and does not have to choose between their vote and their safety. Because none of us know what our landscape is going to look like in November. So we are trying to be proactive in providing for steps that would be the safest and increase the vote. We want people to vote. So thank you, again, to the wonderful women who worked with me and all the time, all the articles that you guys read and the webinars that we watched and all the ideas that we shared. I think we came up with really great things that are going to help the people of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And thank you, Leader Burke, for bringing this Bill forward and for engaging in a very professional and thoughtful debate. I appreciate that. And I also appreciate and would acknowledge the hard work of staff to respond with this fiscal note. Earlier this morning in committee we did have a discussion about cost associated with this change. And the reason that I filed the fiscal note was really trying to pin down our expectations on cost as best we could. And with an admission that this is a bit of a moving target, but you've thrown out a number now with \$300

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

thousand for Cook County is there assumption on executing this program, which seems very low to me but we also talked this morning in committee. We used a number of \$2.7 million or \$4.2 million. We had communication from county clerks that estimated the implementation of this program at \$30 million. But according to the fiscal note, we expect the implementation of this program to fully exhaust the \$16.7 million that we would expect through CARES. My question is, do we have any anticipation on the cost for the State of Illinois and what share of the \$16.7 million would be attributable to the state versus passed through to local election agencies?"

Burke: "Right. I don't have a definitive answer on that. I believe most of the cost will be passed through to the local election authorities. I'm sure the state board will have some costs. You know, they do have a role in this in terms of forwarding information and putting together a universal vote by mail application. But their role in this is... and the Secretary of State will also have some costs that they're going to absorb, but I think the bulk of the cost will be at the local level for the mailing of the application. And if there is an increase in the number of people who are requesting a vote by mail, then there will be that cost too. But we're trying to help with the public health aspect of this as well as to help increase access to the... to the voting process for people. So we're trying to assist in keeping the public health impacts of COVID low... or lower than they would be if people were all gathering in person at polling places to vote. So, there may

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

be a cost, but there are a lot of costs that we are incurring in order to fight this pandemic and this is one of them."

Spain: "Sure, I certainly understand that. One more question on cost. Does the fiscal note and the estimated impact of \$16.7 million also include the expected cost associated with making or extending the voting day holiday through time in a half... time in a half wages or PTO days? What is the cost associated with extending that day off to Election Day to new entities?"

Burke: "I don't have a breakdown of that."

Spain: "But that would be an addition, we would imagine, to the \$16.7 million."

Burke: "Right. I'm sorry, did you have a question?"

Spain: "My question was, Leader Burke, would we imagine that that cost, although unknown, would be in addition to the \$16.7 million that we've estimated so far?"

Burke: "It won't cost the election authorities that. I've been looking through the listing of the cost that the state board has indicated. I don't see that, but in the scheme of things I don't think that is going to be a particularly large cost. And again, it is in the service of tempering our public health emergency."

Spain: "It wouldn't be a cost for the state board but it could be a significant cost to other units of government and to other taxpayers. I want to move on to a different question, though. Because as we talk about expanding vote by mail, that I would agree with Leader Butler that we have a very strong vote by mail program already. I'm very interested in working together on how to improve it because I think this is very important

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

and I appreciate what you're doing. Can you talk about... I see language in the Bill that specifies that election authorities shall accept any vote by mail returned even with insufficient or no postage. Is that correct?"

Burke: "So, that's the reason for the permission of the drop boxes, the secure drop boxes. Again, that is something that authorities are allowed to establish. And we heard from several clerks that this is something that they were considering establishing because they were hearing from their voters the need for this or the desire for this for a variety of reasons. Some people have a mistrust of the Postal Service, some people just like to know that their ballot is going in some place that they know the next person who touches it is going to be an employee of the clerk's office. And so, they asked for this. It is common practice in some of these other states that are a little ahead of us on a more robust by mail and that's why that provision is in there."

Spain: "Let's talk about that provision because it's the item...
the singular item in this Bill that gives me the most pause
and the most gravest of concerns. When you talk about the
collection sites that are available, what specificity and
guidance to we give to these collection sites? Are there any
limitations on the number of collection sites that will be
permitted within a county?"

Burke: "No, we give the discretion to the election authority."

Spain: "Are there any limitations on the type of locations that would be allowed for these ballot collection sites?"

Burke: "No."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Spain: "Is there any monitoring required of these collection sites?"

Burke: "But... well by the election authority, they're required to empty the contents of the box once a day. And they have to be secure."

Spain: "What does that mean?"

Burke: "That they're... someone is unable to access it from outside without the authority of the election authority. I don't know the technology that goes into how you open and close these, but it wouldn't be something that is accessible to the public."

Spain: "So this is really one of the big questions that we have here. And I would argue that there is no monitoring of any of these sites other than someone from the election agency needs to come and collect the ballots each day. But there is nothing to prevent any manipulation of that ballot box at other hours of the day. And even in other states that you have mentioned that are ahead of Illinois in this area, it's those very states... well let me just... let's talk about some states that are ahead, because the State of California allows for these collection sites, but the State of California exhaustive details on what the ballot drop off boxes should look like, what they would be made of, what are the security considerations, where should they be located, when should they be collected, how should they be monitored and supervised. This Bill does none of that and it's very concerning as we seek ... and I think we all care deeply about the propriety of our elections and about the protection of

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

ballots. And so, this is California who is well ahead of us in terms of guidance and rule making and we've seen what happens here in the General Assembly when we don't proceed with specificity and allow executive rulemaking to become the... of the de facto leadership style for our state. So I'm very concerned that we are doing something that dramatically expansive beyond vote by mail, which I certainly support. I want to be very clear about that. And I support efforts to enhance and increase vote by mail. But by creating drop off locations that aren't necessary, because as we said earlier, even a ballot placed into a mail box without postage will be collected and tabulated by the local election authority. We do not have barriers in getting those ballots returned. But we are creating a Pandora's ballot box that I worry will give us huge opportunity for additional ethical scandals in the State of Illinois. And to go back to the State of California, an extensive study has been done talking about the unlimited ballot harvesting process in California that has now manipulated elections, unfairly, in many cases. And I'll speak now, Madam Speaker, to the Bill. There is a big difference between vote by mail and ballot harvesting through drop off sites. And I'm very concerned that we are giving rise to a new type of ballot brokers that have been established in other states. These are paid political operatives that aren't subject to the same electioneering laws that we would see at a polling place. And it is their job, on behalf of the campaign, to go out and collect vote by mail ballots and return them to drop off locations on behalf

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

of particular candidates and receive compensation for doing so. This is something that's happening in the State of California. It's happening in other states. It's an issue that we certainly would want to have to avoid in the State of Illinois. And I would say one more thing, Madam Speaker, as you can tell this gives me great pause as we seek to protect the propriety of our elections. But I want to point out one more thing because, Leader Burke, I appreciate, again, your professionalism in this debate, your thoughtful answers to our questions, which are earnest ones, concerns about how we move forward with any changes to a very sacred process for our elections. But I want to read something that comes from a press conference held by our Governor earlier this afternoon. And he was asked about this topic and his answer really stuck out to me and he said that, this has obviously been a Republican strategy, all across the country, to deny people the ability to go before the ballot box and deliver their ballot to vote. Republicans, generally speaking, have been in favor of suppressing the vote all across the nation and they think it's bad for them if more people vote. Governor, I take great personal exception to your comments and our state and our country is in need of uniting leadership in this difficult time. And for you to accuse myself, this caucus, or a political party of being interested in diminishing the ability for our citizens to vote, I think, is gravely disappointing. I am someone that cares deeply about voting. I want fair elections. I've spent every year that I've been down here working to pass redistricting reform, one

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

of the most fundamental flaws in our broken State of Illinois. I was pleased to work with and support, on the Executive Committee, House Resolution 682, which condemns voter suppression, an effort brought forward by our Chairman of the Executive Committee. I think we need leadership that is uniting our state, working to bring people together. And the continued division that is sewed, pitting one side against the other, as we so desperately need to work together now in our state, is getting very, very, very old to me. I urge a 'no' vote on this issue."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Ford: "Leader Burke, a few questions and some may not be a surprise because I made sure that we talked first. But for the record, does this Bill have a sunset if it becomes law?"

Burke: "Yes, it does. This is only for the November 2020 Election.

We would need to reauthorize all of it or other changes that

we would like to make for elections occurring after November

2020."

Ford: "Thank you. Leader, would you say that this Bill is not as aggressive as you would like it to be as it relates to mail-in... mail-in vote?"

Burke: "Yes, Representative. I think there are many people who would have really loved it if we could have mailed ballots to every single registered voter, but we're trying to balance the fiscal impact, the work that would need to be done by the local authorities with our concern for people to be healthy

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

during the voting process and also to provide as much access as possible. Because access is good, that's what we want. But we understand that there are some practical limitations and some financial limitations on what we can do. So we worked through a compromise and the compromise was, as is being done in numerous other states, is to send the application to people who are more likely to vote and then to follow up with those folks to make sure that they know that they've got an option other than going to a physical voting location."

Ford: "Thank you, Leader. So you would agree that we want to continue to work on this and hopefully we will get to the point where this becomes a law and it will be a little more aggressive. I appreciate that. The next question is, ballot versus application, why would we just go with an application and not ballot?"

Burke: "Again, it's for the most part the cost because it is a lot more expensive to mail the actual ballot instead of the application and it is also a... it is a lot of work for the local election authorities. So I hope we can get to a point where we're able to do this more robustly. But I think this is an excellent, excellent way to move forward."

Ford: "And the final question, Leader, is I heard that we want to make sure that we get as many people to vote as possible. Did we consider ways for the homeless population to receive an application?"

Burke: "We don't have an answer. As you know, that's a difficult, difficult question but we have gotten some great input from a lot of the clerks who are interested in working on this. So

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

this is not a one and done. We're going to be able to work on this issue going forward. I know you've been very thoughtful in a lot of the suggestions you have. So it's definitely something we would like to move forward on after the November 2020 Election."

- Ford: "Thank you, Leader. And to the Bill. I'll just say that I think that this is the time that we're dealing with the census and we believe that the census by mail is appropriate and safe. So this is a time to give a shoutout to people to fill out their census but also say that I believe that vote by mail is safe and that we should vote 'aye' for this Bill. Thank you, Leader."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke, do you have a request?"
- Burke: "Madam Chair, I'd just like to take this out of the record for a moment."
- Speaker Manley: "Out of the record. Rules Committee will meet immediately. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 21, 2020: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1569, Floor Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1863, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1937."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Burke, we're going to continue debate on Senate Bill 1863. The next Member who's indicated they'd like to speak is Representative Halbrook."
- Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to commend Leader Spain for his closing comments. Will the Sponsor yield?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Halbrook: "So, thank you. Leader Burke, my question is about curbside voting. Can you kind of explain that a little bit to us, please?"

Burke: "So just like the provision for the secure boxes, curbside voting is something that the clerks were asking for, for flexibility for folks who want to for whatever reason vote on Election Day but they're nervous or unable to come into the facility. So this would allow... and a local election authority does not require but allows them to implement a process where the election judge could facilitate the voting of the person who would need the assistance."

Halbrook: "What are the perimeters for that? I mean... and is there a time frame? Is this... give me the kind of the who, what, where, when and all that."

Burke: "What do you mean by timeframe? It's on Election Day."

Halbrook: "Just Election Day only?"

Burke: "Oh excuse me, early voting and Election Day. So in-person voting."

Halbrook: "Which is six weeks ahead?"

Burke: "Early voting will start September 24."

Halbrook: "Okay. And so, the election judges that would be required, what's the parameters there?"

Burke: "They're not required. Again, this is allowable through the local election authority."

Halbrook: "So is the election authority have the liberty whether they have one, two, three election judges?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Burke: "No, it... the statute specifies two. The curbside voting program shall designate at least two election judges from opposite parties per vehicle and the individual must have the option to mark the ballot without interference from the election judges."
- Halbrook: "Can these be employees of the election authority or are they additional hires? How does that work?"
- Burke: "They are folks who are authorized to be election judges."
 Halbrook: "Okay. So it's going to require an additional hire
 potentially."
- Burke: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that."
- Halbrook: "Yeah, so it would... would it... would have to have probably additional people would be have to be hired."
- Burke: "Possibly... employees of the election authority can be election judges but there may need to be... depending on what the election authority determines, there may need to be people hired. But again, this is flexibility. They can look at their operations and look at their resources and determine if this is something they would like to offer."
- Halbrook: "Okay. Thank you. Can you explain to us a little more about this Secretary of State Chase Program or however you might have said it? I know the word chase was used."
- Burke: "So it's a follow up notification problem... or program. The Secretary of State is already doing mailing because of the Constitutional Amendment that is on the ballot. So the process would be for after the initial ballot applications are mailed. The election authorities would... as their requests come in, they let the State Board of Election know who has requested

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

a ballot at two different times during this process. One in September and one in October. The State Board of Elections will forward the names of anyone who was mailed an application but has not requested a ballot and the Secretary of State's office has agreed to do a reminder mailing that these are available. So what we were looking at was to make sure people knew and understood what their options are, but also recognizing that the election authorities did not have the funding to do multiple mailings. So we were able to tap the Secretary of State's Office to do those mailings."

Halbrook: "So, just to be clear, this isn't... we're not going to send Secretary of State employees out into the neighborhoods, into the precincts. This is just two periods of follow up mailings. Is that correct?"

Burke: "Correct."

Halbrook: "Okay. Thank you. I had a question from one of my county clerks about IDES and unemployed persons potentially becoming election judges. Does that come up somewhere in the discussion?"

Burke: "Yes. So this would allow someone who is receiving unemployment through IDES to work as an election judge on that one day and it would be... income would not count toward their unemployment benefits... would not reduce their unemployment benefits or otherwise disqualify them from receiving unemployment benefits. As you know, a lot of election authorities have difficulty finding judges in the best of times and a lot of their judges are older folks who might be understandably nervous about being in-person judges

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

and interacting with the public. So that's why we included not only that provision but the provision to allow 16 year olds, 17 year olds to act as election judges. And to encourage schools to give their students... especially since they will not be in school that day, really encourage them to sign up to be election judges, take the training, and help out."

Halbrook: "Okay. So this isn't just for the curbside or any other voting activity in an election center or for the election authority? This would be people that could be used at any precinct. It just clearly says that the pay for the day would not be discounted against their unemployment benefits. Am I getting that right?"

Burke: "Correct. They would sign up to be election judges, receive the training just as you would do... anyone who is... who agrees to become an election judge. It's just we... they'd be helping out and we wouldn't want them to have their unemployment benefits impacted because they... so that... we don't want to have a disincentive to folks to help out."

Halbrook: "Right. So the normal process would still apply for election judges. The commissioning process where the party chairman would nominate them, but that would all still apply.

Nothing changes there, right? Whatever's in place?"

Burke: "Right. It's different in different counties..."

Halbrook: "Right."

Burke: "...but there is no change to how one becomes an election judge."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Halbrook: "It's not like the day before the election that someone calls this group of people and say report here without proper training or proper commissioning, correct?"

Burke: "Correct."

Halbrook: "Okay. So the question I have... and maybe this is to the Bill. In my home county, just the mailing of the application... and you stated there is some reimbursement process and we've heard about that in the debate. But the mailing of these applications would bust one... my home counties mailing budget for the entire year. So this is a serious expense. We already have a vote by mail provision. I'm just going to urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you... Madam Speaker, thank you very much for recognition. I just wanted to ask one question to Leader Burke. Earlier there was a mention about access for homeless people in this process. Does this change in any way the current access process for people who may not have permanent addresses?"

Burke: "No, not at all, and thanks for bringing that up. My comments to the prior speaker just indicated that we will continue to work for ways that we can make that process better."

Ammons: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. First, let me thank the Women's Caucus and Katie Stuart who coordinated this effort with the Women's Caucus. I also want to acknowledge what I would consider our included in first responders, many of the workers that went through a pandemic in Illinois and

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

held an election in the face of that pandemic. Many of them on front lines interacting with thousands of people during the process of the primary and all the work that they needed to do to ensure people's right to vote was accessible and was not hindered by the unfortunate circumstances of a pandemic. And so, I want to congratulate our clerks and their staff all around the state for the work that they did. I, also, want to acknowledge that it's not over and we will have some similar issues in the fall even with the access point of vote by mail and want to make sure that those clerks know that we are a resource to help them as we prepare for the November election. And this Bill goes a long way towards helping us address the concerns of our elections through this pandemic. So, thank you so much, Leader Burke, for the work on this and certainly thank you and shout out to our Women's Caucus for all of our work on this issue."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Leader Burke, I'm looking... this is from the...
from the perspective of JCAR for a minute. The first paragraph
is a reference to emergency rulemaking. Can you tell me the
intent of that emergency rulemaking might be?"

Burke: "Okay, this... this tracks to the reimbursement provision. So we have allowed the State Board to establish rules for the reimbursement of these expenses. And so, the provision on page 1 for the emergency rulemaking tracks back to the provision on page 20 that allows them to make the rules. And

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

because obviously it's... we're working in a tight time frame. There was the provision for the emergency rules."

Wheeler: "Well, then that's why I asked the question because I wanted to make sure I understood that this wasn't for the entire Bill necessarily but it was rather for a more narrow provision that you've outlined on page 20."

Burke: "That's correct."

Wheeler: "Okay. And then finally... on that page 20, I think its paragraph (f), regarding... except as provided, the State Board of Elections does not need to adopt rules to administer or enforce the duties. Can you also address the intent of that paragraph there for me, if you would, Leader Burke?"

Burke: "Right. It gives them flexibility if they feel a rule would be needed to implement some of the provisions. But we don't... except for this reimbursement part, we don't anticipate that there has to be rules in order to implement this but it gives them a little flexibility."

Wheeler: "So I'm going to take that another way to make sure that we agree that in the same context that the statute should be clear enough for the State Board of Elections to be able to execute the intention of the statute perhaps without a lot of extra rulemaking."

Burke: "That is the hope. Hope springs eternal."

Wheeler: "Well, as a member of JCAR I understand the importance or rulemaking and I want to just make sure I understand what we're trying to get done with that. At the same time, I just have one other question and it may have been answered already so you can just tell me it's already been answered and I'll

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

ask the person who asked it earlier. But my home county of Kendall County has outlined the cost of \$5 for each ballot to be processed to the whole... through the entire process of voting. And there's a reimbursement process for that... that in the earlier comments I thought there was a discrepancy of how much was going to be reimbursed by the Federal Government. Have we landed an answer for that yet in today's discussion?"

- Burke: "It's subject to the availability of the CARES Act and HAVA funding. We anticipate that we'll be able to cover. There's an unknown about how many people will... what the take up rate for the vote by mail will be. We're hoping from... especially from the public health aspect that people will take advantage of it. And, yes, that will be some cost but we anticipate that, first of all, it will be safer than everyone in general and that we'll be able to cover those costs through HAVA."
- Wheeler: "No, I understand. My county is just trying to get an idea of what they're potential liability expense wise would be."

Burke: "Sure."

- Wheeler: "And it's just a challenging thing to figure out what might come and what might not come so I want to put it on the record."
- Burke: "Exactly, we have a... we have a little bit of an unknown but we're trying to do our best to defray those costs as much as possible."
- Wheeler: "Appreciate it. Thank you for the answers to your questions."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Bryant: "Leader Burke, I... one question and then I would like to go to the Bill. Can a 16-year-old... in the case of voter fraud would a 16-year-old be charged as an adult if they were suspected of engaging in voter fraud?"

Burke: "The 16-year-old election judge?"

Bryant: "Well, in this case they can be an election judge with this Bill at 16 or 17, correct?"

Burke: "So, currently 16 and 17-year-olds can act as election judges with some caveats. They need a certain GPA and there's recommendations of school and what not. We're removing those so that we encourage more young people to get involved. Are you suggesting that the 16-year-old election judges would be engaged in vote fraud?"

Bryant: "Well, I'm not suggesting that they would, I'm just trying to find out... I'm not an attorney. So I'm curious since we have them now, can they be charged now and would they be allowed to be charged under this Bill?"

Burke: "Well, they're... since they're currently allowed to be judges under certain conditions. So whatever the law is now would apply to them. I would have to maybe get an opinion from the state's attorneys as to whether that charge would be considered something that they would do as an adult. I don't want to opine, I'm not a criminal attorney."

Bryant: "Okay. I'm happy to see young people get engaged in the election system, but I think it probably is a question that

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

should've been asked before we allowed it in the first place and if we're expanding on it. I mean we... coming from the background I came from, I saw some kids who were 16-year-olds engaged in things I wish they hadn't. But to the Bill. There's just a couple things that I want to make note of. First of all, there was a... as a Representative previously commented about some comments that the Governor made today in regard to voter suppression. And I just want to... you know, I want us to be reminded that we have some of the most liberal and accessible voting laws now in the entire state, including absentee and vote by mail and 40 days to be able to go in to vote. So I would say that there's no attempt to suppress voters, but there is an attempt to suppress voter fraud. And... and I think we need to clarify that as well. And then also just two points because the... the cost ... the potential cost of this Bill has been mentioned by several speakers. Most, if not all, is passed on to the local election authorities. So I think there's two things that important for us to note in this. One is that one portion of this Bill is to fix a problem that occurred in Champaign County. A problem that should really be resolved by the political party that was involved and now we're going to actually put on the back of the taxpayers. Fixing a problem that should be fixed at the central committee... State Central Committee level. And then secondly, the ballot chasing that's been referred to is done now by political parties. So you try to get your folks to send in to get an absentee ballot or a vote by mail sent to their home and then you chase that ballot in hopes as a

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

candidate that you can get that person to get their ballot turned in, especially if they're going to vote for you. That's a cost right now that is incurred by that candidate or by the party and in this case we're going to be doing ballot chasing... and again putting it on the back of the taxpayers. So, in it... as a part of the cost of this Bill just remember that there are two elements of this Bill that should be paid for by a political party or by a candidate that are now going to be put on the backs of the taxpayers of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McDermed.

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

McDermed: "Thank you. I have a lot of comments and questions that I received from the collar county clerks. Obviously, I represent one of the collar counties, Will County, and these clerks are both Democrats and Republicans. So, I would like to, on the behalf of the collar county clerks, ask some questions and try to get some clarification. What does this do to the election calendar? They seem to feel like there is some conflict between the dates that are set up in this Bill and the current election calendar and they don't know what's going to apply and what rule... what do they do and when?"

Burke: "Margo, do you have a specific conflict that we can work through? I mean, I have the dates that are established in the Bill."

McDermed: "So, I guess maybe we could short change it... the conversation by saying do the dates that are in this Bill then supersede the dates that are in the existing Election

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Code with respect to when you can apply for a vote by mail, when they have to send it out, by what date it has to be post marked, etcetera and so on. And with respect to the early voting and all the dates that are in the..."

Burke: "So, dates for when you can apply, what we have in the Bill for the November 2020 Election is what will be... what will prevail."

McDermed: "Okay. So they need to be guided by this and not by the current Election Code for this coming election."

Burke: "Correct."

McDermed: "All right. Are there any provisions for changing early voting now that we're expanding vote by mail? Or the times or the flexibility or the amount? And the reason they're concerned about this is this is all cost that's on our local taxpayers."

Burke: "Right. Again, Margo... what will... so just specifically to the early voting, extended early voting will begin October 19, which I think is 15 days prior to the November 3 election and it's a matter of hours that will be extended. It will be a later closing time. So again, yes, there will be..."

McDermed: "So there is additional cost?"

Burke: "...there will be a little increase of cost but we're anticipated that the majority of these costs... because we're trying to alleviate a situation where people are gathering in large groups or in unsafe environments in order to exercise their right to vote. So the extended time kicks in 15 days, which is when more people start to think about voting. And

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- hopefully having those places open longer will alleviate crowding."
- McDermed: "Even if there's no crowding now? Cause when I early voted, you know, crickets."
- Burke: "I think it's hard to have our one anecdotal experience rule, but this is something that I think will help. We're trying to be prepared. We're trying to make sure that we have the safest and... the safest environment and that people will feel comfortable voting whether they choose to do it in person or whether they take advantage of the enhanced vote by mail."
- McDermed: "Okay. So we're enhancing voting by mail and we're having more early voting. Are there any provisions in here allowing clerks to combine and cluster precincts and polling places in order to reduce costs on Election Day on account of so many people will have voted earlier?"
- Burke: "So, we haven't... there's nothing in the Bill that reduces the number of polling places, but we did put in where in some of the smaller election authorities that they can go from five election judges in a precinct to three."
- McDermed: "Okay. So the difficulties with finding polling places in this day and age, which at least all my collar county clerks have experienced, is not affected by this Bill at all?"
- Burke: "I apologize, I was distracted."
- McDermed: "Okay. So this Bill doesn't permit them to reduce the number of places that they have to hustle up and get, even though we intend to and expect more people to vote early than on the day... then do now?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "We're not seeking to have the number of physical locations reduced because we're trying to mitigate having crowds but we've tried to work in some flexibility in terms of what their staffing... or not staffing, but their... the election judge requirement is so that they can manage those physical locations."

McDermed: "Let me ask this question, are we mandating that schools must allow themselves to be used as polling places?"

Burke: "If the election authority requests then the school must allow."

McDermed: "Okay. This is a wonderful... this is a huge, huge gain for the clerks and this is something that I've had a Bill in the past to do and so has my colleague from Waukegan. She and I have each had a Bill like that because schools have been increasingly reluctant to allow themselves to be used. Even though of course each and every one of them have been paid for by the taxpayers, haven't they?"

Burke: "You're right."

McDermed: "Okay. My clerks are going to be really happy to hear that one. I'd like to go back and talk one minute about... one minute more about the Secretary of State and the mailings. Now, you said that the Secretary of State was going to be making one mailing about the Amendment. So, now is he going to be making three separate mailings? Or is he going to include with his Amendment mailing, one of these chase mailings and then with the second chase mailing, also another Amendment reminder? In other words, campaigning for a position here."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "So the initial mailing by the Secretary of State will be for the Constitutional question and it will contain additional information about the vote by mail. And that will go to the universe of people that the Secretary of State is required to send that Constitutional Amendment, which is a bigger universe than who are applications get mailed to. So as people request ballots, the universe of the Secretary of State's chase mailings go down. So the first... the first that they send out of chase mailings will be smaller than the universe who was originally sent applications. And then the second will be smaller than the first mailing list that they used for the chase."

McDermed: "All right. I'm confused. Why would his first mailing be smaller than..."

Burke: "No. So, each election authority is going to be sending out an application to each person who voted or applied to vote in those three prior elections... 2018, 2019, 2020. Some of those folks are going to respond by requesting an absentee ballot. They'll be taken out of the universe because they've already requested it. So now..."

McDermed: "Which universe, his first or his second?"

Burke: "The Secretary has an initial mailing that he has to send because of the Constitutional question. It will contain information about the ability to request a vote by mail. What these chase mailings are, are after the election authorities send the application to all the folks that have voted or applied to vote in 2020, 2019, or 2018. The Secretary of State will then send a chase mailing to the people who have not

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

applied for a ballot. And then some time will go by, people will apply for ballots, they'll be taken off that list and the remainder will be what the Secretary of State mails to."

McDermed: "So the Secretary of State will be making three separate mailings?"

Burke: "Correct."

McDermed: "Okay. So an earlier statement that he's going to be making mailings anyway and it's not adding cost was not completely accurate because actually he's adding two mailings."

Burke: "Yeah, I don't think we said that. I think what we said was the first... the first one he's doing was a mailing that is required already. It's the chase mailings that... as we're calling them, that will be an added expense."

McDermed: "Okay. I evidently misunderstood that there was any savings associated with these mailings. In fact, we're adding two more mailings to his already large budget. Okay. That brings me what... to what I think is my last question which is that the clerks were talking about in order to send this list to the Secretary of State of who needs to be chased both the first time and the second time is going to require new programming, new software, and... increase in cost. So it's not just the cost of mailing, is it?"

Burke: "They should be tracking who has requested an absentee ballot already so..."

McDermed: "Yes, but... what are they going to send him a paper print out?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "Well, no, it's going to go to the State Board of Elections and the State Board of Elections will be sending it."

McDermed: "Yes, and in order to send an e-file to the State Board of Election, somebody has got to create that program."

Burke: "But they already are reporting that information."

McDermed: "That's not what they're telling me."

Burke: "They can... they can do..."

McDermed: "They're telling me they need new software equipment to process, sort, and track the mail. So I'm thinking it might not be as simple as we think it is."

Burke: "They can send an Excel..."

McDermed: "All right. I'm going to just talk to the Bill for a second. What the circuit clerks like about this Bill is that it does allow them to mandate or insist that schools be used as polling places when it's very difficult to find polling places and they've been asking this for all the years that I've been here in the General Assembly, so good on us. The rest of the Bill adds a lot of cost to local authorities, which is going to be passed onto you as part of your county tax bill. It may or may not be reimbursed by the Federal Government and don't forget that we've been reminded on more than one occasion at 2:30 in the afternoon that certain counties and localities may not be reimbursed for anything at all depending on their compliance. So this is an expensive little proposition for a state and for counties, especially the collar counties, which is who I've been asking the questions about today... already have extremely robust vote by mails. I think that this Bill is not targeted to what needs

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

to be done right now, is very expensive, and not needed on top of our already robust voting that we have in place, vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Demmer: "Representative Burke, I was playing close attention before when Representative Spain asked a number of questions about the ballot harvesting boxes that are provided for in this legislation. And I had a question about who gets to choose how many and where... how many of those boxes exist and where they go. And I believe the answer that was given at the time was that, that's entirely permissive and up to an individual county clerk or an election authority to choose where those boxes go. So my question based on that answer is, what would stop a county clerk from choosing to put a few extra boxes in a friendly precinct and a few less boxes in a less friendly precinct?"

Burke: "So let's clarify. These are collection boxes, drop boxes for the purpose of collecting ballots for the November 2020 Election. They're required to be secure. And although, as the previous Representative talked about, they're not monitored 24 hours a day. Neither are mail boxes, which is the other acceptable and much... what I'm sure will be much more widely used method for delivery of these ballots. So the legislation is permissive. It allows an election authority to establish these boxes and set them up if they feel that they can do it and if it's something that their residents would want or need.

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

And we've given the clerks some discretion in how they're going to establish those drop boxes."

Demmer: "But the permissiveness, the discretion could also be taken in another direction. And so, isn't the answer here that there is nothing in this Bill that prevents a clerk from choosing. I mean, in some cases the clerks themselves are on the ballot. They need to be intimately aware with which areas... and we all as we follow the election results, we all know, this is a neighborhood where this particular politician does exceptionally well. This ward, this precinct, this part of town, this part of the county is their stronghold. And there's really nothing in this legislation that would prohibit, nothing in this legislation that would allow for oversight or a challenge or an appeal to an election authority to a county clerk who chose to stack a lot of these collection boxes in a friendly territory for them and deprive their opponent's stronghold from any of these boxes. There's really no... no oversight or no restraint on that ability to prevent... provide very different voting experiences based on any factor that election authority or county clerk chose to take into account because this legislation gives no template, no criteria, or no items for consideration."

Burke: "You know, we talk a lot about having some sort of local control. We're trying to give the clerks some leeway in figuring out what's going to work best. Because this is... certainly our vote by mail program is not new, but the emphasis on doing this so that we can avoid any of the public health issues that maybe we've seen in some other places and

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

encourage to vote by mail, it may change the patterns of people's vote by mail behavior. And so, we would like the clerks to be able to figure out where in their jurisdictions that these... that these secure facilities, if they choose to use them, which/where they are best situated."

Demmer: "And I... so I understand that. And I just... I would say that all of us, there might be situations where we think, boy, I think this is going to break my direction. I think the clerk is going to use this in a way that's going to benefit me politically, but there are also situations where it might cut the other direction. And that's why we try to put guardrails up, we put criteria, we put in appeals process, we put some oversight, we put a check or balance in place. Be careful what you wish for on this because it... what may appear at one point to be an advantage may later come against you. And if that's the reason for voting on this, I would urge you to reconsider that. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. I wanted to take a moment to thank the Women's Caucus for coming together with this. I actually was just on the phone with an activist from my district who wishes we could have a ballot in every mailbox. And so, I just like... I know a lot of people from the other party have spoken against this Bill very strongly, but this really is a compromised Bill because there are definitely a list of things that I have here that we are not doing that was because of feedback from the other side. And so, I think I just really want to emphasis that voting... the ability to vote is so

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

cornerstone to our democracy that I'm hopeful we can get to the point where we can make sure that people can opt in for all future elections to vote by mail, if that's something that they want to do. That we can get to a statewide tracking system. But I think in this COVID era the women have done an amazing job with what we have and how much money we're getting from the Federal Government to come to a compromise. So I just wanted to thank them for all of that work and hope that none of us ever take our votes for granted. So, thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi. It's on."

Mazzochi: "Got it, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. Thank you. So, Representative Burke, you said that this Bill was a product of the Women's Caucus. How many Republican Women were invited to your caucus policy discussion? Because I didn't get an invite and I've got Bills on election integrity issues."

Burke: "So this is not a product... the idea of expanded vote by mail has been going around and floated by lots of different people. It became a priority for many people and something that we thought needed to be done expeditiously because of the COVID-19 pandemic. So we've had input from many people through time, but a group of us, chaired by Katie Stuart, decided to sit down and really dig in to the issue and we proposed a Bill. And a lot of the suggestions that came out of our discussions were put in the Bill. So, this is a group effort. It's not just... it certainly wasn't just some

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Legislators on our side. But this is an idea that has been worked on for quite a long time and to the extent that there's been input from the Republican side of the aisle. We've had plenty of time."

Mazzochi: "Well, you just said that this was a product of the Women's Caucus and you spoke very glowingly that this was the product of the Women's Caucus. And again, I'm a woman, last time I checked, and I've got a whole bunch of Bills relating to elections and voter integrity. And again, we were not invited. Now I do have... do you know why the caucus, by the way, has never given the courtesy of some of my election integrity Bills a hearing?"

Burke: "You'd have to take that up with the committee... the..."

Mazzochi: "Speaker Madigan? Okay."

Burke: "...take that up with your Leader."

Mazzochi: "Representative Burke, you said that this Bill is going to sunset, but today, of course, we just voted to extend the sunset on, I think it was over 16 different laws. Will you, the Speaker, and your leadership commit that no one on your side is going to... of the aisle is going to waive, change, or extend this laws sunset provision, that if a Bill to that effect were to come from the Senate you would also not bring it to the floor for a vote so that this sunset is for real?"

Burke: "So, Representative, I know you haven't been in the Legislature for many Sessions. And so, maybe you don't know that our process with sunsets on regulatory matters is to use the opportunity when a Bill is sunsetting to look at changes that need to be made. So all of those Bills that were a part

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

of the regulatory sunset in a normal year would have had the vetting that is required."

Mazzochi: "Sure, but you see..."

Burke: "The extension was an emergency due to the circumstances we find ourselves in. So that is not a normal practice and I don't think it's applicable or is... should be even brought up in this case."

Mazzochi: "Well, no, see but it's inconsistent because, again, you're promising people, don't worry, this law is going to sunset, it's only for an emergency one time only event of COVID-19. But if you're not committing that this isn't going to get extended then let's... let's be real about it. This is the first step among many, as some of your colleagues seem to be suggesting, that this is going to be a permanent change to election law. You might do it through the sunset process, but let's not give the illusion that this is really just a one year, one time only deal for the emergency of COVID. This is going... this is designed to be a more permanent change to our election laws. Now with that, Representative Burke, have your campaigns ever paid for a vote by mail campaign?"

Burke: "Me, personally?"

Mazzochi: "Your campaigns or people on your behalf in your elections."

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

Mazzochi: "Do you know how much the Democrat Party has actually put in to vote by mail campaign efforts?"

Burke: "I do not."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Mazzochi: "Do you think it's okay to have the taxpayers contribute money for what should normally be the work of a partisan political campaign?"

Burke: "So this is an application that is at issue here, not the ballot itself. So I don't think you're comparing..."

Mazzochi: "Same thing. Step one is getting... is the application to get the ballot. Now you have said that this is COVID related. Now, back in March, Governor Pritzker said, and I quote, 'I feel good about the decision to have the election go on tomorrow.' Now that was at the time when we were having, supposedly, the explosive rates of COVID so much so that we needed to have a shutdown order within a few days. And Governor Pritzker also said, 'We do believe it's safe.' Now is that true or was that false?"

Burke: "I can't speak to that. I'm not..."

Mazzochi: "All right. Well do you know... do you know whether the Illinois Department of Public Health has reported whether they saw an atypical increase in COVID infections in people who voted in the Primary population, before social distancing?"

Burke: "I do not. I don't know."

Mazzochi: "Yeah, well I can tell you. I did ask DPH if they did that study and the answer was, no, they haven't done that study and no that's not showing up in the data. Now you're also proposing curbside voting. Now it's my understanding that some jurisdictions actually will have some curbside voting on Election Day, but if in fact you're afraid about COVID spread, why would you not see that curbside approach as

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

the perfect way to actually enhance the spread of COVID infections as opposed to a way to stop it?"

Burke: "The curbside would be helpful for a variety of voters who for whatever reason were unable or missed the opportunity to vote by mail."

Mazzochi: "Right. But if you have..."

Burke: "Folks who are disabled, folks who are too frail to get out of the car. I think those are the very people that we would want to shield from being in what could be potentially a crowded small room."

Mazzochi: "Right. But are you going to require these election judges, the people who are going out curbside to have COVID testing and be COVID free before they start going out and talking to these people at curbside?"

Burke: "It's up to the election authorities to design that... that curbside. Again, this is not..."

Mazzochi: "Right, but you could... if you don't do that you could now be creating a superspreader event for the very patient population that has suffered the most from COVID-19 infections. And I think that that's absolutely terrible. Now when it comes to these drop boxes... so I've heard so far nobody's going to secure them, but here's another problem, all you're going to need is for one attorney, challenging results of an election, to find one ballot in that unsecured box that's tainted and now the whole group of them is going to be at risk for being tossed out. And you're not making that risk clear to people because you don't have the chain of custody established the same way that you would through the

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

U.S. Post Office. And by the way... and if my neighbors can't manage to keep a yard sign in their yard for the duration of an election period, I really doubt that these boxes are also going to have their integrity maintained and not be tampered with, vandalized over the course of an election period. I also want to know that ... wanted to let you know that there's some other things that you haven't considered. So in my district we had a huge problem with people setting up false Goodwill and Salvation Army boxes. People thought they were doing a really nice thing, they were donating to charity, and what it actually was is it was a for-profit organization that was just taking these things and selling them. How are you going to prevent that type of confusion with your new ballot boxes that nobody's ever seen before? How are you not going to get people confused by counterfeit boxes? 'Cause you know they'll happen."

Burke: "So, Representative, again, these... this is authority given to the local clerks to decide whether or not they're equipped to institute a secure drop box program or that they're not ready to take that on. And if..."

Mazzochi: "Are you giving them prosecutorial authority?"

Burke: "Would you let me finish? Would you let me finish, please?

I was not interrupting you. We give them..."

Mazzochi: "Are you..."

Burke: "...we give them that authority."

Mazzochi: "Are you giving them prosecutorial authority?"

Burke: "Ma'am, may I finish?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Mazzochi: "I thought you were done. Sorry, you paused. You said you were giving them authority."

Burke: "I was catchin' a breath."

Mazzochi: "Okay."

Burke: "So we give them that authority. Different government agencies have different secure drop boxes for lots of different things. For payments, for receipt of documents. It is not something that's never been done before and I think we're... it's done in other states by voting authorities. So I'm very confident that the clerks will be looking at the best practices of what's been done by their fellow clerks and by other government entities and be able to establish this. It... we require it to be secure, we require that it be emptied every day. I think that we will be able to establish that chain of custody that you seem so concerned about. And I'm confident that the clerks who undertake this will do so very diligently."

Mazzochi: "Right, no, that doesn't address the question though of the copycat boxes. Let's assume I decide I want to go into a precinct. Maybe I put it by a school, maybe I put it in a place that looks like it's an officially approved government location. I create a drop box that looks pretty much like the ones that you've got... you're having other people drop their ballots into. How do I know that that's a true one and not a false one?"

Burke: "You can call the election authority and ask. The election authority will put in your instructions for your ballot the... if they choose to go with this, they will put in the location

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

of the secure drop box along with instructions on how to put it in the drop box."

Mazzochi: "Is that in the statute or are you just assuming that's what they're going to do?"

Burke: "The statute requires them to... to notify the voter of how the delivery of the ballot is to be made."

Mazzochi: "Right. So it actually doesn't address the issue. And then again, there's no penalty in the statute because you hadn't thought about it, so how are you even going to prosecute somebody if they put a copycat box up? Now I believe you said..."

Burke: "Any attempt to interfere with election materials, interfere with a ballot is already against the law..."

Mazzochi: "But what if someone says I'm not interfering?"

Burke: "...and those Laws will still apply to anyone's attempt to subvert those election authorities."

Mazzochi: "Yeah, have fun proving intent on that one. So when it comes to... you also said earlier that the clerks strive to do their best to keep their roles up to date. I can tell you my role is not up to date, it's never been up to date, and even when I alert the clerk's office they never actually make it up to date. And the statute doesn't actually require them to keep it up to date, does it?"

Burke: "Federal Law requires it."

Mazzochi: "No, the law does not require it and, in fact, that's the whole reason why I filed HB2513, is because all... it says for example, let's talk about the deceased voters. It says that the clerk may take the deceased voters off the roles.

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Not that they shall take the deceased voters of the roles. So, no, the clerks don't actually have an obligation to even take the dead people off the roll. So if they don't even have an obligation to do that the rolls can't be accurate. You're also changing the rules on voter signatures, but is it correct that right now you can pull a ballot or send in a ballot just by block printing your name? Well, I can tell you the answer is, yes. You can actually pull and submit a ballot by block printing your name. I have another Bill to try to prevent some of the fraud that's associated with that, HB2508. You all haven't given that a hearing either."

Burke: "If we could... if we could talk about just this Bill and not all the Bills that you filed, I know there are other people waiting to speak."

Mazzochi: "Well you're suggesting that there is this massive thing that needs to be done to make sure that we're preserving our elections and election integrity and allowing people access to the ballot. These are some things that are actually denying people lawful access to the ballot or they're allowing people to unlawfully exploit someone else's vote and that's just as bad as saying that someone is not allowed to vote at all. Now one other thing that I've heard in my district in connection with your Bill is that there's been a negative impact of COVID on working parents by the fact that schools are closed because that creates child care issues that normally they might not have to deal with, with a closed school. So won't closing schools on Election Day actually make it harder for some working parents to vote?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "Then they should request a vote by mail ballot. That would be helpful."

Mazzochi: "All right. Well let's be... but they could already do that, right? So you're saying that you need to give... you need to close the schools, but by closing the schools you're actually going to create a new burden on parents. So this net promise of more voting that you're suggesting, again, is not necessarily going to happen. In any event, to the Bill. We already have vote by mail in Illinois. I have not gotten a lot of communications into my office from people in district who wanted to vote by mail but somehow couldn't or were told they shouldn't. And if anything if I've heard complaints, it's been from people who get hounded by political campaigns when they just want to be left alone. It's from people who get political operatives coming to their door looking for people who moved away and they call the clerk and the clerk won't fix the voter rolls. I've gotten calls from people who believe they're being disenfranchised by voter schemes to dilute their vote. You've said how awful it is that some people aren't voting, but some people do have the right to not vote as well. And frankly, it doesn't surprise me that here in Illinois there's some people who say, Illinois is so messed up I don't even want to take a vote because I don't think it's going to be making any difference. And frankly, this chamber is proving that this week. Ultimately, let's drop the pretense that you are doing this because of COVID. You acknowledged that you've had this Bill lying around for years. You're using COVID as an excuse to do what people who

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

don't want their votes disenfranchised from election fraud have fought you on for years. And if you think that this is going to be an efficient roll out, look at what happened with Jesse White. His office botched the roll out of automatic voter registration and he has had years to prepare for that. But I also want to ask a larger question of this chamber, why are we here right now? We are supposed to be here to start crafting policies to help the people of Illinois who are suffering from COVID and in particular the Governor's policies associated with the COVID response. We have people wondering are they going to have a job next week, are they going to get a paycheck, are they going to lose their homes? We have yet to have a debate about the Governor's COVID policies that have been crushing people in Illinois. And what's your priority today for these last several hours? It has been messing around, yet again, with elections. So that a state will pay for the program that the Illinois Democrats organize every year. There is indeed a sickness in the State of Illinois and we are not helping it today. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Brady. Chair recognizes Leader Brady."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Brady: "Thank you. First off, Representative Burke, thank you for all your hard work on this Bill. I'm only sorry that we're going to agree to disagree on the merits of legislation, but I do appreciate your efforts and those around you. Quick observation, I guess maybe question, and that is, with what's

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

in place now that starts 90 days prior to an election between early voting, absentee voting, mail-in vote, and going to a place of early voting and narrowing that down to maybe just the election authority of that county, would that not process that's already in place be much safer? Less expensive? And a process that has already been tested to a degree and seems to work from previous elections. Would that not especially address, if this is COVID-19 related, the safety concerns that we all have?"

Burke: "We have a process in place that can be better and this pandemic has highlighted that need for it to be better and to give enough leeway to respond to whatever the condition, the health emergency, whether it is still in place. We don't know. There's so much we don't know about COVID. We don't know if it's going to taper off. We don't know if it's going to come back. We are getting guidance from health authorities that there could be a resurgence in the fall. We don't know when that will be. I think everything in this Bill provides enough leeway so we can be prepared for a worst-case scenario. Prepare for the worst, hope for the best. I think that is something that will stand us in good stead and make sure that we have the capability to accommodate people however they wish to vote in November. We would hope and encourage that they vote by mail because we think it's going to be safer for this election. But for folks who can't or don't want to or miss all the messages we're going to send by vote my mail, the early voting provisions, the extended provisions are

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

going to help with spreading out those people so we maintain safe physical facilities."

Brady: "Well, I would answer to say that we already have a vote by mail process in place and that's called absentee ballots."

Burke: "And we're going to make it better."

Brady: "Representative Burke, I would just simply say that my time in Springfield, in our attempts at making something better, when we push something through and meet in an extraordinary situation like this, we're not going to make something better. We're creating an accident waiting to happen. There is 166 days until November the 3, 166 days. And we are going to undo and unravel, for the most part, a process that has safeguards in place as best we can to protect the integrity of the election now. To the drop box, Representative, or whatever you'd like to call it, provision. Let's just say that that election authority decides we shall place one of these drop boxes in the, oh, I don't know, lobby of a dormitory at a university here in Illinois. And low and behold, damage occurs, those ballots go everywhere. Inside, outside, down elevator shafts, who knows where. Who's responsible to decide what ballots are recovered and what will be counted and what won't be counted?"

Burke: "So those ballots would be considered spoiled and would be invalid. And then the election authority would reach out in a... in two days, with a very short amount of time, to notify those folks that their ballot was spoiled and to give them an opportunity to cast another ballot."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Brady: "What if there's no way for the election authority to know that? No way to reach out? Maybe the envelopes beyond recognition. Maybe it's soiled so bad you can't read it. Who knows? How do they reach out then?"
- Burke: "They would go through the process that they would go through for any spoiled ballot."
- Brady: "And what if the box just simply disappears? How do they notify somebody then?"
- Burke: "Disappears in what way? While it's in the custody of the clerk?"
- Brady: "No. It's there one day in the lobby of the dorm and gone in a few days after that. Who knows how many ballots were put in that box, right?"
- Burke: "Well I appreciate your imagination and..."
- Brady: "Right, that probably won't happen in a dormitory in a university, right? I would find that hard to believe."
- Burke: "But the same could happen to a post office box. The same could happen... the same could happen in wherever the clerk has stored the ballots after they've been collected or mailed in and there are provisions in law for dealing with those situations."
- Brady: "Possibly, but see we're creating more potential for it to happen. More potential for fraud, that's my concern. And to the placement of these boxes, it's up to the local election authorities is what I understand."
- Burke: "It's the... implementing the secure boxes is, first of all, a choice of the election authority. Some will do it, some won't. And then once they've opted to do... and it could be one

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

box, it could be multiple, depends on... again, on the jurisdiction. But, yes, the election authority would have the discretion about where and how many to place."

Brady: "Okay. So we're not... we can certainly be assured that it's not going to end up in like a cemetery or something like that?"

Burke: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Brady: "I said we can be assured that nothing like a box would end up in a cemetery or anything like that? There would be all places that can be monitored, correct?"

Burke: "Monitored..."

Brady: "Secured."

Burke: "It is required to be secure. And I will just point out, again, mailboxes are the delivery method that are currently authorized and mail boxes are not monitored at all and they're in many, many more places than anyone would put a limited number of secured boxes."

Brady: "Well, I have a feeling maybe the security of the mailbox and postal service backed by Federal Law is a little more secure than what we're testing out with 166 days to go to an election."

Burke: "Well, those same laws that would prevent interfering with a ballot would also apply to the secure boxes. So there is... there are repercussions for anyone interfering with these ballots or with the boxes themselves."

Brady: "Can you explain the section, Representative, a little bit about brail ballots and how election judges are going to have the ability and knowledge to deal with that?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "So they need to notify voters if they have brail ballots."

Brady: "And so, my election authority indicates that's not the case. So you're saying that they will have to notify them?"

Burke: "Just one second, I'm getting clarification."

Brady: "Sure."

Burke: "So there isn't law currently, requirements that the election authority's convey the information about the ballot access that they have for the… under the Americans with Disability Act. So, that is still… that's all in place. Nothing changes in terms of that."

Brady: "So back to my original point, Representative, and I believe I heard you correctly. This is not a one and done situation? It will be continued work."

Burke: "This law only applies to the November 2020 ballot. There will be people who would like it to continue. And I'm sure there will be a robust discussion as this Bill gets closer to the sunset and in our next Session about extending it, about making some changes, about doing more, doing less. But those will be new discussions."

Brady: "And is there anything, Representative, that allows a ballot without having received an application to be sent out, to be received?"

Burke: "So, it... just so I... there's only... this is only for this election."

Brady: "I understand that. I... Representative Burke, I understand that. My point was, for this election and other elections, we have other mechanisms to vote in safety, secure, and by mail that are in place."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "We have Bills about elections..."

Brady: "Why would we jeopardize something new to try with 166 days out when we have..."

Burke: "Because we're in a unique situation."

Brady: "We do have a unique situation."

Burke: "We're in a public health... we're in a public health crisis that we need to respond to.

Brady: "Absolutely."

Burke: "And I think everything in here is done in a way to be responsible and responsive to that public health crisis. So this Bill is limited in duration to the November 2020 election. As you well know, every Session we have Bills about elections, and I'm sure next time will be... there will be... it will be no exception. People have ideas about how to make elections better and we often take up those Bills."

Brady: "We often do. That's correct, but we don't completely narrow the one way that you can vote and exclude other tried-and-true methods."

Burke: "We're not limiting anything."

Brady: "Me going to my polling place and voting is not limited in this Bill?"

Burke: "You can... how does that limit your ability to go to your polling place?"

Brady: "Well, you tell me."

Burke: "It does not."

Brady: "Okay. You're just expanding the vote in mail side?"

Burke: "As well as early voting. As well as the ability for someone... if the election authority chooses to do so, to have

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

curbside voting. Those are the expansions that I see in this $\mbox{Bill."}$

Brady: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, simply, we want to have the voting ability of all individuals legally done and protect the integrity of that voting process. That's what's at heart here, not only the safety, but also the integrity. And I believe that this opens up an area that jeopardizes that integrity of the ballot. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris in the Chair."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Caulkins is recognized."

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

Leader Harris: "She indicates she'll yield."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Leader Burke, I have a few questions and I've enjoyed listening to the discussion. Some of it's pretty fascinating, really. Will the returned solicitation for a mail-in ballot be able to be used to purge the voting rolls?"

Burke: "So, what I think you're saying is if the election authority sends out an application to somebody in that universe that we discussed and it's returned back to the election authority as undeliverable...

Caulkins: "Correct."

Burke: "...can they use that to purge the rolls? Yeah, it depends on the situation and there's Federal Laws as well as some State Laws in there. I don't feel comfortable giving a definitive."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Caulkins: "Well, the clerk sends out verification post cards, periodically, to determine if people are still at that address or still there. And when those cards come back, they use them to clean up the voting rolls. Can they use these returned solicitations for that purpose?"
- Burke: "No, not... not in that same way. And I think... I don't want us to... I'm not an expert on this area, but what I just want to say is that there are some times when something gets sent back but people are still living there. So, you cannot... this cannot be the basis for purging someone from the rolls."
- Caulkins: "So, if it... will these letters come back to the clerk? Will they come back as undeliverable?"
- Burke: "I don't know. I mean, that would, I guess, depend on the individual circumstance. I mean, they should return... can you clarify because I don't think we quite understand what you're asking?"
- Caulkins: "No, I think you... I think you have it. We're going to send out a letter to everyone that has voted that's in your matrix, and we're going to ask them to request a mail-in ballot. Many of those people... and let's just use a student at Millikin University in Decatur. They're no longer at that address. They've graduated since the last election, or they've moved into a fraternity or a sorority house, or they didn't come back to school. But they're going to get a letter because they voted in the last election. That solicitation to request a mail-in ballot can't be delivered to that individual. Will that solicitation then come back to the clerk?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "I believe it will if it's... you know, the clerk has their return address in there. I'm not an expert on post office procedures, but that's what I believe would happen."

Caulkins: "And then when that comes back, could that returned as undeliverable be used to strike that person from the voting rolls?"

Burke: "No."

Caulkins: "Why not?"

Burke: "Federal Law and State Law will not allow for that."

Caulkins: "But that's how they purge the rolls to begin with.

They send out a notice and if that comes back... I mean, isn't that how we clean up voting rolls?"

Burke: "No. There's processes that the clerks go through for cleaning up the voting rolls and this would not be an acceptable substitute for that process."

Caulkins: "Can you guarantee the clerk... the clerks in my House District, that all of their expenses will be covered by the CARES Act?"

Burke: "We cannot guarantee that every cent will be covered, but we do have a significant amount of money from the Federal Government for the purpose of addressing challenges that local election authorities face because of COVID. And we're... the state board will reimburse to the extent that they have the funds to the local authorities. So, no, I cannot guarantee that 100 percent will be... will be reimbursed, but we are confident that an overwhelming majority of these expenses will be reimbursed."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Caulkins: "And so, if the money isn't sufficient to cover everyone's costs, will it be prorated across every clerk? In other words, if Chicago gets a hundred percent of its money, or Cook County, will Macon County get a hundred percent of its money? Or if Cook County gets 80 percent of its money will Macon County get 80 percent of its money?"

Burke: "So, because the money is coming from the Federal Government there will be some guidance from the Federal Government to the state board on exactly how that should be disbursed. I don't have those details in front of me, but there will be a method by which it gets disbursed. And it sounds like your concern is that some local authorities would get 100 percent of their costs reimbursed and some would get 20 percent."

Caulkins: "Correct."

Burke: "And I... I do not believe that that is going to happen."

Caulkins: "When you talk about... we'll go to the next question then. And this is a big concern for the clerks in my House District, is that these funds will not be equitably distributed and that they're going to be on the hook. You talked about signature verification of these mail-in ballots and that there had to be three election judges present and no more than two from any party."

Burke: "Correct."

Caulkins: "Is that a 'should'... is that a 'should' or a 'must'?"

Burke: "A 'must'."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Caulkins: "Okay. So there is... they must be there. Thank you. Will the cost of these... I don't know what you want to call them... boxes, is that going to be part of the recoverable..."

Burke: "Yes."

Calkins: "...phones... fees...

Burke: "Yes."

Calkins: "...the clerks will be able to have?"

Burke: "That's the intention, yes."

Calkins: "So, if my county clerk decides to spend a hundred thousand on boxes that are secured in the way that California has decided to secure their boxes, they're not going to be penalized because a county in another... builds their own boxes for \$150?"

Burke: "So, the guidance from the Federal Government regarding those... reimbursable costs is that to be allowable under a grant like the feds are giving, the cost must be necessary, reasonable, and allocable to the grant. So, I think in... they'd be looking at the reasonable and making sure that what was... what was purchased or brought on board was reasonable in comparison to their voting population, the number of voters who typically turn out in election, the number of people who are requesting ballots, things of that sort."

Caulkins: "No, I understand that. But the cost of... I mean, we heard in an earlier discussion, Leader Burke, that there's no guidelines. I mean, if someone wants to build a wooden box with a padlock on it and a slot, or if someone decides they really want to be secure and follow the guidelines like they have in California and build something that's going to be

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

attached to the ground and have a very secure lock, maybe perhaps insulated, and it's going to cost, who knows... 5, 10, 12, 15 thousand dollars, they're not going to be penalized for that?"

Burke: "No, because that would be reasonable."

Caulkins: "Excellent. Do we... and I've served as poll watching and done things. Don't we already allow curbside voting? Can't someone present themselves at a polling place and not be able to physically go in and we can send out two election judges, one from each party, to allow them to vote without having to physically go into the building? Isn't that permitted already?"

Burke: "So, there are guidelines and requirements to have curbside voting currently. So, it's limited to people who have a demonstrable and verified disability and it has to be done in advance. There has to be arrangement made with the election authority and it's a much more structured. For purposes of just this election, we want to make it more accessible to people who might not have that disability designation, but for other reasons, may not feel comfortable going into the physical space."

Calkins: "Well, in my experience, Ma'am, we've never turned away anyone that presented themselves at the polling place that asked for help."

Burke: "That may be true, but we're putting it in statute so that that is something that all the election authorities would be comfortable doing. You know, you're speaking anecdotally from

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

your experience. I don't know that in all 101 counties that that's happening."

Caulkins: "Interesting."

Burke: "One hundred and one other counties. I know there is one hundred and two."

Caulkins: "We're not counting. Part here... there was 51 states at one point, I think."

Burke: "And I was just informed there's 108 election authorities." Caulkins: "Election authorities."

Burke: "So, I've got a whole different number in my head now."

Caulkins: "In your Bill there is something about a permanent vote by mail list. Can you tell me what that is, please?"

Burke: "Can you point that out to me?"

Caulkins: "I don't have it in front of me."

Burke: "'Cause I don't think it's in the Bill."

Caulkins: "It doesn't say that if someone in this election in 2020 sends in a ballot in the vote by mail process that they are automatically going to get a ballot at the next election?"

Burke: "No, that is not in the Bill."

Caulkins: "Okay. I'm misinformed. Thank you, though. That's a big deal. When there's an objection to a questionable ballot, how does your legislation differ from the current legislation? In other words, if someone... I know in the past, when these ballots are being counted or recounted, either party can have an election judge present. We're going to go through a recount, actually, in Macon County. But either party can challenge a ballot. How does that change in your Bill?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "So, under current law, the determination of whether the ballot is valid or not can be made by someone, a staff member of the election authority, or an election judge. This would require more... I guess collaboration might be the good word... of three election judges, two of whom... only two of whom can be of the same party to review the ballot and require unanimity in order to have that ballot declared invalid."

Caulkins: "No."

Burke: "And... for the reasons... could you excuse me for a minute?" Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Burke: "For the specific reasons of the signature or that the ballot is open, things like that."

Caulkins: "So, if one of the election judges believes the signature doesn't match or if two of the election judges believe the signature doesn't match, that still is not going to be an invalid ballot because the third election judge doesn't believe it?"

Burke: "That's correct. You need unanimity."

Caulkins: "And why is... I guess, why? Can you explain why you did that?"

Burke: "So that there are more eyes looking at the… well it's not only for signatures, it's also for ballots that may be open and it's… it's a big deal to invalidate somebody's ballot. And to have three people who are on differing sides, so to speak, to be able to come to an agreement, makes… I think, makes it so there's more… more likelihood that the voter's intentions and the voter's ballot will be counted."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Caulkins: "Wouldn't it also make it more likely for mischief if the ballot favors one political party over the other? And so, if there's a question about that signature, all of one election judge can make sure that that ballot got counted..."
- Burke: "But because it requires the three, I think..."
- Caulkins: "...and over... over turn the other two judges? I guess I'm trying to make a point that this Bill creates a tremendous amount of uncertainty and sets up a scenarios, various different scenarios for mischief, I guess. It really doesn't secure the system."
- Burke: "I mean, that sounds like your opinion. So I'll just let you state your opinion."
- Caulkins: "No, I guess I'm asking you your opinion. I mean, this is your Bill, Ma'am."
- Burke: "I think the provisions that we put in are fair and equitable and are what's needed. If we have a difference of opinion, we have a difference of opinion."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Caulkins, do you have more questions?"
- Caulkins: "I have one more question, please. We... you talked about the costs savings by doing mail-in ballot, but yet, there's no cost savings on the polling places. Why didn't you... I mean, if we're going to get to people doing more mail-in ballots, why wouldn't you let the clerks of the county decide or... I mean, this is a sweeping... very sweeping and, I think, quite revolutionary Bill. But there just seems... why weren't the clerks included in this?"

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Burke: "We did talk to quite a few clerks and it's my understanding that the clerks are in support of this Bill, or at least several groups of the clerks. I am going to walk back a second. I don't recall saying that there was costs savings due to mail-in ballots, and as I think we had a discussion with one of the other Representatives. Because this is in response to the public health situation that we're in now and that we may be in, in November, we don't know. We're trying to prepare as best we can. So, we're hoping that more people than usual take advantage of vote by mail. But for people who, for whatever reason, choose to vote in person, we want to make sure that there's adequate physical space for those folks to vote. So getting rid of physical polling places is not something we're looking to do. And extending the early voting time extends the amount of time that those are open so that you don't have people coming in at the rush hour right when work ends. It's open 'til 7:00 in those 15 days before the election. And hopefully that spreads out and minimizes the contact of voters with each other, and also for those folks who are working those polling places, that it spreads out the contact with the voters."

Caulkins: "Leader Burke, thank you very much for your indulgence.

To the Bill. This Bill isn't really ready for prime time.

This Bill contains a lot of unanswered questions. This Bill has create... is going to create a tremendous amount of uncertainty in a very short period of time and... and I don't believe should be addressed in this Special Session. This Bill will result in another very costly and unfunded mandate

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

on all of the election authorities. And if there is one thing that I think makes people unhappy is that when this... when this Body, the General Assembly, passes unfunded mandates and that, I believe, is what this is. This Bill will force many counties and municipalities to raise taxes in order to afford the postage, not just in this year, but in every election year going forward. Because even if we're able to obtain some money from the Federal Government, which I believe is not going to be sufficient, and I believe the Sponsor of this Bill acknowledges will not be sufficient to cover all the costs, going forward that money will not be available. So, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Harris: "She indicates that she will."

Chesney: "Leader Burke, you've mentioned a number of times that we're in this public health crisis. In a quick summary, is the idea that we need to expand early voting and vote by mail because you feel some people within the electorates might not be comfortable voting for health reasons?"

Burke: "Yes."

Chesney: "So my question is, is allowing children to now be active participants as election judges, how is that protecting those that can't protect themselves?"

Burke: "They're currently allowed to be election judges."

Chesney: "I understand, but you said that we are going to expand it to 16 and 17."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Burke: "Sixteen and seventeen-year-olds are currently allowed to act as election judges, but there is some criteria that they have to meet in terms of a GPA and some other school requirements. This takes away those requirements so that those young folks can act as election judges. I mean, voting and election are essential civic functions and we need to make sure that we have those... that we have the facilities available. And as I'm sure many of you have experienced, a lot of you are... the judges, historically, have been older folks and they're justifiably a little hesitant to step forward. And so, if we have younger people who are willing to do that, I think that's something we should be encouraging."
- Chesney: "In the middle of a public health crisis you want to expand the ability for children to be election judges?"
- Burke: "Are you suggesting that we decrease the ability to vote?

 I... I guess I don't know where you're going with this?"
- Chesney: "I'm just understanding how that addresses the current COVID crisis. If the idea is, is we want more voter participation in sixteen and seventeen-year-olds, for the most part, aren't able to vote, I don't understand why we would expand the ability for children to put... be put front and center into a global health crisis and I just don't understand what the spirit is behind that expansion, is my question."

Burke: "I think I've stated the reason."

Chesney: "Okay. Leader Demmer mentioned when it came to the ballot boxes, and I don't want to belabor the point, but is there anything that currently restricts the placement of these? So,

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

for example, in heavily Republican areas or heavy Democrat areas is there anything that... is there any guidance that can protect the placement at all?"

- Burke: "I don't mean to bring out the lawyer in me but, honestly, this has been asked and answered numerous times."
- Chesney: "Understood. How about for the mail-in ballots, is there anything that addresses... is there anything that addresses the address for those that are going to be unavailable in, perhaps, a different state? Can somebody still request a mail in ballot for, perhaps, Wisconsin?"
- Burke: "So they're... can you clarify the situation? They're an Illinois resident who has a temporary residence in Wisconsin?"
- Chesney: "No. For somebody that perhaps is a resident of Illinois but is maybe not available, can they have that ballot mailed to a different state?"
- Burke: "Yes, just as they currently can. And an example of that would be a student away at college."
- Chesney: "So, if the Governor is working on his family farm in Wisconsin nothing will prohibit him from voting in November?"
- Burke: "If the Governor requests an absentee ballot, he's more than entitled to."
- Chesney: "Thank you. To The Bill. I think we've spoken about this issue, Speaker, for hours now. And my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have mentioned a number of times that we want as many people to vote as possible. I would suggest that we insert just a few additional words, we want as many likely Democrats to vote as possible. If this Bill affected my

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

colleagues on the other side of the aisle, their ability to win an election by one percent, this Bill would go down in flames. But we're going to expand the ability for children to play a more active part into our elections, even in light of a global pandemic. We're not going to address fair maps. We're going to make sure that the districts are effectively drawn so my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a better chance of winning elections. But I'll quote a famous Democrat by Rahm Emanuel, 'You never let a crisis go to waste.' I encourage my colleagues to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Oh, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Ugaste: "Thank you. Leader Burke, thank you for your time and willingness to stand and answer questions for us today. Hopefully someone got you something to eat, and thanks everyone for their work on this. I've heard, and I believe you've said, that one of the things you're trying to accomplish with this Bill is get as many people to vote as possible in the upcoming election. Is that correct?"

Burke: "To have access to as many people as possible, safely, yes."

Ugaste: "Okay... okay. Thank you. And in doing so and still protecting the integrity of the vote, correct?"

Burke: "Absolutely."

Ugaste: "Would you then consider an Amendment to include the 2016 voter rolls so that we can get as many people as possible?

Because when I look at the State Board of Election numbers

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

for 2016 versus 2018, there's 1.1 million more people that voted in 2016 than 2018."

Burke: "So, there's a couple reasons for not going that far back.

One, those addresses wouldn't still be... I guess valid to...
'cause they wouldn't have been certified because the time that those voters would've been certified has passed. So those... that I don't think is a very reliable data set. So, going back that far, a lot of those addresses aren't going to be good. And it just would add unnecessary expense. And I've heard... I've heard loud and clear that there's a concern about expense being passed on to the local election authorities, to the local clerks. And including that 2016 would add more expense and provide a less reliable group of people."

Ugaste: "Well, I'm worried about expense, too, trust me. I truly am, and I'm worried about doing it in a way that we're incurring unnecessary expense. But Leader Butler mentioned that every two years the clerks are supposed to purge their rolls of people who have moved and the vote goes out. So that would've happened then in 2017 and 2019. So, those may actually be very accurate rolls compared to 2019 and 2020. So, I would ask again that we reconsider it and get as many people as possible, if that's what we're actually going to do. But I think I have your answer."

Burke: "All those... I don't mean to interrupt. I'm so sorry."

Ugaste: "That's okay. Go ahead."

Burke: "All those folks from 2016... everybody will be getting that initial... as part of the mailing from the Secretary of State with... regarding the Constitutional guestion and then the

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

notice about the push for early voting. All those… everybody will be getting it. So, they'll at least get that one touch in addition to the… so they will definitely be getting the one touch. And to the extent that they voted in 2016 and 2018 and 2019, they would be getting those from the clerks as well."

Ugaste: "But those who just voted in 2016 won't get an application automatically, will they?"

Burke: "No, but the will certainly be..."

Ugaste: "Okay."

Burke: "...part of the public service... you know, the notification provision that the Secretary of State is doing."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Leader. To the Bill, I... I appreciate efforts, always, to increase voter participation when done appropriately. And I think the potential problems with some voter irregularities with this particular Bill have been addressed already. I'd like to see that cleaned up as well. I wish everyone would get out to vote for every election. It's a right and a privilege we've been given that I don't think enough Americans take advantage of. So, I'd like to see more of it happen. But I'd like to do it in a way that if we're going to be giving people opportunities and affording opportunities and trying to increase the numbers, we do it in a way that truly does it. And we're going to miss out on, potentially, 1.1 million voters between 2016 and 2018, and I'd like to see a change. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Parkhurst."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Parkhurst: "Thank you. With all deference to Leader Brady, who I consider my friend, I think that he is good at his profession as a undertaker and I don't think that that really leaves much to his imagination. I think of him as a serious man and not a man what flights of fancy. So, your suggestion that ballot boxes from a college campus could disappear or be tampered with as some kind of imaginary story, is just not true. In fact, one week after mail-in ballots opened in South Carolina, ballots have been found in Maryland. So, this is happening. All of us want people to vote. They want them to vote. They want them to vote safely and securely. That's why we're here. That's how we got here, by people having the right to vote. And so, we have a system in place and we need to improve that system through our absentee ballots and make sure that that is a safe way to vote. But what we're proposing is vote by drop box, which is not secure. It is just a recipe for voter fraud and none of us wants to do that. We want to suppress voter fraud and there are not enough checks and balances, there's not enough security, there's not enough integrity to this ballot harvesting drop box system. It just is not fair to the people of Illinois. And we know that there has been voter fraud in our state, long standing, years and years of voter fraud. And so, I think that it is reckless of this Body to vote for this Bill at this time. It is in no way an attempt to suppress the vote, but it is an attempt to protect our voting rights. Our people of Illinois deserve to have safe and secure way to vote and this is just not it. So, I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Harris: "The last speaker on this Bill will be Leader Durkin."

"Thank you. I want to echo a couple things. Yes, Leader Durkin: Brady is a serious guy. And I tell you what, I've never met a more serious undertaker in my life, so... I don't know what that means but anyway. A comment was made earlier, a question by Representative Bryant of whether or not these 16-yearolds, who would be election judges, if they are involved with some type of election fraud would they be subject to criminal penalty. And the answer is 'yes'. Under the election... under the Juvenile Court Act, juvenile court, the delinquency section has exclusive jurisdiction over matters relating to any violation of state or federal criminal laws. Go look at the Election Code Section 5291-20. You have 20 different criminal offenses that mainly are felonies and a few misdemeanors. So, yes, there is a possibility that a 16-yearold, if they are going to be working at a poll and they get involved with something that they shouldn't, in theory, they could be prosecuted in the juvenile courts of Illinois. So, let's make that perfectly clear. Now, I have a few other questions. Now, I would say... Representative Burke, words mean something and I think you would agree with that, and I have just a few questions about that Section which we allow for the 16-year-olds to act as judges and the requirements that are necessary. A couple of them I found rather interesting and I'm not sure if this is new language or not but we're being asked to vote on it. It says that anybody under the ... anybody who's obtained at the age of 16 can be ... will qualify,

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

also if they have been deemed as a good repute and character. Is this new language?"

Burke: "It's current law."

Durkin: "Well... if I don't... if I think that somebody who's a 16 year old is not of good repute and they have bad character, how would someone strike that person from serving as a election judge?"

Burke: "I'll inquire. One moment."

Durkin: "Okay."

Burke: "I have to admit, I don't know under the current law what the process with each election authority is for objecting to the qualifications of an election judge."

Durkin: "Okay. Could you... it also states that they must be skilled in the four fundamental rules of arithmetic. Could you explain to me what the four fundamental rules of arithmetic are?"

Burke: "Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division."

Durkin: "Boy, you're good."

Burke: "I hope... I hope the math professor in our midst tells me I got that right, yes."

Durkin: "Okay. All right, that's good. Okay. So, I guess the question again is that who would have standing if they didn't like anybody who was picked and felt that they did not qualify? This is not an 'or', it's an 'and'. Each one of these qualifications are required for that election judge, correct?"

Burke: "Right. So, currently, there are qualification requirements in statute, not only for 16-year-olds but for all election judges. And we've only, in doing this, have

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

removed a couple of the provisions regarding their grade point average, being enrolled in a certain program, things like that."

Durkin: "All right. I wasn't trying to be dilatory but I'm looking at this and it just seemed a little awkward, a little odd. But I'll move on and I've just got... just a few comments I just want to state. I know there was some questions that were made earlier by an individual saying that this is an opposition by Republicans is about voter suppression, and it's just furthest thing from the truth. On this side of the aisle all we want are fair, transparent, and responsible elections. Period. We want people to vote. Want to make... we want to encourage people to vote all day long. But we area also a party that believes that this is a sacred right that we must, must do the best we can to preserve the integrity of this process. And that's all we're asking for, and we think that this Bill doesn't achieve that. And I'm going to go as far as to say that this legislation is nothing more than a partisan power play to create an advantage in next November's election in the Congressional races and also the State Legislative races. I've been around here long enough, I know how this works and I know how different parts of the state work on Election Day. But I do know this also that I'm not a person that believes in ultimate certainties but there are two certainties... one in life. One, that we will see the sunrise in the morning and the second one is that we'll see voter fraud in November, particularly, in Illinois at a robust... of a robust nature. Particularly, with this Bill. I

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

can't understand this whole issue of this drop box. We've talked about it ad nauseam. But the fact is, I think it's unfair for us to not lay out parameters for the county officials for them to be able to decide whether or not this is a good process, and how they should comply with what we are asking them or giving them that opportunity to do. Someone may say this is a good idea but they're going to say, well, what type of drop box we'd use. Well, are they supposed to look at the Amvet or the Goodwill boxes that we put clothes in? Is that the type of drop box? I mean, we just have not given them any... any guidance on this and I think that's unfair. And I'll get back to this whole issue. And people don't think that voter fraud is not apparent, it is. It's everywhere. There was a voter judge, it was a judge in Philadelphia that was indicted. It was an election judge was indicted today for stuffing the ballot box by the U.S. Attorney's office. That's just one example and it's in the news today. We're going to see more of that. But why give that opportunity, that opportunity, to bad actors who will continue to act in a nefarious way to manipulate the elections and the votes, how they are counted on Election Day. I'd like to say that I can support this Bill but I just can't because it's... as Representative Chesney said, it seems like... very much like that this is, as Rahm Emanuel said, 'don't waste a crisis', and that certainly is apparent with this Bill. Vote 'no'."

Burke: "Thank you, everyone, for a robust debate. I enjoyed my afternoon and evening of chatting with almost every Member of

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

the Republican Caucus. So, thank you for your questions. And I would just like to clarify, there was one small drafting error in the... in the Bill. There will be a Bill coming over from the Senate that corrects that drafting error. And it clarifies that on page 7 and 8, the ways in which a vote by mail ballot may be rejected is if the signature doesn't match, the envelope is open, or it has already cast a ballot. So, those are numbers one, two, and three in the subsection, and there will just be a small clarification to say it's limited to just those one, two, and three reasons. So ... you know, Illinois, as many people have said, has been a leader in the vote by mail. And we're seeing more and more states in the wake of the ... wake of the pandemic going this way and making vote by mail easier and more accessible for their residents. So, we're a leader, and let's continue leading. This Bill expands vote by mail. It also provides more in-person voting for the November 2020 Election. The Bill is, as I said, has been... had a lot of different input. I thank people for all the hard work that they put into this and I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1863 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.
On a vote of 72 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

- Clerk Bolin: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 124, offered by Speaker Madigan. This Resolution is referred to the House Rules Committee."
- Clerk Hollman: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately. The Rules Committee will meet immediately. The Rules Committee will meet immediately. The Rules Committee will meet immediately."
- Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 21, 2020: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is the Motion to Concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 2174."
- Speaker Harris: "The Clerk is in receipt of Motion in Writing to waive posting requirements. Leader Manley on the Motion."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the posting requirements be waived so that the following Bills can be heard in the Executive Committee. House Joint Resolution 124."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Manley has moved to wave 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. Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

 Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."
- Wheeler: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to take a moment. This was more on my mind yesterday but is

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

still certainly intact. I want to thank all of my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. I really want to thank the staffs of all of our offices, the JCAR staff as well as the Governor's staff for all their efforts in what was an unusual situation for JCAR. The response that we received in our offices was overwhelming to the point where the... my Springfield secretary answered 2 thousand telephone calls in 3 and a half days, personally. I think that deserves praise as well as my district office staff responding to 10 thousand emails. I want to personally thank the Governor as well for his thoughtfulness and his consideration. I'm grateful that the Legislature has an opportunity to take up this issue, and hopefully a thoughtful and appropriate response will be forth coming. Again, I want to thank the Governor's staff for their communication for all these processes. It's a lot of work. They've gone through a tremendous amount trying to prepare around 70 Emergency Rules and inform the JCAR staff what's going on as they're happening. So very difficult and I'm grateful for that. We're going to have a chance to take in account some pretty specific situations for some people who are very much hurting and haven't gotten as much support from the government as they'd like and as they need and they're running out of hope. But more than anything I just wanted to say thank you to everyone involved, to my staff, to the staff at JCAR, and to the staff of all of our offices who handle a pretty overwhelming load the last 3 or 4 days. Thank you."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Harris: "Representative Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bryant: "Point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Bryant: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope that you'll lend your ear to me for just a moment. I want to make clear to you an issue that was brought to my attention last week on Friday just before one o'clock. You may have read some of the media reports on it, but I want you to hear it directly from me and then I also want to read an email that I received yesterday form a gentleman who is actually from the Chicago suburb, so not someone from my own district. Last week on Friday, just before one o'clock, I received information from a staff member in my office that told me he had gotten a call from a frantic constituent. A very nice lady, not a computer hacker, just someone who had gotten on the PUA site and was trying to register to get benefits for the first time since the COVID shutdown. She already is losing her business, she's having to file for bankruptcy, and she was trying to get familiar with the system. Within two clicks of being on that system, she accessed a page that allowed her to see... first, one of fifty pages, 5-0, one of fifty pages and she started scrolling through them so it was more than just one page. And on that page were individuals name, address, complete social security number. In one part it showed the number of dependents that each of those individuals had. She said as she was scrolling through this and started to realize the information that she was seeing was probably not information she was supposed to

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

have access to and she saw one place where should could click on that said correspondence. And so she thought, oh, I'll send someone a note and let them know what's happening. When she clicked on correspondence, it actually opened up a page that allowed her to see private correspondence between IDES and those individuals. So she took some screenshots of it because she didn't think that anyone would believe what she saw, then a person that she trusts was her banker so she called them. They happen to be a friend of mine so they called my office. I was trying to understand what my staffer was trying to tell me on the phone and I said well, just send me the text... or the screenshots. So he proceeded then to send me a couple screenshots of what this lady was looking at. Then I got a little nervous because I'm looking at individuals, I think there were five on there of complete Social Security Numbers. Not the last four digits, but complete Social Security Numbers. So I immediately made contact, I tried to call an individual in the Governor's Office and I've got great relationship with her. She texted me and said, I'm on a conference call with the Governor. Can I call you when I'm done with the call? I texted back to her and said, I think you should get off that call and talk to me right now. So she called me. I explained to her what I was looking at, and then I said, you have to see this as opposed to just what I'm telling you. So she also asked me to send it to a Deputy Governor. I sent that... those screenshots to the Deputy Governor as well as the individual that I was speaking to. About an hour later I followed up to just make sure that they

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

had received the information... and I sent those by email because I didn't really wanna have this stuff floating around on cell phones. So it was that serious information that it was making me very nervous. I believed that by letting the Governor's Office know at one o'clock on Friday that an announcement would be made of some sort to at least say that there was a potential breach in this personal information on that website. The Governor had a daily briefing at two thirty on Friday. No announcement whatsoever. So I thought, well, maybe that need some time to look at it. So I waited through Friday night. On Saturday morning very early I sent a text message to my contact at the Governor's Office and said, can you just update me on what's going on with IDES? I didn't get an answer back until almost five hours later, at ten thirty or so and it just said, when I know something, I'll let you know something. No attitude in what she sent, but just letting me know that she just still didn't have anything to tell me. So we've now at this point... I am worried about not having put this in writing because I saw some people's personal information and I still haven't let the public know that there's a potential breach. So I sent a letter to the Governor. I asked four questions. Does the Director of IDES know about this? Does the Governor know about it? Have people been made aware that there's a potential breach? And are we going to protect them with one year of credit monitoring? By seven o'clock that evening I still had had no response from the Governor's Office and no announcement that there had been a breach. So I put on my social media site what had happened

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

and I released it to the media. Was not until about ten thirty or eleven o'clock that night that the Governor's Office issued any kind of statement saying that they were aware of a potential breach. They did not send that to me as a Member of this Body, which I think is due to us out of respect for the Members of this Body. It was sent to WBEZ, so a radio program instead of to the Member of this Body who asked the question. Six days have passed now, I have had no contact from IDES and no response from the Governor's Office. And I want to read you this email that I received yesterday from an individual with a 630 area code. Just so you can see that this is not just someone from the 115th District and because I want you to know this is not partisan. I did not try to make this an issue with the media, I gave the Governor's Office thirty plus hours to own this and make the announcement themselves and they chose not to do that. I find that reprehensible. When there's this much information that's out there of someone's private information. This is what the gentleman sent me, 'Dear Representative Bryant, because of the data breach IDES has caused fraud with my PUA application. I'm seventy-four, a veteran with cancer, independent contractor, limousine driver to help pay for my cancer medication and treatment. I was notified yesterday by IDES agent that someone has accessed some of my personal information.' So I sent him a email back and told him that I was very sorry about what he was going through and asked if they had at least offered him some credit monitoring. In caps this is what he sent back to me, 'Nothing. Someone got my information and added to it,

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

mother's maiden name, different place of birth...' and then he kind of goes on to say some other things. So I'm just telling this to this Body today, as of today, you should be telling your own constituents that their data, their personal information has the potential and probably the likelihood that they have been exposed to the extent of their full name, their address, their full Social Security Number, and believe me this went to the highest levels of the Governor's Office within a matter of just a few moments. So everybody owns this, but you need to be telling your constituents that there's potential here that their personal data has been accessed. And I look forward to having you all add to my pleas with the Governor's Office to make known to us how many people does this affect, how deep does it go, what are we doing to help these individuals? I think we owe that to the people of Illinois and I look forward to you joining me in this effort. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Marron, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Marron: "Thank you. I would like to thank Representative Bryant for bringing to light the data breach problems at IDES. It's been over a month now that myself, Leader Whirley, and Leader Durkin started to talk about, in a press conference, some of the issues at IDES. And it's been very frustrating for me because during this entire time this is something that myself and my staff have dealt with regularly. Every day multiple

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

people call our office, constituents that can't access their unemployment at IDES. We've literally had to resolve hundreds of constituent complaints. And still, over 2 months into this crisis this is still an issue. This has still not been resolved and it's getting very, very frustrating. And I would like an explanation from the administration on why this can't get fixed. I'm willing to come to the table, as I know a lot of my colleagues are to help with resolution to this, but the Governor won't even have an honest conversation or engage us to let us know what the problems are. We're willing to put forth the resources, the manpower to do what we can but, first of all, the Governor needs to be honest with us about what the problems are. Instead, we get broken promises and excuses. I'm a farmer, when I have a job to do on my farm I get the job done. If I can't handle the job myself, I hire somebody. If I have to hire 5 people, I hire 5 people. If I have to hire 10 people, I hire 10 people, but I get the job done. I don't do the job halfway and pat myself on the back because I got half of a job done and say, oh, it's better than what I started. I don't operate that way. I doubt many people in this chamber operate that way. A successful state doesn't operate that way. My constituents deserve better, the people of the State of Illinois deserve better, and our Governor... we deserve an explanation from our Governor on the failure at IDES."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Reick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Reich: "Following upon my two colleague's comments here, I, too, learned about the breach on Friday and was told to say nothing for fear that it would bring more people to the site and create greater exposure of those people's information and create greater harm. I find it ironic that this conversation is being had just after we voted on a voter Bill that would possibly provide just as much misinform... or just as much bad information out in the public as this does. I guess it just goes to show that we're pretty good at causing problems, we're not very good at fixing them. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "And, Representative McCombie, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCombie: "Thank you, point of personal privilege on the same issue. I think... I have personally asked and in privately in an email when I saw the Governor a couple weeks ago before this breach actually get up and look like he was surprised with some of the questions challenging him on the IDES issues. And I emailed his staff who we have contact with and said, somebody's not telling the Governor the truth. He needs to know what is happening because he is getting up in front of the entire state and not telling them the truth. And I asked for a phone call specifically to ask about IDES issues and did not get a phone call and still have not. I've asked for a second response, still have not. I think we need to call for a full audit on the IDES system and somebody else needs to be held accountable on this. Somebody has to answer to this and if it's not the Governor, it's his staff. Somebody

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

needs to be answering this because we have over a million people unemployed and a lot of those people are going to be unemployed for a long time. They need to be getting a paycheck. They need to be feeding their families. This is a problem that is on all of us for all of our constituents. This isn't a partisan issue. This isn't at the fault... is the viruses fault, but this is not. But this... this system and how it is being run is at the fault of the administration. And no matter if it was Rauner, if it was Quinn, if it was... whoever it was, the person who is in charge has to answer to this and we have asked to be called. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ford, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to say that I hope that we can get the system in order, but I also like to thank all of the hard workers in the department. They are very responsive to calls as I know. I've called many times and they're doing all that they can do with what they have. So I also think that we should thank the workers, the frontline staffers for doing the best that they can do with the cards that they have been dealt. So for that, I say thank you to all of the IDES workers for what you're doing to try to get the job done."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The Executive Committee will meet immediately after Session. It will meet immediately after Session. Also, the Executive Committee will meet at nine o'clock in the morning here. Nine o'clock in the morning tomorrow."

2nd Legislative Day

5/21/2020

Speaker Harris: "The House is prepared to adjourn the First Special Session and proceed with regular Session. Representative Manley moves that the First Special Session adjourn until Friday, May 22, at 11 a.m. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the First Special Session is adjourned."