18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Consent Calendar-Second Reading-Second Day Bills being read a second time and held. House Bill 4, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 11, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 32, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 34, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 41, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 51, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 53, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 86, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 119, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 182, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 202, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 212, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 217, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 227, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 292, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 310, a Bill for an Act concerning homeless shelters. House Bill 332, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 365, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 379, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 398, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 416, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 417, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 425, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 426, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 452, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Bill 562, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 625, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 628, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 638, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 640, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 644, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 691, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 692, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 694, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 407, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4... correction, House Bill 716, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 733, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 734, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 809, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 813, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 835, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1710, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1719, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1721, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1724, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1725, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1726, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1738, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1745, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1755, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1760, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 1777, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Bill 1785, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1802, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1836, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1879, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1883, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 1915, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1916, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1927, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1928, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1931, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1950, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1954, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1957, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1960, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1976, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2365, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2394, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2401, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2405, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of these House Bills. They'll remain on the Order of Consent Calendar-Second Reading-Second Day."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- Speaker Hoffman: "The House will come to order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Padget."
- Wayne Padget: "Good afternoon. Before we pray, I would like to take this time to personally thank Leader Durkin and all the distinguished Members of this Body for the special recognition bestowed upon me yesterday. It is truly my honor to serve. Let us pray. Dear heavenly father, we come before you today, praying that on this day you give us wisdom and guidance. Let us also pray for the men and women in all branches of our armed services. And, Lord, lastly, humble us to remember that yesterday is history, tomorrow is a mystery, but today is a gift, and that's why it's called the present. These things we ask in your son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Hoffman: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Hammond."
- Hammond et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Manley is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle. Leader Manley."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excused today is Representative Burke, Buckner, Halpin, A. Williams, and Gordon-Booth."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Welter is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle. Leader Welter."
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, there are no excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 112 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Members. Members, if I may have your attention for the purposes of an announcement. This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers your nose and mouth, except for when necessary for eating or drinking. This includes when speaking on the microphone at your desk. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, including while speaking on the microphone, as pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Thank you very much. Members, for an important announcement. Please pay attention. The deadline... once again, the deadline to file a Floor Amendment is going to be Thursday, April 20, at 4 p.m. The deadline to file a Floor Amendment will be next Tuesday, I apologize, next Tuesday, April 20, at 4 p.m. The Rules Committee will be meeting the next morning. Again, the deadline for filing your Floor Amendments is next Tuesday, April 20, at 4 p.m. Thank you all. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

1472. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: do pass as amended Standard Debate for House Bill 802. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on April 13, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1063, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 1742, and House Joint Resolution 7. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 253. Representative Greenwood, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 68, House Resolutions 23, 24, and 32. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 3150, and House Bill 3984; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1290, and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill Representative Ann Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 165. Representative Willis, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Bill 1068, and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3793. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1356. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1157, and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3071. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, reports the following committee action taken on... Representative Gong-Gershowitz, Chairperson from Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 48, and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2741. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 14, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 155, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 711, Floor Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 714, House Joint Resolution 9, House Resolution 9, House Resolution 16, House Resolution 33, House Resolution 48, House Resolution 56, and House Resolution 82. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 642. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 106, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3260, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3862, and House Resolution 61. Representative Mah, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 690, and House Bill 3497; and recommends be adopted is House Resolutions 18, 25, and 40. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 for House Bill 414, Floor Amendment(s) 1 for House Bill 577, Floor Amendment(s) 1 for House Bill 2566, Floor Amendment(s) 2 for House Bill 2746, Floor Amendment(s) 1 for House Bill 3160, Floor Amendment(s) 2 for House Bill 3165, Floor Amendment(s) 2 for House Bill 3205, and Floor Amendment(s) 3 for House Bill 3317."

Speaker Hoffman: "Members. Members, we are going to proceed to the Order of Third Readings. We will be going in alphabetical order. In alphabetical order in the order of the priorities that you have provided. Please be prepared... please be prepared to present your Bills. On page 26 of the Calendar, Representative Ammons on House Bill 1063. Representative Ammons, please proceed. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time, previously.

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

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on Floor Amendment #1."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I can get my computer to work here, I'll tell you what this is. Basically 1063 repeals the ability of the State of Illinois to charge people with HIV with a crime as opposed to a public health crises to reduce the amount of spread and passage of HIV. And I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons moves to the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons on House Bill 1063. Please proceed."
- Ammons: "Thank you. House Bill 1063 is a vestige of a forgone period in 1989 where HIV was little known and treatment was unknown as to how we can deal with transmission. This virus has been prevented with several remedies today that does not require us to criminalize people with HIV. So, this Bill will repeal the provisions that criminalize HIV transmission and provide it effective way to make it a public health crisis as it should always have been. It encourages testing and treatment and the disclosure of HIV status without the threat of criminal penalty. It also protects our LGBTQ community, people of color, women, and black and brown communities. It is, lastly, an outdated version of criminalization, primarily of people of color with HIV, and we are trying to repeal that and ask for its passage from this Body."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1063 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 27 of the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Avelar for House Bill 3596. House Bill 3596. Out of the record. House Bill 2542. House Bill 2542, on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. On page 26 of the Calendar, House Bill 2828, Representative Caulkins. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2828, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the General Assembly, this is a Bill that we addressed last year. This Bill allows teachers who have let their license expire come back into the teaching profession for less than the \$500 that's currently required. It is a \$50 per year that license has lapsed. I hope that this Bill will encourage teachers to renew their license and get back in the classroom. We have a serious lack of teachers. And I would support an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2828 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 27 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3155. House Bill 3155, Representative Collins. Representative Collins on House Bill 3155. Please proceed."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3155, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Collins."

"House Bill 3155 amends the Medical Patient Rights Act Collins: to require the health care profession ... health professionals, during a public health related emergency as declared by the Governor under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act. This Bill does four things. It permits people with... eligible for critical... they can't hear me? Can you hear me now? Speaking into the mic, okay. So, House Bill 3155 amends the Medical Patient Rights Act to require that health professionals, during public health related emergencies as declared by the Governor under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act. This Bill does four things. It permits people eligible for critical or intensive care services to remain eligible regardless of a patient's age or disability. It provides individual patient assessments based on the best available objective medical evidence. It may not deny a patient's care based on stereotypes, assessments of a patient's quality of life, or assessments related to disability or identity factors. And may not make decisions on health care resources based on age, ancestry, creed, disability, gender, and so forth if the characteristics are

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

not relevant to the patient's medical diagnosis and treatment. I greatly appreciate an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3155."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, this... I just want to clarify. This... this only takes effect when there is a declared emergency by the Governor, is that... like we're under right now. Is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes. Yes."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please answer audibly.

Collins: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank... and I believe this came in front of a committee I'm on. Do you know what the nature of the 'no' vote was or any of the discussion in committee with the... issue was with the Bill?"

Collins: "So, there was one 'no' vote, but there was no clarity on why there was one 'no' vote in committee."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. Thank you for that clarification. No more questions."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Frese."

Frese: "Thank you. Will the Representative yield?"

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

Frese: "I was the 'no' vote. And I think the reason why that 'no' vote came was because of some vague language. I thought there was going to be an Amendment, but I was later informed about

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

the meaning of the language that was included. So, I will be supporting this Bill today. Thank you."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Ugaste: "I quickly reviewed the text of the language, and I don't see anything, but I just want to make sure. Is there anything in this Bill which indicates that the Governor's powers to declare an emergency would extend beyond the original 30 days?"

Collins: "No, not that I'm aware of."

Ugaste: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Demmer is recognized."

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

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

Demmer: "Representative Collins, there's a similar Bill that we heard from Representative Lilly in another committee. And at the time, I asked a question. The language also appears to be in your Bill indicating that a patient care may not be determined based on place of residence. During this public health emergency, we've had quite a bit of guidance that's been given out on a regional basis, which would seem to tie back to the place of residence. So, even now, for example, there's different eligibility criteria for vaccinations based on your place of residence, whether you live in the City of Chicago, or Cook County, or other parts of the state. How does this prohibition on using place of residence comport

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

with what we've seen in current practice with a regional approach?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes. So, there is a clause that says... there is a clause that says, 'if the characteristics are not relevant to the patient's medical diagnosis and treatment.'"

Demmer: "I understand, however, in this example that we're living right now, eligibility for vaccinations, there is a distinction made based on place of residence and it is not related to the patient's diagnosis or course of treatment. It's just an availability, just a local policy of supply, demand, logistics."

Collins: "So, they're at risk of where they live. So, this will make that relevant."

Demmer: "I'm sorry. I don't understand. Do they..."

Collins: "So... yes. So, there are... they are at a higher risk at where they live. So, this will make this relevant."

Demmer: "Who's at a higher risk?"

Collins: "In response to what you're saying. But if..."

Demmer: "But... I mean, do you understand that... it seems that today the... and through the phases that we've gone through. Different regions have been in different categories. Some regions today, for example, could be, with certain criteria, be moved back to more restrictions. Some of those restrictions have included things previously like the cancelation of elective medical procedures. Those, with a region-based approach, that's based on a place of residence for an individual. How... doesn't this Bill say that you would not be able to use place of residence to make those decisions, meaning there... you... we

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

could only have statewide policies on that and not regional policies?"

Collins: "So, I do not believe that, Representative."

Demmer: "Okay. I appreciate the opportunity to talk through that.

That's one of the criteria here and perhaps we could look at this in the Senate if there's further clarification that could happen. Thank you."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I just have a quick question. Obviously there's a lot of discrepancies right now in the Governor's ability to continue these health care emergencies after 30 days during this pandemic. And I understand it didn't last just 30 days, but the Legislature should've been brought to table at some point. So, my concern here, does this allow the Governor to declare a health care emergency? And if the General Assembly does not act, individuals will not have to reapply to maintain services?"

Collins: "Sorry, Representative, but this Bill has nothing to do with that. It doesn't have anything to do with whether or not the Governor can declare a disaster."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. It says, 'Emergency Management Agency Act declaring that public health related emergency exist.' My... our analysis specifically talks about a health care... health related emergency."

Collins: "So, that's not right. If you look at Section (b), it explains it that, 'During the pendency of a proclamation

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

issued by the Governor under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act declaring that a public health-related emergency exists, a health care professional.'"

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, this has nothing to do with a... an emergency declaration? This is if the individual has a health emergency. Is that what you're saying?"

Collins: "It has everything to do with if we were in another pandemic or any other emergency... yeah. It has to do with an individual."

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Speaker, I think when... since we're all wearing masks, can I ask that we all yell into the microphone? I'm having..."

Collins: "I'm so sorry."

Davidsmeyer: "And it's not just you."

Collins: "Oh."

Davidsmeyer: "It was many... everybody. I just want to make sure 'cause people are talking, and I'm just... I'm trying to grasp what this Bill is actually trying to do. Can you give me a quick explanation..."

Collins: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "...and not the technical explanation. Just give me the 101 version."

Collins: "So, as you know, during our pandemic, there was a woman in Oregon who was disabled. She went to the emergency room. She was sick. Can you hear me? She was sick and an emergency room doctor labored her as a DNR without her permission or her family's permission. He made a decision on her life without even trying to save her because of her disability or for whatever reason. It was her family that fought for her to

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

get off of the DNR list. I, too, had a situation like that with my sister, who is a liver transplant survivor, where she was as a DNR because of her age. And, luckily, she's still here today, 10 years later. But during a pandemic, this woman was discriminated against because of her disability. And if it wasn't for her family and her friends who fought for her to get off that list, she probably wouldn't still be alive today. And also, another point I wanted to make is that we've all seen what happens with the nursing home industry, that in predominately black and brown communities they had the highest rate of COVID-19. The residents, and the workers, and the people who lived in those communities. And so, what this Bill would do, no matter what your age, race, sex, gender identity, and so forth is, you have access to medical attention. That's what this Bill does."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. No, I appreciate the clarification. I was reading it a little bit differently. So, I..."

Collins: "Yeah, it's okay."

Davidsmeyer: "You know, moving forward, I'm okay with this Bill. So, thank you."

Collins: "Thank you, Representative."

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

Collins: "Sorry."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Yeah, I would just greatly appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3155 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Durkin: "As we're talking about health care in the last Bill, I just want to remind people that we have an opportunity to go across the street and do the COVID SHIELD test from the University of Illinois. I just did it an hour ago. While we don't make that a mandatory occurrence here for our entry into this chamber, I would just say let's do it. Let's lead by example. I'm encouraging everybody to participate in this test, not only for your health and safety but for the men and women who are part of our staff that work here too. So, test, test, test."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Leader. On page 26 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1711, on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Chesney. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1711, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Members of the General Assembly. I'm here to present House Bill 1711. This is my puppy mill Bill. I'm... certainly appreciate the bipartisan support that I've received and the over 40 cosponsors on this Bill. Throughout the State of Illinois, many municipalities and counties, including the entire City of Chicago, Cook County,

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Springfield, and my town... my hometown of Freeport, has asked for humane ordinances to be brought forward. This is also a major initiative in DuPage County. I suspect there might be some questions. So, I'll yield the rest of my time, Mr. Speaker, for any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Is there discussion?

On this Bill, Representative Tarver, for what reason are you recognized?"

Tarver: "Very quickly, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Tarver: "I have no issue with banning puppy mills, but I do want to just remind the chamber, again, this is proof that we, apparently in a bipartisan manner, care more about dogs than we do humans. Because we have an opportunity to make sure that people of color can make it to and from work, to and from Springfield by passing a Bill like qualified immunity so that we're not shot in the back, people don't reach for tasers and accidently grab .45 caliber firearms and kill people. So, I do want to make the point again, 'cause I know it hasn't resonated for enough folks yet, that this is proof, in God's white America, dogs matter more than people. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll."

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

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

Carroll: "Representative Chesney, when you came to committee you discussed your story about the dog that you rescued in your house. Can you go into some detail about that, please?"

Chesney: "Yeah. So, this actually happened to my wife. My wife purchased from, I'll call it a mall dog, 13 years ago. And

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

this dog is now blind, has no teeth, and has a number of health defects. And what we're finding is, is there's about 19 stores that this Bill would target. And... this actually happened to my family, and they sell very expensive dogs with very deceptive practices. But the thing that gets me the most, Representative, is the sourcing of the animals is very inhumane. They're coming primarily out of Missouri, Oklahoma, and Ohio. And the reason this Bill hasn't moved in the past, even though it's been presented, is the Department of Ag and the Farm Bureau have always been opposed. This is the first time they've actually slipped in neutral because they represent... they recognize, like I have, that this is a bipartisan concern and that's why a lot of the municipalities and that's why you've seen the robust cosponsorship on this Bill."

Carroll: "Thank you. To the Bill. I want to applaud Representative Chesney and his efforts on this Bill. He, in committee, took a lot of very difficult questions from... from opponents to it and, I thought, answered them in a very professional manner and made sure that the concerns were addressed. And I would encourage this Body to support this Bill. It's one of our first efforts towards bipartisan legislation that really addresses an issue that we need to deal with. So, thank you, Representative Chesney, for bringing this forward. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes, will the ... will Representative Chesney yield?"

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

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Meier: "I still see there's a lot of opposition to this Bill. You know, what happened 13 years ago, this Legislature has done many Bills since then. We've came down on puppy mills. We've changed things. So, from 13 years ago to now, many things have changed. One of the things as we've changed this, trying to make things better, is we have lost more of our mom and pop pet stores. But a Bill like this, which says that we're going to only get our pets from the humane societies, from the different societies, we have wonderful societies out there throughout the State of Illinois working to protect and save animals. But, if you go through and you look at what's happening, a lot of ... it's now started, some of the humane societies, there's been reports on different national newspapers, have gone to sales where animals are being sold because they can't get enough pets in their shelters. And they're buying these animals from basically puppy mills and not from breeders that they know and so that they have pets for people to adopt. I believe that this is wrong. You say Farm Bureau and everybody's taking their opposition off, but they're not in favor of this Bill. They don't support this Bill. They went neutral on this Bill. So, our mom and pop businesses would have a few breeders that they knew, and somebody would come in and they'd want a Great Pyrenees. They would contact those breeders and get that Great Pyrenees. Now they have to go to a humane society, and all these societies have different prices. But... you know, the price of them. I adopt a dog in my local county for \$65. I go up to a society, I found a cute little dog named Sadie that I adopted 3 years ago, cost me \$325. My niece-in-law goes out and adopts a dog

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

that she likes from a society, she pays \$1100. That's a lot of money to a society. You know, the U.S. Humane Society is in favor of this Bill, but the money that we send to them, looks like they only put \$18 thousand of that money, of millions of dollars of money from Illinois, comes back to our societies here. So, I have a problem with this Bill. The Illinois Chamber has a problem with this Bill. Look at the opponents on this Bill. Trying to protect animals is a wonderful thing. We all agree with that. This Bill is going too much into regulations. We've already done a lot of things. What's happened with your wife's dog is sad. There's no doubt about it, nobody should have to go through it. It's especially terrible when you're losing a dog if you have kids. But we've got to let businesses have a chance and let a mom and pop business have the chance to continue this, and our breeders. I've had more people come to my office complaining about a dog that they went out and they saw on Facebook or they went out of the Internet, and then they drove four or five hundred miles, one way, to pick up this dog that they had lined up to buy from a breeder, and they bring it home and they have problems. And they want to know what I can do to help them with a dog that they went and bought in Kentucky, Tennessee, or some other state. So, I believe, just saying, that pet stores only can get a dog from the Humane Society is wrong. They need to find good suppliers. We need to stay on their butts to make sure those suppliers are good. But taking all other options out for the people in this state is a bad thing to do. They need to have an option. I would hope everybody would vote 'no' on this Bill."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Excuse me. Representative Ness. And we will implement a five-minute timer."

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

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

Ness: "So, I... I want to say ... start out, I support this Bill. I support the idea of ending puppy mills. My only, like, real concern is if we... by not allowing them to... by looking at it from the business side of it, we're not really stopping puppy mills, right, because they will still continue. It just makes it a little harder for them to get their pets out on a market. People will go another way, as was mentioned a few minutes ago. So, I just wanted to, perhaps, put it out there that, as we continue looking at this, that we think about, like, how do we... how do we encourage better practice and ensure that the industry, itself, ends the mistreatment and the breeding of animals in such a way that results in what you've described? So, that's my only one concern with this Bill. At least when they're in a store, we can regulate that. But once that goes away, we don't see as well. So... but I do support the Bill. I just wanted to go ahead and put that on record and say, let's keep looking at this, okay?"

Chesney: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Ammons."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Ammons: "Thank you. I just want to clarify, unfortunately, I wasn't in committee for this particular Bill. So, this Bill would prevent legitimate breeders from being able to sell

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

puppies or cats to a pet store to sell certain quality of animals?"

Chesney: "No. This only... Representative, this only speaks specifically to retail pet stores. So, if you have an independent breeder where you go to their particular location, you can purchase whatever you'd like. So, there's ... there's 19 retail pet stores. They're primarily in malls, and that's what this would limit. These mall stores, we'll call them, they have a long history of purchasing from inhumane sources, predatory lending. They charge a hundred, two hundred percent interest rate installment loans. And it's well documented that these particular business practices are inhumane. So, I have an issue with the way that they sell their animals, but, most importantly, I have an issue with how they source their animals. And they're sourced out of state, which makes it very difficult to regulate, actually nearly impossible to regulate, and they know this. That's why the business has been difficult to combat. So, what's happening right now is local municipalities are coming in and regulating them that are Home Rule. So, City of Chicago, Cook County, Springfield, my home City of Freeport, Aurora's looking at the ordinance. This is a major DuPage County initiative. Because what they're recognizing is, is once they get the data, that this is a.m. this is a huge issue. So, if you're south of I-80, you probably haven't seen a retail pet store. They're primarily in the Chicagoland area."

Ammons: "And let me just clarify that... so, the retail pet stores then would have to, hopefully, get enough pets from the Humane Society only? That would be their only source of pets?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Chesney: "It wouldn't be the Humane Society. It would just be not commercially... commercially bred animals that put profits over the welfare of the animals. So, they would be shelters... it would be shelters and rescues."

Ammons: "So, shelters and..."

Chesney: "This is how, like, Petco and PetSmart do it. So, you know..."

Ammons: "So, they get them from shelters and they..."

Chesney: "That's right, yeah."

Ammons: "Okay, thank you for clarifying."

Chesney: "Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Smith."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Smith: "Just wanted a little further clarification. You know, I'm all for rescue dogs. I've rescued two myself. But this Bill would not impact any private sales?"

Chesney: "No."

Smith: "So, if my friend's dog has a litter of puppies, I can purchase one from him?"

Chesney: "Absolutely. No impact at all."

Smith: "You're good with me."

Chesney: "Thank you so much, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Ford: "Representative, could you explain to me the legal definition of a puppy mill?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- Chesney: "The legal... I don't have the legal definition in front of me, but the definition that I would offer would be a particular breeding facility that puts the profits over the welfare of the animals. So, this would be... this would be cage stacking. This would be wire bottoms where their feet fall through. This would be isolation. You probably haven't seen, nor have I, any in the State of Illinois because our state breeding practices are... are acceptable and those have been... those have been written into rules. The challenge is, is that the surrounding states haven't come up and that's where these animals are being sourced."
- Ford: "So, there's no legal definition of a puppy mill, which means we really can't make a law to outlaw what you're trying to do because there's no legal definition?"
- Chesney: "No. This has... the word puppy mill you won't find in the Bill. This is simply asking that retail pet stores buy from humane sources. The reason puppy mills... yeah. It's... the reason the word puppy mills is used is just because that is... that's an identifiable piece of this legislation and, ultimately, some of the sources that we're trying to better regulate. And so, that's why it's being used."
- Ford: "And what would be the penalty for people if they break the law, if this is signed into law?"
- Chesney: "Well, I don't know that I... I don't have that information. I'd have to get back to you on the penalty piece. I would suspect it would be regulated. The... it would be regulated at, for the most part, on a local... locally, and it would be enforced locally because it would be in violation of State Law."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Ford: "Yeah, I see here, my analysis says that it's a Class C misdemeanor. Or is that once... provides that a violation of Section 3.8 is no longer a Class C misdemeanor. What... so, it reduces it from a Class... from a criminal offense to a fine?" Chesney: "That appears so."

Ford: "But I... I think that's good. So, you're looking at... do things like that, huh? Reduce things from criminal liability to fines. I think we can work well together."

Chesney: "I look forward to working with you, Representative."

Ford: "I'll be right over there after you pass this Bill. I've got a list of Bills that we can do this on. Thank you."

Chesney: "I look forward to the robust discussion."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber."

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

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

Weber: "So, I just was reading current law. It states that pet shop operators cannot obtain or sell from anyone that is not currently licensed, anyone who's received citations, received three or more complaints, received no access violations, et cetera. Could you tell me exactly what this changes from the current law?"

Chesney: "Well, the challenge is, Representative, it's not being enforced, and they know it. And the reason it's not being forced is because there's a national standard that's under the USDA that's woefully inadequate. They have what's called their survival standard. The survival standard means that they only are going to regulate animals to the extent to keep them alive. What this is saying that is... that there's a very small group of bad actors, we'll call them, that know... know

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

this and are, in my view, skirting these rules. And so, what we're asking them to do is to come into compliance. And this is what the largest animal retail stores have already done for years, and it's a multibillion dollar market. Unfortunately, we have a few people that are exploiting what I would say is a very sensitive issue, which is why you've seen much local pushback and broad bipartisan support on the issue."

Weber: "Well, I understand what you saying. So, you're basically saying that we already have this in place but no one's enforcing it... can we have some attention here, please? I can barely hear myself."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Weber: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, I guess I have some problem because from what your Bill sounds like it does is it would basically... the stores that can now have breeders that have not had complaints will no longer be able to. And I know you say this is only the big mega ones, but I'm getting calls from stores in my district that says this also includes them. Have you contacted or even spoke with the American Kennel Club or the Illinois Federation of Dog Clubs in regards to this?"

Chesney: "They have not specifically weighed on this, but I have...

I have spoken with the retail pet lobby on this issue, and we were unable to reach... reach an agreed Bill."

Weber: "So, the shelter dogs are, itself, becoming kind of a big business. From what I've heard, there is not enough shelter dogs in the State of Illinois, so that we are importing, I think the number I heard last was almost 40 thousand dogs,

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

from places that we don't know where they're coming from. By cutting out the breeders out of these, I think we're asking for trouble. We're going to be hurting some of our small businesses that will be included in this. And I would ask everyone for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Jones, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Jones: "Speaker, on the Bill, would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Jones: "Representative, I'm trying to get clarification. So, there's a couple points I want to ask. So, my brother is a dog owner. He loves dogs. He goes out of the State of Illinois to get a dog. Are you saying that this legislation, he would be prevented from doing that?"

Chesney: "Not at all."

Jones: "So, what... what will this legislation do to my brother and others who are dog owners, who want to go and get a dog, that..."

Chesney: "Nothing."

Jones: "Okay."

Chesney: "Has no impact. This impacts approximately 19 retail stores, they're commonly in malls, that this would impact. Other than that, if you go direct to a source, if somebody wants to breeds dogs, if somebody has a facility where they market animals, you can go... it has... south of I-80, there's not one of these stores. City of Chicago, there's none of these stores. And there's just a few pockets that need to be addressed of what I would view bad actors that are terribly

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

treating the consumer but also buying from inhumane sources. But it has no impact, Sir, on the example you just gave."

Jones: "Okay. So, let's talk about the bad actors that you mentioned."

Chesney: "Okay."

Jones: "How many bad actors are you talking about and is this an issue that's prevalent statewide?"

Chesney: "It's not... it's prevalent in about 19... 19 locations. Most of them are north of I-80 in the suburbs. But if you're south of I-80, you probably haven't seen one of these stores. It has virtually no impact."

Jones: "So, why isn't your Bill narrowly tailored to those 19 locations as opposed to the State of Illinois?"

Chesney: "Because what's happening is, Representative, is they continue to pop up. This is hotly debated in the Aurora area. And when they regulate it locally, they just continue to move. And so, this Bill would just have a humane standard for the whole state. Because in my view, it's been accepted in Cook County, DuPage County, and even rural areas like where I live in Freeport. And there's been really no opposition other than from a very niche market known as this pet lobby, primarily with people on my side of the aisle."

Jones: "So, you were asked earlier was there a definition of puppy mills, and there's no legal definition of puppy mills. There's also no definition of the 19 locations. So, why can't you just, if this is happening, make it a pilot program and do it in your district as opposed to doing it around the State of Illinois?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Chesney: "Because I think that we want a humane ordinance throughout the entire state. And Senator Castro, I think, has committed to having that conversation in the Senate to further those discussions. But what we found is, is that the only way that this... this business practice exists if they're charging terribly high fees to the consumer and very high cost to the consumer and that they're breeding inhumane animals, which is why you're seeing so much pushback in the locality. So, what we're asking for is just a statewide standard. And I think it's just a better practice to have a statewide standard because I don't think anybody, regardless of where you live, would want to be duped into purchasing these dogs that, in my view, are inhumanely bred, and is the view of most people."

Jones: "So, earlier, one of our colleagues made a statement that it seems like we care more about dogs than humans. What's your response to that?"

Chesney: "This Bill, right now, Representative, is to address animals, and I... I recognize the importance of furthering legislation specific to... specific to people that would affect everybody. And I think I've supported that. I've supported the interest rate caps because that was one of the black pillar initiatives. I've also worked with Representative Davis, just yesterday, to talk about... and furthering the conversations with audits and people of color. And I think that when it comes to doing a better job, I think my record is consistent. I'll work with anybody on both sides of the aisle to do a better job for the state. So, that would be my response as a Representative."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Jones: "So, my final question, since you mentioned that, how did you vote on the Black Caucus pillars?"

Chesney: "I voted... I voted for one specifically."

Jones: "Which one was that?"

Chesney: "That was to cap the interest rates."

Jones: "So, on qualified immunity Bill you voted against that?"

Chesney: "I did."

Jones: "On the economic pillar you voted against the Black Caucus?

On the education pillar you voted against the Black Caucus?

Just... yes or no?"

Chesney: "I believe I only support one, Sir."

Jones: "Okay. Mr. Speaker..."

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

Jones: "...to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Jones: "This Bill is not ready yet. I would ask the Sponsor to either pull this Bill out of the record or ask my colleagues to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Keicher."

Keicher: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Keicher: "Thank you. Representative Chesney, if you could please
help me with some understanding. Is this mistreatment
occurring at the mills or at the store?"

Chesney: "It's happening at the mills. The conduit is the stores."

Keicher: "Okay. Can you help me understand that if a mill out of state gets shut down, what happens and what's the disposition of those dogs that were formally at the mill?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Chesney: "I don't..."

Keicher: "Could they be taken to a shelter, a humane shelter?"

Chesney: "I don't know."

Keicher: "Okay. Is it reasonable to assume they'd be taken to a
humane shelter?"

Chesney: "I don't know."

Keicher: "Okay. So, I would assume they would be taken to humane shelter. My local humane shelter took custody of over three dozen dogs just in the past couple of years. And then, that store that you're trying to stop from doing this would be acquiring those mill dogs, just through a different avenue. Is that accurate?"

Chesney: "Say that again, Representative."

Keicher: "If the mill gets shut down, those dogs go to a shelter, there's nothing prohibiting that store from acquiring those dogs from the mill from being sold now at their store."

Chesney: "I..."

Keicher: "If they pass through a shelter. Your qualification is
they passed through a shelter, correct?"

Chesney: "Yes. And there's been attempts to do that in the Chicagoland area and that's... there was just an ordinance that was passed out of committee yesterday..."

Keicher: "Okay, I'm going on. I only have five minutes,
 Representative. Is your goal to put these stores out of
 business, these 19 stores?"

Chesney: "No."

Keicher: "Okay. You mentioned earlier that these are currently not in force and that your Bill seeks to come into compliance.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Why aren't we attempting an enforcement measure as opposed to a new Bill?"

Chesney: "Because the enforcement mechanism would have to happen out of state and it would require an entirely new department at the Department of Ag."

Keicher: "So, does your Bill address other states' pieces of legislation?"

Chesney: "We cannot, no."

Keicher: "That is correct. So, it does not accomplish what you're
 seeking to accomplish. Can you tell me why the Illinois
 Veterans' Association is against your Bill?"

Chesney: "'Cause they're opposed to about anything."

Keicher: "Can you tell me what the criteria is that you used that defines what makes these 19 stores bad actors?"

Chesney: "Because these 19 stores have been cited on multiple occasions regarding the inhumane treatment of animals. And every time they get caught, they change their ways. And then when they get done getting caught, they get caught again. And it's a vicious cycle, and they move and they change names and..."

Keicher: "So, again, we go back to an enforcement issue that your Bill fails to address. My next question, is there anything that prohibits, currently, county boards from enforcing a local ordinance that would address your concerns?"

Chesney: "Yes."

Keicher: "And what is that prohibition, please?"

Chesney: "It would have to be a Home Rule municipality."

Keicher: "Okay. At the county level, is there anything prohibiting
 this from being put into county ordinances..."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Chesney: "Yes."

Keicher: "...should those local bodies choose to do so?"

Chesney: "Yes. It would have to be a Home Rule county."

Keicher: "All right. That's all I have. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mason."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mason: "Thank you. Representative Chesney, first I want to say I appreciate the work that you've done on this Bill and the work that you've done with folks on both sides of the aisle. I know that we've worked together on this legislation. We don't see eye to eye on every topic, but we do on this. And you've worked really hard, and I appreciate that. I think that people are reading more into this Bill than it needs to be. And I just want to clarify a couple of things that have already been clarified, but hopefully we can get to the bottom of this. This Bill really would affect about 19 retail stores, correct?"

Chesney: "That is it."

Mason: "Okay. And these are puppies that have been, as we know historically from factual information that's reported, puppies that are bred in poor conditions, sold out of small cages in the mall, not typically given proper health care, oftentimes sold as sick, oftentimes sold to people at 300 percent interest because they have a picture on the wall saying, we finance. And, in fact, I just heard a radio commercial the other day about a puppy store that finances. Is that true?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Chesney: "Yes. Everything you're saying is accurate, Representative."

Mason: "Okay. And I have a breeder in my neighborhood who breeds her puppies... or her dogs, and sells the puppies, and does this as a business out of her home. She takes good care of her dogs. She doesn't overbreed them. She makes sure that they're healthy and well. Would this affect that small business owner operating out of her home?"

Chesney: "Not a bit. Not at all. Zero."

Mason: "Okay. Great. Folks, this is simple. This is abuse, pure and simple. We can work on more than one topic at once. And I think that this is a topic that everyone can embrace. It doesn't stop reliable business owners doing things the right way from still profiting over breeding puppies. It stops those malls and those bad actors from continuing the abuse of animals. I thank you, and I ask everyone to support this."

Chesney: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Jones has a parliamentary inquiry."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hoffman: "State your inquiry."

Jones: "Does this Bill require 71 votes since it's preempt to Home Rule?"

Speaker Hoffman: "In anticipation of the question, I had asked the parliamentarian for a ruling. The parliamentarian has ruled that it does not preempt Home Rule, and it requires 60 votes."

Jones: "So, the Sponsor has indicated that this Bill does preempt
Home Rule because he mentioned twice that it does and there's

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

language in there that does. So, I would ask the parliamentarian to reconsider that because the Gentleman has said on the floor it preempts Home Rule."

Speaker Hoffman: "We'll get back to your inquiry. Representative Elik, final speaker."

Elik: "Yes, I'd like to yield my time to Representative Meier, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes. Earlier, I referenced... I referenced The Washington Post. That article was on April 18, 2018. Okay. So, if you read this article, it states how shelters go and buy these animals from auctions in Missouri and then put them in their shelters and you pay the large cost of adopting that animal through that shelter. So, they are supporting the people they're fighting. I still want you to urge a 'no' vote. Because of time, I will not talk any further on this, but I believe this is a bad Bill and there's better ways to help take care of the animals and regulate these stores than telling every store... and there are mom and pop pet stores in Illinois, besides these big 14, that will no longer be able to sell an animal through their store. You'll still be able to sell them out of your home, but you won't be able to sell them out of your mom and pop store wherever you are in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Jones. Representative Jones, to your inquiry. I'm told by the parliamentarian, regardless of what the Sponsor has indicated, the Bill would have to explicitly state that it preempts Home Rule, and it

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

does not do that. Therefore, it requires 60 votes. Representative Chesney to close."

Chesney: "Thank you, Members of the General Assembly in the House. This is a unique time where we're able to, as Democrats and Republicans, to do the right thing. We have just a few, a very small few, actors, bad actors, that are not doing the right thing. I'm certainly encouraged to have chief cosponsors Carroll, Conroy, Hernandez, and West. And I want to thank each of you for your strong support of this Bill. I think, as a state, we have to ask ourselves, can we do better? And in many times, we have these debates, and we come on the same side of the issue. I think what this Bill does is it comes on the side of humane pet ordinances. And I would respectfully ask an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1711 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we will institute, going further, the rules of Standard Debate. The rules of Standard Debate indicate that there will be three voting... three speaking in favor and three speaking opposed. The in favor includes the Sponsor. We will go to page 25 of the Calendar. Representative Andrade on House Bill 52. Leader Andrade. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 52, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 52 has been an initiative for me for the past couple of years. And House Bill 52 deals with vehicle security circumvention devices. These devices are used to catch the signal if you have a fob. The relay box can open your car. It can actually turn it on, and they could steal your car with just this box. This Bill limits who can purchase this and who can own it. I have worked with the committee and we have lowered the Bill... and we have narrowed the Bill to a scope of that if someone has committed a felony in the last five years. And now, it only limits... it has to do with vehicle theft felony, they can't possess this device. This device is strictly used to break into cars and steal a car. So, I'm asking for your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Bill, Representative Hammond. Proceed." Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Hammond: "Representative Andrade has worked very hard on this legislation and has come a long way from where he began with it and worked with many, many individuals to bring the Bill that we have before us today. And I want to commend him for all of the work and, more importantly, thank him for bringing forth a piece of legislation that definitely addresses an issue that is extremely prevalent in so many cities across the State of Illinois and certainly the U.S. And I appreciate your work on this, and I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 52 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will move to page 27 of the Calendar. Representative Conroy on House Bill 3498. Out of the record. Representative Costa Howard on House Bill 12. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 12, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 12... House Bill 12 expands the use of the Family and Medical Leave Act, or FMLA, as it is commonly referred in our public school setting. HB12 provides that our teachers... that our hourly employees in our public school settings, our community colleges, and our public universities who have been employed for at least 12 months and who have worked at least 1,000 hours in the previous 12 month period shall be eligible for FMLA under the same terms and conditions as provided to eligible employees under the FMLA Act of 1993. Let me be clear, this is an unpaid family leave. Currently, to qualify FMLA, employees need to work 1250 during the 12-month period of employment. But, as many of you know, for our school employees, that's an extremely difficult number to obtain because that many of them only work 9 months out of the school year due to our school calendar, breaks, state holidays, thereby reducing the opportunities for them to reach that hourly requirement. But we all know that FMLA, when it was passed in 1993, quickly became outdated. And as time has gone

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

on, particularly in this year of the pandemic, we have seen families need to make these decisions regarding the health and safety of not only their families but to protect others as well. So, again, FMLA doesn't just apply to the birth of a child for a woman, it applies to fathers as well. And it also applies for employees, one, that need time to recuperate from a major health condition, that can care for a family member who also is recuperating, or even family members who have been injured during active duty. Again, House Bill 12 is quite simple. It reduces the number of hours from 12... 1,250 to 1,000 for our employees and our public school settings. All other aspects of FMLA apply. Again, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On that question, Leader Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Thank you, Representative. I just want to clarify a couple of things and talk about practical situations. So, what we're really doing here is we're going from 1250 hours to 1,000 hours because, if you work full time for 9 months, you're not considered full time to qualify for the Family Medical Leave Act, which allows you to take 6 weeks off, unpaid. Which, I mean, you would hope that in most situations employers would do that already, correct?"

Costa Howard: "Correct."

Batinick: "And this applies to both teachers and staff?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Costa Howard: "Well, it applies to our hourly employees because, remember, administrators and teachers are under collective bargaining agreements."

Batinick: "So, this doesn't affect teachers..."

Costa Howard: "It... it can. Yes, it can. It doesn't affect our administrators. They're 12 month employees..."

Batinick: "Right."

Costa Howard: "...that's a different situation."

Batinick: "But it does affect teachers. So, there is the ability, if you... for a teacher... and I'm just clarifying this for my side. There is the ability where you... maybe you bargained for paid maternity leave for a father or mother, as you had mentioned. You could then take an extra six weeks and use your sick leave for that. You can, kind of, stack those?"

Costa Howard: "Representative Batinick, could you repeat that question? I want to make sure I answer you accordingly."

Batinick: "Sure. So, if teachers have bargained for time off for maternity leave for the father or the mother, after that maternity leave expires, you have the ability to take your sick leave that you banked and use it to get paid for your FMLA to take an extra six weeks off."

Costa Howard: "A couple of things. First of all, Representative Batinick, this is an unpaid leave. So, anything that you referred to as stacked, I believe, in your prior question, this is an unpaid leave."

Batinick: "Right, and..."

Costa Howard: "If a..."

Batinick: "Let me start by saying I'm going to vote for your Bill."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Costa Howard: "Okay. You got it."

Batinick: "I'm trying to clarify for my side. So, when you take the Family Medical Leave Act, it's unpaid..."

Costa Howard: "Right."

Batinick: "...but a teacher who has sick leave can use that for an unpaid FMLA."

Costa Howard: "I understand what you're saying. Okay."

Batinick: "So, and... now, that is an asset that they can use at retirement, they can use along the way, whatever it is. But I'm just trying to vet..."

Costa Howard: "I got you."

Batinick: "...the reality of what's happening. So, this affects teachers, it affects staff, it's the thousand hours because of the uniqueness of education being 9 months out of the year, 9 and a half months out of the year instead of 12. I support the Bill. I think you might be split on the side. There might be some further qualifications. I just wanted to pull that out. So, thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Stuart."

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

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

Stuart: "I just wanted to thank you so much for bringing this Bill forward. I think it's really important to recognize the real impact of this is going to be on that really important support staff and those folks that are so instrumental in providing the high quality education. Many of those folks are our least paid, most underpaid in the profession to begin with. And they deserve the dignity of being able to take their time off when they need to take care of themselves or their

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

family without the risk of losing the job that no teacher could do in a classroom without their support. So, I think this is a great Bill. We've had lots of conversations about family medical leave in the United States and how we compare to other counties. This does not, by any means, fix all of those problems. But this is definitely a step in the right direction and represents the unique nature of the school setting. So, thank you so much for bringing this forward."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Reick: "I am not necessarily opposed to what you're trying to do, Representative, in this Bill. However, I do believe that it does strip local school districts of their ability to control their own budgets because, even if someone is unpaid, they're going to have to be replaced by someone else who is. And to the extent that you have employees who are subject to collective bargaining, you are still... you're taking away a certain amount of the collective bargaining rights of both sides. So, while I understand what you're trying to do, and I'm not necessarily opposed to the rationale behind it, I don't believe that this Bill quite addresses all of the concerns that we on the Labor Committee had when this Bill came through. And, therefore, I would ask that, even if this Bill passes, that you allow us to revisit the provisions in this Bill that we find somewhat objectionable and allow us to maybe craft a better solution to this problem. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McCombie."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

McCombie: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?" Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

McCombie: "Do you think that this Bill would be instrumental, especially at this time, for us to be reconsidering this, due to helping our parents and our grandparents, to keeping them at home to take care of them?"

Stuart: "Absolutely, Representative."

McCombie: "Thank you. I support the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard to close."

Costa Howard: "I want to remind everybody that this is a Bill that reflects the values that we believe we have in this chamber, to help those in need. This is a Bill that actually does just that. It helps our families. It helps our employees. It helps them be able to do what's best for the health and safety of themselves and the health and safety of others. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 12 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 27 of the Calendar, House Bill 3709, Representative Croke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3709, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Croke."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Croke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB3709, House Amendment 1, would amend the state's Insurance Code by changing the current discriminatory definition of infertility. The definition of infertility is limited to a couple that can biologically reproduce but does not conceive after one year of unprotected intercourse. In short, this legislation would expand access to infertility treatment coverage for single women or single individuals, women over the age of 35, LGBTQ couples, and patients that have been found to have medical histories, physical findings, or diagnostic testing that deems them infertile by a licensed physician. Everyone looking to have a family should be able to receive the same insurance coverage and services regardless of age, gender, sexuality, medical history, or relationship status. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois and the Department of Insurance are proponents of this Bill, and the Illinois Health and Life Insurance Council is neutral. They, too, see that this is not just another mandate but an issue of creating parity. I'm happy to answer any questions Members may have. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we go to Unlimited Debate on this one? I don't think it'll be... we'll keep our side toned down, but I think we want... we'll want to vet some stuff on this, if that's okay."

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, Unlimited Debate."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Batinick: "Representative, we had a spirited debate during committee, which I appreciate, and you sent me some... some information afterwards. So, I just want to kind of get all that out. So, basically, what we're doing here, a couple of things. Number one, right now there's a state mandate for IVF. And the rule is, is that you have to be trying to naturally have a baby for 12 months in order to qualify for that coverage, correct?"

Croke: "Yes, and I... it's fertility services. So, it can be outside IVF."

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. Fertility... fertility services, you have to try naturally. Thank you for that clarification. Number two, I want to clarify, this just affects the... this affects about 20 percent of insurance plans in the state, correct? This doesn't affect ERISA. I don't think it's... Medicaid, I guess it would be."

Croke: "Yes, this only impacts health insurance plans that the state has the ability to regulate. So..."

Batinick: "Okay, which is a small percentage."

Croke: "...nothing under the federal oversight. Yeah."

Batinick: "So, you had sent me... and this was part of my concern. Part of my concern is we keep expanding coverage on all sorts of things that is often what small businesses... the way that small businesses get their insurance. And we keep doing these add-ons that nobody else have to pay for, and it's making it really expensive to have insurance in this state if you're self-employed. I know of people that have deductibles that are in the five figure range and have two, three thousand dollar monthly premiums. I think you had sent me a form that

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

said this would... they were projecting a raise of about one percent in some... in cost in some of the states. One of my concerns about that document, and I wish would've brought that up to you earlier, that was a projection that said by 2019 we expect this. Do you know what the age of that document was and what the... do you have more updated information on how much this is going to affect insurance premiums?"

- Croke: "So, that document was provided when New York was looking at their... expanding their fertility coverage. I don't have an updated document, but I could... I could track down that information for you, definitely."
- Batinick: "Okay. I have a feeling it's going to be after the vote, but that's... that's all right. I didn't ask for it 'til now, so. I guess, the other thing I want to make clear, what this does is, this allows... this Bill... if you're a single woman and you're not trying to have a baby, you can... you can get fertility services paid by your insurance company. So, essentially, being single would now be considered a medical condition, correct?"
- Croke: "No, but you could access fertility services if you were single because being a mom and being a wife are two separate things. They're not synonymous. So, if I'm a single individual who wants to be a mom, but I don't want to go have intercourse with men that I have just met maybe, I'm not in a relationship, I should still be able to access that fertility treatment. And one-third of women right now who are going to sperm banks are single women 'cause we're seeing an increase in women wanting to be moms but not wives."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Batinick: "Correct, but... but now they're doing that by their own choice. They're not... it's... wouldn't making this... aren't you essentially saying that that's making it a medical condition to..."

Croke: "No."

Batinick: "But by now... there's a lot of things I can go pay to do on my own as opposed to just hopping on an insurance. One of my concerns we brought up in committee is, I can hop on this kind of insurance, which is going to drive the rates up, get this treatment, and then hop off. If anybody's paying for fertility services now, they can just get... go on the marketplace, get insurance, and then, according to your Bill, it automatically has to be covered, correct?"

Croke: "I'm just... I guess I'm not getting past the idea that as a married woman, I could access this. But as a single woman in the same positon I wouldn't be able to."

Batinick: "Okay. So, but... it is a little bit... it is a little bit different. So, you... so, the change in the law that you prescribe is that somebody... if somebody is trying, as a single woman, and is trying to have a baby naturally, I understand the argument that they... that they should have access to that because they're trying to... I don't think it has to do with whether they're married or unmarried, it's whether you're..."

Croke: "So, you... may I ask a clarifying question then?"

Batinick: "Sure."

Croke: "The idea that a single woman who's not married but trying to have a baby... you're okay with promoting women engaging in sexual intercourse with random men, potentially, to have a baby. Then they would qualify. But if a woman doesn't want to

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

engage in that, they don't... you're not comfortable with them
qualifying then?"

Batinick: "Well, no. I'm not... I'm not saying random... I'm not saying random people. I'm saying that the qualifications shouldn't be whether you're married or not. I know a lot of people that are in relationships that have chosen to have a baby. I don't think marriage should necessarily be the qualifying purpose to getting medical treatment. I think a medical condition should be the qualifying treatment to getting... to getting medical treatment. That's it."

Croke: "I think we just disagree. Yeah."

Batinick: "That's fine. I'll go ahead and go to the Bill. There may be some other discussion, there may not be."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill. Please keep it short."

Batinick: "Wrap it up, yeah. I think this is covering situations that I wouldn't consider a medical condition. I think insurance is for medical condition. We have a really high insurance rates in this state. We keep tacking on to the cost. It affects a small portion of people, and I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

Cassidy: "Representative... sorry, go ahead. Do your thing. Ask your question. Okay. Are you aware if there are any waiting periods for, say, erectile dysfunction treatment? Are there any time periods or proof that have to be provided before someone can access erectile dysfunction treatment?"

Croke: "I'm not aware of... I'm not aware of that at all."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Cassidy: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Cassidy: "You've met my kids. In my early career, I worked with the original Sponsor of the Family Building Act. And at the time, it was the best we could pull off. And during that time... wow. Hi, y'all. During that time, my then partner and I decided it was time to begin our family. I was already diagnosed with a condition that would prevent me from getting pregnant regardless of the gender of my sex partner. And yet, I spent a year undergoing medical procedures that we all knew would not produce pregnancy, some of which were actually office visits billed to my insurance. A waste. I mean... so, hey, team waste, fraud, and abuse, this takes care of that. This makes it possible for a doctor, in their considered opinion, to determine that someone needs a medical procedure. Under our... under our current circumstances, I hear from people trying to build their families all the time who have to, frankly, play games to get to the point of being able to get treatment. They have to lie. They have to do what I did and, frankly, waste 24 vials of sperm. Under the department's rules, we have loosened that. So, many of the people that my colleague are concerned about rushing to decide to have babies and causing insurance rates to go up are already accessing it through the interpretation of the rules. But I still hear from people on the regular who read our law and read it to exclude them and read it to force them to go through invasive, uncomfortable, and completely useless medical procedures in order to grow their family. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Willis."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Willis: "Representative Croke, this Bill... would this Bill help someone like my daughter, who is a single woman, not in a relationship, going through early onset menopause but would love to have a natural born child?"

Croke: "Yes."

Willis: "I have just put my name on. I urge everyone. My daughter does not have the privilege of waiting to see if she's going to get married again, but she certainly wants to have a family. And I think this is something to see happen. It should not matter whether you are married to a male or a female, in a relationship or not a relationship. If you want to have a family, we need to give you every opportunity to do that. And I urge all of my fellow Members to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Morrison: "And we were in the committee, I was on the committee. I brought up a few points, but I just want to re-sum for the Body here before you vote on this. We spent almost an hour talking about puppies. We spent almost an hour talking about what happens with puppies and the regulation of puppy mills. And Representative Tarver stood up and made a point about how we're putting puppies ahead of human life. What this Bill is talking about is human life. It's not just about insurance coverage. It's not just about equity and who gets covered for what. We're talking about human life. Unless you think this

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

is just conservatives who are raising problems with this issue, The New York Times has done a number of articles about the problems within this industry and the lack of regulation in this industry. Here's a recent headline two weeks ago. Here's the headline. 'The Latest Issue in Divorces: Who Gets the Embryos?' The subhead, 'Amid the pandemic, I.V.F. rates are on the rise, so are disputes about what to do with remaining frozen embryos when the couples split up.' Again, it's just one aspect of a Pandora's box. We're talking about the sale of eggs. We're talking about the sale of sperm. We're talking about paying people for surrogacy. Basically an expansion of people being commodities. And are we remembering the children in this situation? We hear this so often, what about the children, what about the children? We're talking about human beings. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

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

Mazzochi: "All right. I have a question. When it comes to subsection (b), we've made very clear in the existing law that if the covered individual has not undergone four completed oocyte retrievals, et cetera, then two or more completed oocyte retrievals shall be covered. So, we do put limitations on when you can actually do some of these fertility treatments. And yet, when it comes to subsection (d) that you're newly adding, you're basically prohibiting any restrictions on the scope of treatments that are permissible to address fertility issues. So, one of the concerns that I have is, if you, for example, are a 75-year-

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

old post-menopausal woman, under subsection (d), you could demand infertility treatments even though they may not have any actual realistic chance at medical efficacy. So, I just want to have an understanding as to whether you believe subsection (d), as it's written, is going to trump subsection (b)."

Croke: "Representative Mazzochi, I believe you're referring to an old version of the Bill."

Mazzochi: "Sorry."

Croke: "I believe you're referring to an old version of the Bill.

We adopted an Amendment in committee."

Mazzochi: "No, I'm looking... I'm looking at House Amendment 1."

Croke: "There's no... there's no subsection (d)."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. It's on... hang on. Oh, I apologize. Okay. Yeah, no, it's subsection (d). It's at the top... bottom of page 3, line 26, over onto the top of page 4. It says, 'A policy, contract, or certificate may not impose any exclusions, limitations, or other restrictions on coverage of fertility medications that are different from those imposed on any other prescription medications, nor may it impose any exclusions, limitations, or other restrictions on coverage of any fertility services based on a covered individual's participation, et cetera."

Croke: "Apologies. Yes, seeing it now."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Croke: "It was at the end of the page. Sorry for that."

Mazzochi: "Right. So, my concern is, is that this is very broad language that essentially says I can demand coverage even if the treatment would actually be medically unreasonable. So,

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

that's why... or infeasible or a practical impossibility because, statistically speaking, a 75 or an 80-year-old woman is not going to be able to carry healthy embryos to term. Or if it does, it would require a massive amount of medical intervention. And because you're not allowing for any limitations on this, that's why I'm... we currently have some limitations in subsection (b), but subsection (d) that you've newly added seems to take some of those practical restrictions away. So, that's why I'm trying to understand. Which version has priority?"

Croke: "Which version of the Bill has priority or which section?"

Mazzochi: "No, which... which subsection. Which... you know, normally in statutory construction, subsection (d), because it's being newly added, would trump the restrictions that are in subsection (b). So..."

Croke: "Right. So, quickly to your hypothetical, to the 75-yearold woman who is seeking fertility treatments. Their coverage would be denied because it would not be medically necessary.

Mazzochi: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you."

Croke: "If they are menopausal, they would not be able to access this because there is no way for them to be able to conceive."

Mazzochi: "But that's not how your legislation is drafted. Subsection (c) is saying you can't impose any restrictions on securing fertility services, which would obviously include age restrictions. It would include other fertility status restrictions."

Croke: "It still has to be medically necessary."

Mazzochi: "Where does it say that in this legislation? Or... I mean, we don't have anything in here on medically achievable. And

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

I think that's what the subsection (b) in the existing statute was trying to get at by saying, if you've gone through four cycles and it hasn't worked, then you can't demand coverage anymore. But your new language in subsection (b) seems to be taking that restriction away by saying that you still have a right to demand any services without any restrictions or without even any feasibility that it be medically achievable."

Croke: "Okay. So, we have... we believe that the provider would deny this under it not being medically necessary."

Mazzochi: "Right, but that..."

Croke: "And that's okay because the individual is 75 and would not be able to conceive no matter what because they are menopausal."

Mazzochi: "Right. But the thing is, you're taking that power to deny away from the medical providers with the breath of this language. I think it would certainly help if put the medically necessary language in, but..."

Croke: "And I disagree with the interpretation... your interpretation."

Mazzochi: "Well, my interpretation is literally what's written here. I mean, there's no ambiguity in what you've written. You've written in here 'all', '...nor may it impose any deductibles, copayments, coinsurance, benefit maximums, waiting periods, or any other limitations on coverage.'"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi, Representative Caulkins yields his time to you. Please proceed."

Mazzochi: "So, that's... that's the concern that..."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Croke: "We believe, again, it would be denied under the basis of medical necessity."

Mazzochi: "I'm sorry."

Croke: "Again, I'm repeating myself. I don't agree with you. We believe it would be denied under it not being medically necessary."

Mazzochi: "Okay. But then... how then is this Bill going to actually accomplish all the things that you're saying it's going to do? Why wouldn't... aren't you running the risk that, say, a doctor is going to say, well, I believe you are medically a male, therefore, this treatment isn't going to work for you? It's unnecessary. I believe that biologically there's other options for you. You know, I think you just to clarify this in the language because you're... you're either going to create a situation with this current language that is either an absurdity or it's something where your... the approach that you're taking now, for legislative intent purposes, is going to actually undermine the very thing that you're supposedly trying to get. So, because of that, I'm going to have to be a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Hey, Margaret. I apologize for jumping in on your Bill. First of all, I think it's a very good Bill. I'm proud of you for bringing this. I'm happy to support it. I just want to make sure since it's all going be a record for all time that I clear my name. When I mentioned something about a puppy mill, and I won't go into depth on that, for that to be used and my name to be used in an argument to subjugate women, I think it's a little of... it's a little offensive. So, I agree

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

with you. I don't think that being a mother and being a wife have to be synonymous. I think that women should have agency over their bodies and make their own decisions. I certainly hope the same for my daughter when she grows up. I'm proud to support this Bill. But I also want to make a distinction. Just like a mother is not synonymous necessarily with being married, we're not talking about human life. We're talking about trying to conceive human life. So, when I talk about a dog, we're talking about a dog that's living and breathing, or whatever, right? When I'm talking about humans being shot in the back, I'm talking about people that are actually living and breathing. So, I want to be clear when my name is brought up to have a very clear record. My name will not be used to subjugate women. You have a great Bill. I apologize for taking an additional couple minutes. I'm happy to support it."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Croke to close."

Croke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation's about equal access to coverage and would make Illinois insurance law more inclusive. Everyone should be able to receive the same insurance coverage, regardless of gender, sexuality, medical history, or relationship status. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3709 pass?'
All in favor of the vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Representative Davis, page 25 of the Calendar, House Bill 679. House Bill 679. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 679, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, which is one of our state commissions of which I happen to be a commissioner on. So, I'm proud to do this Bill on their behalf. And essentially what it's suggesting is that, in a situation where someone has given power of attorney of their... of some of their health decisions to someone, there may be a situation in which they want to revoke that power of attorney. And what this Bill is suggesting that, in the situation where the individual who has given the power of attorney may be in a crisis situation, that the ability to revoke that power of attorney should be given, kind of, a 30-day stay just to make sure that that is truly what the individual wants or wants to do with their power of attorney. Because they're in crisis, it could be maybe assumed or inferred that that person is not able to make the right decision with regard to their... their health care choices. So, therefore, the ability to push out the revocation of the power of attorney for 30 days, at the very least, allows that person to maybe be stabilized so that if they still want to revoke the power of attorney, that they're doing it, kind of... they're doing it in a way that it makes sense for that individual. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. I'll just speak to the Bill. Again, I think that the ..."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "...I think that the Sponsor is... has crafted a Bill that is targeted towards certain situations, particularly where someone may be having a mental health breakdown, needs to secure compliance with medication, where there may be an instance where this could be of value. But precisely because this is drafted as a blanket, irrevocable power of attorney with no process for going through an... or any other option to change your mind, there are absolutely situations where someone may need, because of a changed health situation, because of changed family circumstances, where they need to actually or want to revoke that power of attorney. What if, for example, you are in a situation where your original power of attorney was for your husband. You're now in the hospital for domestic violence, you want to revoke your power of attorney. This Bill would actually, under State Law, prevent you from doing so. So, again, I think that there are ... that if this Bill had been more narrowly tailored, there would be an appropriate place for this. But because it's such a blanket description, I cannot support it as it's currently drafted. And I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the previous speaker's absolutely wrong in her assessment relative to that. But, nevertheless, that is

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

her opinion and everybody's welcome to state their opinions here. The way I've stated the Bill's the way that it works, and it allows for someone who may be in crisis, who wants to revoke their power of attorney, an option to... it's suggested that should be put off for 30 days just to make sure that that is indeed the right decision to be made. That being said, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 679 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar, Representative DeLuca on House Bill 176. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 176, a Bill for an Act concerning..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Out of the record. Out of the record. I apologize. On page 27 of the record appears House Bill 3404, Representative Haas. Representative Haas. Out of the record. On page 26 of the Calendar, Representative Halbrook on House Bill 2807. Out of the record. Page 25 of the Calendar, House Bill 160, Representative Didech. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 160, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "House Bill 160 amends the School Code and provides that a student shall be excused from engaging in physical activity components of a physical education course during a period of

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

religious fasting if the student's parent or guardian notifies the school principal in writing that the student is participating in religious fasting. This initiative is supported by the Northern Illinois American Muslim Alliance as well as the Jewish Federation of Chicago. This Bill creates an appropriate and modest accommodation for religiously observant students and will also send an important signal that Illinois respects and welcomes the many diverse cultures and communities that enrich our state. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Carroll: "Yeah, I'm reading on here right now there's two people that slipped in opposition to this Bill. Do you know what their opposition involved at all?"

Didech: "No, I'm not aware of anybody who slipped in opposition to the Bill. Nobody reached out to me."

Carroll: "It's a great Bill. And on behalf of someone in Jewish community, this is very important 'cause we have a lot of students that fast at certain times, and I think this is a really important issue for our community. So, I really appreciate you bringing this forward, Representative Didech. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Didech to close."

Didech: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 160 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Flowers on House Bill 1779, page 26 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1779, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1779 gives timely access to guidelines indicated comprehensive biomarker testing, will enable more patients to access the most effective treatment for their disease, and can potentially help achieve the triple aim of health care, better health care outcomes, and improve quality of life, and reduce costs. House Bill 1779 will ensure Illinois is covered by Medicaid, and state regulated insurance plans have coverage for biomarker testing when medically appropriated. Progress in improving cancer outcome increasingly involves the use of precision medicine, which uses information about a person's own genes or their proteins to prevent, diagnose, or treat diseases like cancer. Biomarker testing is an important step to accessing precision medicine, which includes targeted therapies that can lead to improved survivorship and better quality of life for cancer. There is currently limited and desperate access to biomarker testing. According to the recent ACS CAN survivor view survey of cancer patients and survivors, 29 percent of the patients who discussed the need for biomarker testing and their doctors

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

did not receive their testing because it was not covered by their insurance or the out of pocket cost was too high. So, with House Bill 1779 improving access to the biomarker testing, thereby access to targeted therapies, is a strategy to reduce health care disparities, improve outcomes for cancer patients. Not all communities are benefiting from this latest advancement in biomarker testing and precision medicine. Communities that have been marginalized, like my community, including communities of color, individuals with lower social economic status, are likely to receive biomarker testing. People in the rural communities and those receiving care in nonacademic medical centers are also less likely to benefit from biomarker testing. Ensuring equitable access to biomarker testing by improving coverage for access through testing across insurance types is key to reducing health disparities. Indeed, without action like this to expand coverage for biomarker testing, including Medicaid, advances in precision oncology could increase existing health disparities. House Bill 1779 would make it possible for more patients to get the right treatment at the right time. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1779. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick on House Bill 1779. Please proceed."

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

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

Flowers: "Yes."

Batinick: "Representative, I just want to clarify the plan for this Bill on our side of the aisle. There was going to be an

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Amendment possibly, but we're pulling that, and we're going to maybe work on some things in the Senate. Is that what we're doing here? No."

Flowers: "In committee, I said if it was necessary to bring the Amendment back, but it wasn't necessary."

Batinick: "Okay. According to my spokes, we're good with what you're saying. So, thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ford."

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

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

Ford: "Leader Flowers, could you tell me how long you've been in the General Assembly?"

Flowers: "Excuse me?"

Ford: "I mean, you did such a fantastic job. And I've tried to use that same method, that there's no need to bring it. That was good. I agree with you. They wouldn't do that for me, but... to the Bill. I want to ask you a question. This Bill will also help individuals that have been adopted that wouldn't know who their biological family is. Is that right?"

Flowers: "Representative Ford, this Bill will help so many people.

I am so humbled to be able to carry this type of legislation, knowing that people who may be giving up hope for life, that there's an opportunity that they may have another opportunity because of this legislation in which we are about to vote on. So, it's... to me, it's just a win-win situation. And even poor people, poor people on Medicaid, to know that they, too, will have the same opportunity, the same... talk about equity. Health

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

care equity. This is a good example. This is where we should start, and we can only go up from here."

Ford: "Well, I want to thank you for the Bill. It will make a difference in a lot of people's lives. And I just had to thank you because I have a really, really personal feeling about this, and I'm very excited. I get a really good feeling about the Bill as you presented it, and one day I'll tell you why."

Flowers: "Well, thank you. I, too, had some personal experience and that's another reason why this Bill is very personal to me as well. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Hammond: "It is an honor to join Representative Flowers on this important piece of legislation. And, I think, Representative Flowers, you are certainly cutting edge on this and you have given many, many years to this General Assembly. And I think that this Bill may, in fact, be one of the very best Bills that you present in this chamber, and I'm honored to join you. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "There have been three individuals who have spoken in support. Representative Mazzochi, are you support or oppose?"

Mazzochi: "I actually support this Bill. So, not the one to be the three."

Speaker Hoffman: "This Bill is on Standard Debate. If you support the Bill, we have exceeded our individuals speaking.

Representative Reick."

Reick: "I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Okay. Please proceed."

Reick: "Representative, I'm reading the analysis of the Bill and it says that this prohibition against the limitation on the test is due specifically... or is limited specifically to people who are in stage 3 or stage 4 of metastatic cancer and are in pretty... pretty deep trouble as far as their illness is concerned. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "I don't think the amended version put that limit on. So, let me just take a look."

Reick: "Would you, please?"

Flowers: "Representative, are you looking at the Amendment or are you looking at the old Bill?"

Reick: "I'm sorry, Representative. I'm... I may be looking at the old Bill. What's the... please inform me as to the Amendment. According... according to our analysis, if I'm reading it right, Representative, it looks like your original restriction of... of applicability to those who are in stage 3 or stage 4 has been removed. I'll be honest with you, I probably would support the Bill if it had... if that restriction was still in there. Otherwise, I'm afraid I'm going to have to say 'no' on this Bill. If I'm correct in my... in my understanding of your committee Amendment."

Flowers: "Representative, this Bill is about saving life any time it's needed."

Reick: "I understand that, but..."

Flowers: "And so, I can't... I'm not going to put any limits. If there's no limits on the Bill, I'm not going to put any limits there."

Reick: "Okay. There..."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Flowers: "I'm not going to play God."

Reick: "Okay. There... nor should we."

Flowers: "No."

Reick: "But again, the original Bill had that limitation in there.

And beyond that, thank you. Thank you for your answer. I appreciate it."

Flowers: "I hope you change your mind when it's time to push the button."

Reick: "Thank you, Ma'am."

Flowers: "It's about life. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Flowers to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1779 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bennett. Got it? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, House Bill 376, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Please proceed. Read the Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 376, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present House Bill 376. House Bill 376, the TEAACH Act, stands for teaching equitable Asian American community history. The Bill amends the Illinois School Code to include a unit of instruction on

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Asian American history into our public school curriculum. TEAACH ensures that Asian American stories and experiences are taught at a time when anti-Asian racism, discrimination, and xenophobia are increasingly and shamefully common. In 2020 alone, hate crimes against the Asian American community spiked by 150 percent. The organization Stop AAPI Hate has identified 3,795 hate incidents over the past year, with women reporting hate incidents 2.3 times more frequently than men. Hugh Research reports that 31 percent of Asian American adults have been subjected to racial slurs or harassment because of their race or ethnicity in the past year. These are not isolated incidents and anti-Asian racism is nothing new. The recent mass shooting tragedy targeting Asian spas across the Atlanta area was rooted in a deep history of xenophobia, racialized sexism, and the perpetuation of stereotypes that have normalized and justified violence against Asian American women. The persisting fetishization of Asian American women that not only undermines our humanity but threatens our very safety and our very lives. Asian Americans are a part of the American fabric, but we are often invisible. We have been the victims of racialized violence exclusion throughout American history. and My grandparents face discrimination and deportation under racist policies codified in the Chinese Exclusion Act. Yet, in elementary and secondary school, I was taught nothing of my own family's history or the shared experiences of other Asian American families that are woven into American history. I first learned of the Chinese Exclusion Act and studied the constitutionality of incarcerating Japanese Americans in the

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

1940s when I was in law school. Systemic racism is a pattern that feeds into policies that exclude Asian Americans in a way that silences communities. There are, of individual acts of violence, but also events throughout our history that display mass violence or exclusion, including riots against the Chinese in the gold mining days and against Chinese railroad workers, without whom the Trans Continental Railroad would not have been built. Other examples include the Bellingham riots in the early 1900s against the South Asian community in Washington State. Violent assaults in the Watsonville riots against Filipino American farm workers by local residents opposed to immigration in the 1930s. The intimidation of Vietnamese American fishermen by the KKK in the 1970s. And then, more recently, Islamophobia, and then the deliberate use of racist rhetoric to gaslight division and target Asian Americans for the pandemic. The lack of representation and curriculum, positons of power, and in media leads to miseducation. Empathy comes understanding. We cannot do better unless we know better. But when people don't learn about Asian Americans, the effect is non-Asian people start to believe in stereotypes and behave towards Asian Americans based on those stereotypes. The lack of knowledge is a root cause of discrimination, and the best weapon that we have against ignorance is education. Asian Americas have a rich history and have made significant contributions to our shared American heritage. This weekend, at my own event with the Asian American Caucus to brief members of the community on TEAACH, I learned for the first time from Albert Chan, a teacher at Niles North High School

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

in my district, that the first Asians in America were Filipino. Filipino Americans arrived in Spanish galleon ships as deck hands in 1587. Filipinos were in America pre-English colonization, pre-settlement. It's fascinating American history through a different lens that includes people of color. Bhagat Singh Thind challenged his classification under race based immigration laws in a U.S. Supreme Court case in 1923. Susan Ahn Cuddy, Korean American, was the first female gunnery officer in the U.S. Navy. Nearly 70 years before Brown v. Board of Education, a Chinese American family sued to end school segregation in California in the 1880s and won in Tape v. Hurley. The most decorated unit for its size in U.S. military history was the 442nd Regimen, comprised mostly of second generation Japanese Americans whose families were in internment camps while they fought abroad. Larry Itliong led the Filipino farm workers' strike, working with Cesar Chavez in the UFW. In 1886, Anandibai Joshi became the first South Asian woman to earn a medical degree from an American school, the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania. These, and so many stories, aren't known. It's time to change that and teach a more comprehensive understanding of American history that includes these important American stories. A 2010 analysis of introductory U.S. history text books confirms that Asian Americans are left out of curriculum. Researcher Okiyoshi Takeda found Asian American leaders came up in just 15 percent of the text, and fewer than 3 percent describe them as heroes, nation builders, or change agents. This legislation is personal and it is necessary. I am an third generation Chinese

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

American and a graduate of Illinois public schools, and I learned most of the history that I just shared today preparing to present this Bill. It's time to add Asian Americans into what we teach and pass House Bill 376. I ask for an 'aye' vote, and I'm happy to answer questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Bill, Representative Mah."

Mah: "To the Bill. I want to thank Representative Gong-Gershowitz for bringing this Bill forward, and I couldn't be more proud to be a chief cosponsor because this Bill could not be more personal or more important to me. In order to convey exactly how personal, I want to share a personal experience with you that I have never spoken about in public. About two or three years ago, I was visiting Boston, Massachusetts, sitting on a bench, enjoying a sunny day with a friend in front of Faneuil Hall when a group of school kids, probably about middle school age, walked by in a line with their teacher, probably on a school field trip visit. They were visiting a site known as the Cradle of Liberty, a place where debates took place going back to the American Revolution where abolitionists and women suffragists, labor unions gathered and debated what would become our history. But in that moment when the line of kids walked by, one of them looked in our direction, my friend and I, another elected official from California and myself, and said, 'Who are the ching chongs?' We were stunned silent. In that moment, we were denied the full measure of our humanity by a pre-teen child. We were subject to a deep indignity, and we didn't even know how to respond. We didn't speak of it to each other, although I'm fairly certain that it registered with my friend as it did

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

with me. Who are the ching chongs? We were reduced in that moment to a racial epithet and caricature. One question that this Bill is trying to answer and a problem that it's trying to address is that whether that child or other children would have uttered those words if they understood that Asian Americans are not perpetual foreigners to be objectified but are part of the history that built this country. We're as American as Faneuil Hall or the Freedom Trail that those kids were visiting. Who I am is a product of my family's history and our history in this country. And my understanding of Asian American history from when I was a young child, not because it was part of a curriculum, but because my family shared it with me, that helped to shape who I am today. You know, would that child, or any child, have uttered those words if they knew that Asian Americans like my grandfather came to this country seeking opportunity, but they were technically barred from entry because of the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. And this was a law that specifically spelled out who was to be excluded. Chinese immigrants of the laboring class. This law was passed at a time when Asian Americans had no voice whatsoever in government, no representation. They were legally prohibited from testifying against white people in a court of law. And this law stayed on the books until 1943, when it was repealed. My grandfather and many Chinese immigrants like him made their way to this country regardless. They found a way to enter. It was not authorized, yet they lived and worked and contributed to the economy of this country. Because of legislation like the ... "

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mah. Representative Mah, Representative West yields his time to you. Please proceed." Mah: "Thank you. Because of the existence of laws like that, that particular law, my grandfather lived apart from his wife and family for 40 years. Would a child have uttered those words if they had known that Chinese Americans, Chinese immigrants helped to build the Trans Continental Railroad were given the hardest, most dangerous jobs in order to complete this infrastructure that would be pivotal to the growth of our economy and to the growth of this country. Asian Americans have been an integral part of this country. And yet, they have been subjected to tremendous injustices, including the internment of Japanese Americans. Two-thirds of the hundred and ten thousand Japanese Americans were American citizens. Yet, they were locked away in concentration camps across the United States. American history... Asian American history is American history. Asian Americans built this country, strengthened this economy, and are an integral part of who we are as a nation. We belong here. And every school child in Illinois should know these stories so that others would not be subjected to the humiliating experience that I had or anything worse. Three weeks ago, I stood on this floor and I asked for everyone's support, to see us, to hear us, and to understand that Asian Americans have a long history in this country and to accept that we belong here and to do what you can to prevent instances of hate crime and racism against our community. With HB376, we have the opportunity to lay the ground work for more awareness and equity in our state. Our children are the future. That's a very common saying that a

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

lot of people like to say, but let's educate them to be part of a future we can be proud of. Thank you, and I ask for your 'aye' vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Bill's been removed from Standard Debate.

There are three more speakers. Representative Conroy."

Conrov: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. First, I'd like to sincerely thank the previous speaker for sharing her story, and I hope each and every one of you heard the personal story that she just shared. When will the name calling stop? To the Bill. The TEAACH Act helps to paint a more complete picture of United States history by adding requirements to the Illinois School Code to teach a unit of Asian American history in all Illinois public schools. This Bill would help to ensure that not only Asian American students, but all students, engage with content related to our shared history. For many Asian Americans, history is an overlooked component of our shared history of the United States. Passing the TEAACH Act would help to combat the invisibility of Asian Americans in our history books. For more than a hundred thousand Asian American K-12 students, passage of the TEAACH Act would ensure that the histories of their communities are shared in the classroom and creates a chance for them to feel reflected in the curriculum. For the 800 thousand Asian Americans who call Illinois home, this Bill would be an important affirmation of our shared history and an investment in the future of Illinois. All of our students in Illinois would benefit from an enriched understanding of the lessons illustrated by Asian American history and expanding the School Code's commitment to respect the dignity of all races and people and to ensure

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

every form of discrimination in their life and career. Over the past 12 months, Stop AAPI Hate has received 3800 firsthand reports of anti-Asian incidents. With the resurgent tide of anti-Asian sentiment brought out... about by the COVID-19 pandemic, the longstanding stereotypes, the teaching of Asian American history is essential to help combat xenophobia and build bridges of understanding within and across our community. The TEAACH Act would build on similar parts of our School Code to add Asian American history to the fundamental lessons that students in all Illinois public schools receive. This Bill would create space for the vibrant and dynamic stories of Asian Americans to add to our shared understanding of the United States. Please stop the name calling. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Lewis."

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

Lewis: "So, to... I am in support of this Bill, and we do sit on the Southeast Asian Coalition together. And for those that don't know my story, my wife is from India. She is part of the brown community, and she is considered Asian. So, this topic of teaching Asian history in our schools is very important personally as well as to those in the community. I just ask the Sponsor, can you make sure that all Asians are included in so that we do not repeat and leave out those who consider themselves as part of a demographic when we're developing education?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you not only for your words, your support. And, yes. Of course we all know that the work begins with the implementation of this Bill. And it is not only my hope, but my expectation, that this curriculum will reflect the full diversity of the Asian American community."

Lewis: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

"I want to thank Representative Gong-Gershowitz for bringing this Bill. As I sat here, I thought, I'm Latina. And as I heard her speak, and I heard Representative Mah speak, for me, something that was so evident and so clear, is that anti-Asian racism is racism that impacts all of us, not just some of us. When you talked about your experiences as a child, and Representative Mah talked about what she has seen, experienced, and continues to experience today, it should bring all of us to tears. It's 2021. We get to sit here, stand here, legislate here in front of these chandeliers. We are lawmakers, and we have the opportunity to truly change the way that we treat one another and, hopefully, also, how our children are able to treat each other through education and through legislation. I stand in full solidarity on this Bill. Growing up in Chicago Public Schools, when people ask me about the Asian American experience, you know what I could say, the only thing I could say? Well, I remember learning about Pearl Harbor. Is that what we're talking about? That was all we ever learned, a day that will live in infamy. I remember that.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

But when it came to the contributions, when it came to what has happened to Asian Americans in this country, when it came to the impact that they have had every single day for hundreds of years in this country, I had never ever heard anything until I took an anti-racism training four years ago. So, for me, as I think about hopefully one day having a child, I want my child to be able to learn about the diversity, the beauty, the contributions, the pains and the suffering of a community that, unfortunately, has been invisible for so long. And a community that has been pitted against other communities like mine and the African American community. And this idea and stereotype and these words used as the perfect minority, don't feel bad for them. They've got it good. I stand in solidarity with you because this Bill will be transformational, not just for our children right now, but for our grandchildren and for the children to come. And, hopefully, our children can teach us how not to be bullies, teach our colleagues not to be bullies, and to recognize that Asian American history, as Representative Mah said, is American history. I urge an 'aye' vote, and I thank you for bringing this Bill forward."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. What's wrong with you? What's wrong with you? Let me explain. This Bill came before the education committee, which I'm a Member. And I asked the same question I ask all the time when these Bills come up. You know, where do you draw the line? There's so... so many things out there that we need to talk about. I supported the Bill. But when I got home that night, my wife and I sit down and we talk about what's going on in Springfield, and I told her about this

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Bill. And I said, you know... and I asked a question of the Sponsor. And my wife says, what is wrong with you? I've known my wife 42 years. We've been married 35. We have two beautiful daughters, Jennifer and Stephanie. My wife was born in the Philippines. And I'm like, what do you mean what's wrong with you? And she said, Fred, these things, look what's going on. Look at TV. I'm like, yeah. But no, what's wrong with you? This has been going on forever, since I was a kid growing up in Niles where we emigrated from the Philippines, the way they treated us in school. And just recently, going to Woodfield Mall, and people look at me like I've got something... there's something wrong with me. What is wrong with you? And she starts telling me things that's happened to her the last 10, 15, 20 years. I consider my wife my best friend. She knows me better than most people. I think I know her better than most. And she starts telling me things that I've never heard about. It broke my heart. And she says, you know, Fred, and the reason things are like this is because that's the way we're raised. Be quiet. We keep things to ourselves. You study hard. She's been a nurse for a while. She does a fantastic job, but boy did I learn my lesson. So, I called the Sponsor the next day and I'm like, Jennifer, I apologize 'cause my wife just beat me up just 'cause I had some questions, and she told me some things I wasn't aware of. And it killed me because I thought I knew her very well, and I can't believe these things are happening in my community, in Hoffman Estates, in Schaumburg, today. Now, timing is everything, and I know there are other things that we would like to include in our curriculum. But when things are going on now, the

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

timing is now. So, I ask you to please stand in support for people like my wife, for the AAPI community and do the right thing. And, Jennifer, this was a teaching moment for me. So, thank you so very much for bringing this up. And I'll be with you 110 percent. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bourne."

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

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

Bourne: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate you bringing this Bill forward. And I especially appreciate you bringing the students to our committee for... to hear their testimony. I think that's always very powerful when we're able to include young people in this process. I have a couple of questions but want to preface by saying that teaching young people the dignity of all humans is something that I certainly value and think our public school system should value. And I think everyone in this chamber does. When we were in the Bank of Springfield Center, there was a Bill that included the Inclusive American History Commission, which is being constituted right now with members to look at the curriculum and guidelines of the history that we teach our students. Is it your intention that this would be included in their report?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "So, thank you for the question. I think we talked about this maybe a little bit in committee. As you know, the Inclusive History Commission, I think, is scheduled to complete its work in December. The timeline for the implementation of this Bill is in the 2022-2023 school year. So, it's my thought that this could certainly be folded into

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

that conversation. And it is my intent to ensure that Asian American history is included as part of the school curriculum. So, I don't see this as superseding that or I'm getting ahead of that. I think it actually aligns nicely with the timeline for that."

Bourne: "I appreciate that answer, although I take a different perspective, that if we are going to have this commission who is making these recommendations, that we should have that conversation, have the report, and then vote as a Body, potentially, on an inclusive package that encompasses this Bill and other ideas that I think would be important to teach. I also have ... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm looking at a list of all of the curricular mandates that we have in Illinois, and I know that there's a previous lawmaker that would stand here and read the whole thing, and I will spare you all of that. I can't find a single one that I can argue with as I'm just scrolling through here. I voted against, I think, all of them since I came to this chamber that have come before me. Not on... not on the subject matter. Sometimes on the subject matter, but mostly because of my perspective on where these conversations need to take place. A lot of these really heartwrenching stories that we've heard cannot be mandated. We can't mandate the change of a heart. This happens with families. This happens in conversations in communities. And this should happen at the local level where school boards and parents and students, like the students who testified in our committee, can have this heartfelt conversation within their community of how do we become better. The only way we change as a society is by having this public consciousness of how we

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

become better and we share these stories. And I am so moved by the stories that we have heard. And hearing these things makes us better people and makes us aware of other people's humanity and dignity more than our own experience ever could. But it's not my perspective that we can legislate that. And so, I stand opposed, again, to one more curricular mandate, which doesn't at all diminish the content of the Bill. I just think that this is the wrong venue. I appreciate your hard work on this Bill, and I look forward to working with you in our committee in the future on other Bills to make sure that our students get the best education possible. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Words matter. What we say, what we don't say. What we teach in our classrooms? And, just as significantly, what we don't teach. We already teach American history. We're just asking to be included in it. Inclusion is a choice. So is exclusion. The drafters of current American history and social studies curriculum chose not to include Asian Americans in teaching our shared history. And if, in a 202 year history in the Illinois General Assembly, Asian American stories had been included in our curriculum, I wouldn't be standing here right now. Those conversations aren't happening at the local level. We aren't being seen. We aren't being included. So, I'm asking this Body to choose differently today. It's not enough to condemn anti-Asian violence. The question when confronted with hate should be, what are you willing to do about it? It's time to end a history of erasure, of exclusion, and invisibility. I'm asking you to stand with me. I'm asking you to stand with the

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Asian American community, to stand for inclusion. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 376 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar appears House Bill 117, Representative Guzzardi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 117, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, colleagues. I rise today to present House Bill 117, which is a Bill that addresses a crisis that is happening in Illinois and across the country. It's a crisis of retirement savings. The median retirement savings in this country is only \$5 thousand. And 1/3 of all Illinoisans over the age of 55 rely on Social Security for 90 percent or more of their income. We all know that Social Security is not intended to that. It's meant to be a supplement to one's retirement savings. You're not supposed to live on it, and it's just not enough to. Several years ago, this Body began the process of addressing this by passing the Secure Choice program. It's a wonderful program. It mandates that employers of 25 or more employees can do 1 of 2 things. They can either... if they don't currently have a retirement savings program, they can either create one on

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

their own, create a 401(k) or an IRA for their employees to participate in, or enroll, at no cost and with very minimal effort, in a program run by the state called Secure Choice, which will offer an automatic auto-enrollment IRA program to their... to their workers. It's been a really successful program. Employers love this program. They're very happy with the opportunity to offer a benefit to their employees for free that they weren't able to offer otherwise. To date there are 81 thousand people enrolled in Secure Choice with over \$50 million of retirement savings that they wouldn't have had just a couple years ago. So, the Bill before us today expands their program, the Secure Choice program, from employers of 25 or more to employers of 5 of more employees. There are a few other small changes that are made in the Bill at the behest of the business community. And I would say we've had great conversations with the business community. Again, businesses, employers have really loved this program. It's been a big success. And as a result of the Amendment that we adopted in committee, 11 of the largest employer groups in Illinois are neutral on this Bill. That includes the Chamber of Commerce, the Retail Merchants Association, Manufacturers' Association, the... the Life and Insurance Council, all of the ... a wide array of the largest employer groups have moved to neutral on this Bill. It's a really wonderful program. It's one I hope we can expand here today. Workers are saving and employers are happy. I really urge an 'aye' vote, and I hope this can be a step forward to help address this crisis facing our workers. Thank you so much."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, we had some lovely discussions on this particular piece of legislation. I wanted to... you hit some things that didn't come up. I think you're probably going to get a split decision over here. One of the items that you brought up though during committee was, we can't... can you explain why we can't make this optional for smaller businesses? So, originally you were going to bring it down to anybody who has just even as little as one employee, right?"

Guzzardi: "That's right, yeah."

Batinick: "And we settled on five. Okay. And it's at 25 now."

Guzzardi: "Exactly."

Batinick: "So, this is affecting small businesses between 5 and 25. Why can't somebody that's under 25 employees have access to this program if they so chose?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, it's because of a vagary of Federal Law. I think it's in the ERISA law. It doesn't allow smaller employers to opt-in. So, I got a lot of small independent businesses in my district who say, like, I would love to offer retirement savings to my workers, but I can't, like, pull it together to do an IRA on my own. I don't have an accountant. I'm just a coffee shop. So, they would love to opt-in to this voluntarily, but they just can't because of the way Federal Law is structured."

Batinick: "Okay. I thought it was my understanding that, if they did opt-in, there'd be some liability for them."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Guzzardi: "Exactly. That's correct. Yes. Thank you,
Representative."

Batinick: "Okay. So, 25 to 5, and then you have... you still have a couple of... the NFIB is against it and a couple of other... the smaller business people. But some of the... but you said, what? Fourteen business groups are neutral on it now?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, it was 11 groups, I believe. Yeah."

Batinick: "Okay, 11. And what moved them to neutral?"

Guzzardi: "Well, it was a couple of things. Working with you, Leader Batinick, we raised that threshold from one to five, which was an area of concern. And we also made some changes around the enforcement provisions, around delaying those enforcement provisions, making sure those businesses get more notification if they need to enroll and addressing the way that the enforcement will work. Those..."

Batinick: "Okay, that's right. There's a... what's the timeline for the... for the run up on this?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I'll have to pull the date up, but we pushed it back by..."

Batinick: "'Cause it used to be immediately and it was 6 to 12 months, I believe."

Guzzardi: "That's exactly right."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. Thanks."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Demmer: "Representative Guzzardi, I just want to clarify with you that the five employee threshold that's established in this,

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

how... how would that affect employers who might have seasonal fluctuations in their employees? Is it... do you trigger it if you ever have five or just... could you explain that?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, it's a... it's a rolling average of last four quarters, I believe, if I recall."

Demmer: "So, you'd have to... a business that maybe had one busy season, and they rest of the year it was just mom and pop and nobody else, they wouldn't... they wouldn't be triggered by this, instead they would have to have five employees over a course of four quarters consecutively?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, an average. Yes."

Demmer: "An average. Okay. Okay. I appreciate that. I just wanted to offer some clarification on that because I think that when you get down to some of these businesses that are very, very small, they might now have a great deal of sophistication or, sort of, back office power. And certainly some who... oh, I don't know if it's a pumpkin patch, and they've got one busy month in the whole year, and the rest of the year there's nobody there. Those are the kind of businesses who may be affected by this. But I appreciate the context of that... that average over a longer period of time. Describes a different kind of business than what five, at one point, would."

Guzzardi: "That's right. And I'll just add briefly... and I appreciate that. Just to add briefly, the... what it's required to enroll in this program is really minimal. They've made it very, very easy for the employers. There's not a... there's not like a bunch of HR paperwork. You go online, you fill out a form, you enter each of your employees' names and their Social

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Security numbers and you're done. It's like... it takes five minutes. It's very, very easy. But..."

Demmer: "Okay."

Guzzardi: "...but yeah, we do want to be sensitive to those employers who have those fluctuations for sure. Thank you."

Demmer: "Appreciate that. I encourage a 'yes' vote."

Guzzardi: "Thanks."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins, are you a... in favor or opposed? Do you know?"

Caulkins: "I haven't made up my mind."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Caulkins: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Caulkins: "Representative, this program has been in place since 2018?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. The legislation enacting it was in 2015, but I believe they started enrolling people in '18. I think that's correct."

Caulkins: "How many plans are there in place? Or how many participants are there now?"

Guzzardi: "Do you mind just speaking a little closer to the microphone. Sorry."

Caulkins: "Well, here we go. How many people are enrolled in this program presently?"

Guzzardi: "There are a little over 80 thousand savers so far."

Caulkins: "And... I guess we heard that there is no cost...
essentially, no cost. The employer's not mandated to
contribute to this program?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- Guzzardi: "There's... oh, no. There's no employer contribution and there's zero cost at all. There's maybe 15 minutes of time, but that's all it cost."
- Caulkins: "And how is this money protected that an individual puts into this program? I know this state doesn't have a real good history on retirement programs. Is this money protected or segregated in such a way that the employees don't stand a chance... or a very slim chance..."
- Guzzardi: "Yes, this money is in the Treasurer's Office, invested very safely. It's invested in what they call Target Date Retirement Fund. So, it's... it is protected. Yes."

Caulkins: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Caulkins: "Thank you for your time."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

- Hammond: "Representative, when you're... when you're stating five employees, just for clarification, is that five full-time employees? If a business has five full-time and five part-time, or two full-time and three part-time, how... how are we categorizing that?"
- Guzzardi: "That's a good question, Representative. Give me just a moment to consult my notes and see if I can pull up an answer."
- Hammond: "Sure. 'Cause in our analysis... or in our reading of the Bill, it's not qualified. So, I'm just checking to see, and if we can do that over in the Senate."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Guzzardi: "Yeah, I'm not sure offhand. Let me get an answer back to you, Representative."

Hammond: "I appreciate it. Thank you very much."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The last speaker on this Bill is Representative Murphy."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Murphy: "Before I yield to ask you my question, I'd like to tell a story first, okay? I was approached to consider this Bill a few days ago. And when I did, I thought back to my early career. I started in the restaurant business in 1979. And at that point in time, it was commonplace that we offered benefits such as health insurance. We were able to offer health insurance for managers for their entire family. Regular employees had individual health insurance. Over the course of my career, because of economic reasons, margins got tougher and tougher. At the end, when I sold my business four years ago, no one had health insurance in our operation, including myself. I was on my wife's health insurance, as she's a school teacher. So, when I thought about this Bill, it goes against one of my core principles of mandates, but I thought, I need to support this because we need to be able to do more for our workers as small businesses. I appreciate the fact that there's no matching on this. And so, employers will be able to do this. There will be some administration time. And so, that comes to my question. One thing I raised to the Treasurer's Office, I hope we will work where we will be able to come up with a system in that when employers report their

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

new employees to IDES, that we can also have that information go directly to the Treasurer's Office for this. One thing that's very cumbersome and is very frustrating as a very small business... and I only had 23 employees at my diner. And it was very cumbersome that we had to give the state the same information over and over. So, I hope we work on making this as smooth a transition as possible. And I have one more question for you. I hope you'll consider that. And my... my last question is in regards to independent contractors. Where will they fall in regards to an employer... an employee? I'm sorry."

Guzzardi: "Yeah, the... my understanding is they're not consider employees and, therefore, wouldn't be counted under... under the provisions of the Bill. But, I think, to your previous question, it's well taken. And I think there are probably some back ended administrative measures that could be made to make that process a little more seamless. And I know the Treasurer's Office has worked really hard on making this process as easy as possible for employers, and I'm sure they'll try to pursue this as this rolls out."

Murphy: "Well, I appreciate you bringing this Bill forward, and I look forward to supporting it. And I urge an 'aye' vote.

Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "I appreciate the questions, colleagues, and I urge your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill House Bill 117 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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 106 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 26 of the Calendar, House Bill 1742, Representative Hirschauer. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill to Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1742, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hirschauer, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hirschauer on the Amendment."
- Hirschauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Floor Amendment serves to further strengthen protections in this Bill by requiring that the petition for a civil no contact order that is initiated by a family or household member must include a statement that the victim has consented to the filing of the petition."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hirschauer moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please leave this Bill on Third Reading. On page 26 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2449, Representative Hammond. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2449, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2449 simply brings into consideration that we have two separate sets of rules for calling county... or for county boards to call a special meeting. And this basically brings them both under the same rules that a county board chair can call a special meeting. Happy to take any questions. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2449 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has all... have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 25 of the Calendar, we move to House Bill 40, Representative Hurley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 40, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the committee... Members of the chamber. House Bill 40, it's the 102nd General Assembly House Bill 40, not previous House Bill 40s. And currently, this... students with developmental disabilities, on the eve of their 22nd birthday, basically get kicked out of school. This Bill would allow them to finish the school year with their classmates and their friends. I'm here for questions, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick on the Bill."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, you just want to slow things down a little bit for my side real quick? So, what happens now is if you're... I know it affected a lot during the pandemic, but if you hit 22, you're aged out, even if it's in the middle of the school year, right?"

Hurley: "Correct."

Batinick: "And then, there is... I think there's some strong proponents and some strong opponents. What's the nature of the opposition is, is that the kids coming in then, right? That... that's the issue?"

Hurley: "I... it's probably a funding issue."

Batinick: "Funding issue. Okay. All right. Thank you for clarifying that. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Morgan: "I just want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this legislation as we discussed in committee. As many of you know, I have an adult brother with special needs. And I vividly recall at the age of 21 how he was removed from his program that was making meaningful progress in his vocational training. I think this is significant for so many families. I really want to thank the Sponsor, and I urge and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Davidsmeyer: "The only question I have, I believe that we had a Bill in a prior year, it may have back in 2019 or 2018, where we were trying to do something similar but there was a concern that it... it didn't go along with Federal Law. So, is there... is there currently an age at which Federal Law does not allow an individual at, say, 22 to be in the same school as an individual that is 16, for instance? Or 14? Because if you're talking high school, you're talking a little bit older. So, I think that we've seen a Bill in prior years, and I think that's the only opposition that I would have is if... if there is a federal rule that actually doesn't allow an individual of a certain age to be with an individual of a... a minor of a different age."

Hurley: "I'm not aware of that, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, but what would happen if there is a... an issue that goes against Federal Law? Would we revert back to the Federal Law or would this be still required?"

Hurley: "Again, this is new information to me. I've been working on this Bill for two years. I don't remember the Bill in 2019."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and I wish I remembered the Bill..."

Hurley: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "...but I just wanted to clarify for myself because I remember it coming up in the past and us working on something similar to this. And so, that... that was my only concern to make sure that we're not going against those rules. But I appreciate what you're trying to do, and I understand your reasoning. So, I will probably be supporting your Bill."

Hurley: "Thank you, Representative."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "There are several individuals, and I believe they're all in support. We've already had three individuals who have spoken in support of the Bill. Is anybody seeking recognition opposed to the Bill? If there are none, we will have Representative Hurley to close. Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Everybody has told..."

- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hurley, hold on. Representative Stava-Murray, we're on Standard Debate. If you are in support of the Bill, we've already had three individuals who have talked in support of the Bill. Representative Stava-Murray."
- Stava-Murray: "I... I just had a question because I had spoken with someone on how the current genesis, it actually was on the history of the Bill. So, we used to just cut... or we used to allow people to go through the end of the school year after their 21st... or after their 20th birthday maybe, was the original law that was described to me by the superintendent of one of my districts. And he said the reason why they changed the law was because there inequity in the amount of services that people were receiving. So, lots of people were coming to Representatives and telling them, hey, it's not fair that because I was born in June I get 11 months less services than someone born in August. So, that... I was just wondering if there was anything in this Bill that helps deal with that concern of inequitable services for people."
 - Hurley: "And I apologize, Representative Stava-Murray. I didn't really hear you because of the noise and the mask and everything. The Bill, again, 21... I don't know the history. But kids that are 21 years old, on the eve of their 22nd birthday, as long as I have known, finish school at the age

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

of 22. It could've been previous... you know, 10, 15 years ago, it might've changed but..."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah, and I think it was about a decade ago. And so, the superintendent was just urging me to know that history. And I thought that it might be important to share that for others as well who might be not sure about it."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber, are you in support?"

Weber: "I just had some clarifying questions. I'm sorry. Real quick."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber."

Weber: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Weber: "I think I... in committee I had brought this up, and I guess it was questioning. We're talking about how it's fair for the kids to be able to finish out their school year, and I just wanted to clarify. If someone turned 21 the day before the school day... or school year started, they would not be going to school. But if you turn 21 the first day of school, then you would go through a full year?"

Hurley: "Correct. Very random."

Weber: "All right. So... but there's not... I mean, is there a graduation ceremony? I guess I don't understand how that works. Is it..."

Hurley: "They just get to... just like my son or daughter, they get to finish the school year with the rest of the class. So, if it's a graduation, yes. Depending on the school for the ceremonies."

Weber: "Okay. All right. I guess I can understand the person who turned 21 the day before school started, how they would feel

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

like they were not getting treated fair also. So, I guess I'm still undecided. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hurley to close."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will say my personal story here. My neighbor came up to me, she has triplets. Her name is Katie. Her son, Charlie, has down syndrome. And in November 5 of last year, he aged out of school. He was not allowed to go back. All his friends were back, and he didn't know what was going on. So, this is just another equity line for students with developmental disabilities. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 40 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. To House Bill 1955, on the Order of Third Reading, page 26 of the Calendar, Representative Jones. Out of the record. Representative Manley on House Bill 3147. Leader Manley. Out of the record. On House Bill 111, on the Order of Third Reading, on page 25 of the Calendar, Representative Mayfield. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 111, a Bill for an Act concerning juveniles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I hope everybody can hear me with my mask on. House Bill 111 is a juvenile justice initiative

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

that allows for juveniles to remain in the juvenile system at the age of 18. This Bill only applies to misdemeanors. This is to keep our juveniles out of the adult correctional system."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick on House Bill 111."

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

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

Batinick: "So, it's... to clarify, it's after 18 that they would stay in the juvenile system, right? That's what you're changing the Bill to say? Not until 18?"

Mayfield: "Until they're 18."

Batinick: "The definition of delinquent minor shall apply to any minor prior to his or her 19th birthday, currently. Okay. So, you're raising it from 18th to 19th birthday?"

Mayfield: "Yes, correct. I'm sorry."

Batinick: "Okay, as opposed to 18. And you have a whole bunch of proponents. And the opponents are the chiefs, the sheriffs, and the Illinois Probation and Court Services, correct?"

Mayfield: "Right, but they're soft opposition. They didn't really come out strongly."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm just clarifying. What's the significance of 19... 18 versus 19?"

Mayfield: "Personally, I'd like it 21, but we couldn't seem to get our opponents to go to 21. The whole objective here is because we understand there's a lot of data to support that the mental capacity, or the brain, for a 19 year old is still developing. We do see a lot of individuals that are in DOC who have been charged with adult crimes who really have the opportunity to be rehabilitated. And we want to make sure

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- that we're giving them this opportunity. I do want to stress that this is just for misdemeanors. We also had to take out the felonies..."
- Batinick: "That was my next question. So, this is just from... so, a misdemeanor minor, you're raising it from 18 to 19 to stay in the juvenile justice system?"
- Mayfield: "Correct. And to give them a time to work. A lot of our local state's attorneys have alternative programs, and this will allow these individuals to take advantage of those alternative programs so that they can turn their lives around and be contributing citizens."
- Batinick: "Okay. That was very helpful flushing that out. Thank you, Representative... Leader."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no... no one further to be recognized,

 Representative Mayfield to close."
- Mayfield: "We just want to ask that we give our youth an opportunity here to be successful. We know that they do make mistakes. No... you know, but that's no reason just to lock them up and throw away the key. This Bill provides them with an extra opportunity, if you will, to be successful and to take advantage of alternative programming. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 111 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Representative Manley on House Bill 3147, page 27 of the Calendar, Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3147, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We don't have an Amendment? Or we do?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 has already been adopted."

Manley: "Fantastic. Okay. House Bill 3147 amends the Nursing Home Care Act, requiring that a disaster must be declared by the Governor, instead of pandemics and other public emergencies, in this... in the original introduced Bill. It also changes a language from a facility and... from a facility 'shall facilitate' to 'facilitates should make every reasonable effort'. So, we're changing the language a little. We worked closely with IHA, HCCI, and IHCA. It was collaborative and removed all opposition, and I'm here to take any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "It just... you clarified it at the end. The Amendment took off opposition, correct?"

Manley: "Yes, it removed all opposition."

Batinick: "Thank you. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Manley to close."

Manley: "Please vote 'yes'."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3147 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this
question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting
'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 26 of the
Calendar appears House Bill 1926, Representative Luft. Read
the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I bring to you House Bill 1926. It's a very simple Bill. It repeals the City and Village Tuberculosis Sanitariums Division of the Illinois Municipal Code. Amends the Counties Code, the Illinois Municipal Code, Tuberculosis Sanitarium and the District Act, making conforming changes. This has been a burden on the counties, health departments, and municipalities who have to levy tax and budget for this process that started in 1917. It was amended in the 1940s. The last sanitarium that was opened closed in the 1970s. This is just a matter of clean up. We are here to add things onto the books to make things better. And we're also here to remove things off the books to make things better. No opponents. The proponents was IML. I would entertain any questions and ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Hoffman. A few questions of the Sponsor, please?"

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Butler: "Representative/Mayor Luft, is this your first piece of legislation that you've debated on the floor of the House of Representatives?"

Luft: "Yes, Representative. I'm a freshman to the floor and very happy to be here."

Butler: "What was your first ordinance that you sponsored as... on the Pekin City Council?"

Luft: "I believe it was to eliminate our treasurer's position at the city."

Butler: "Oh, you're a good government guy. I like that. Did the treasurer like that?"

Luft: "Well, he worked for me. So, yes, he understood. It was fiscally more responsible to move that position into accounting."

Butler: "You are a fiscally responsible mayor. We like that."

Luft: "Yes, Sir."

Butler: "I see you're... the beginning of your remarks were a little... a little low. I couldn't quite hear you. So, could you explain again exactly what this piece of legislation does? Particularly since I see sanitariums on the board here, which I don't know if I've ever actually seen that on the board in my six years here."

Luft: "Well, that's why it needs to be removed, Representative.

There's people that have not heard that word ever in their lifetime. That's how old this is. But this Bill repeals the City and Village Tuberculosis Sanitarium Division of the Illinois Municipal Code, amends the Counties Code, Illinois

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Municipal Code, and the Tuberculosis Sanitarium District Act, making conforming changes."

Butler: "So, Representative Luft, you and I spent one year in high school together. I think you were a year ahead of me in high school at Spaulding Institute High School in Peoria. So, we're about the same age. Are you a Metallica fan?

Luft: "I might have one Metallica CD in my collection, yes."

Butler: "Are you familiar with the sanitar... the song Sanitarium by Metallica?"

Luft: "Yes, I am."

Butler: "Do you know any lyrics from that song?"

Luft: "I do not."

Butler: "Would you like... could we play it on your computer maybe?

I don't know."

Luft: "At some point we will..."

Butler: "Could we get Metallica to come to Pekin to the Dragon Dome maybe and perform?"

Luft: "I would gladly welcome that and do what I could to help make that happen. Yes."

Butler: "Very good. Well, Representative, welcome to the Illinois General Assembly. This is a good government piece of legislation for your first Bill. I'm proud to call you my friend and split Pekin with you. So, welcome aboard and good job, Mayor."

Luft: "Thank you, Sir. I appreciate that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ness."

Ness: "Thank you, Speaker. And does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Ness: "So, I have a clarifying question. First of all, congratulations your first floor Bill here. That's really exciting."

Luft: "Thank you."

Ness: "Does this eliminate tuberculosis boards or just sanitariums?"

Luft: "At this point, just the sanitariums."

Ness: "Okay. So... so, boards are still funded... county boards... tuberculosis boards are still going to be funded?"

Luft: "Not there... there are not specific boards dedicated to that, but the boards themselves... there's a piece in there with the sanitariums that they do have to address through their levies each year, through their budget. There's a very small percentage that they do now that the county treasurer has to deal with as well. But there are no tuberculosis sanitarium boards, so to speak. But the county board, yes. This will eliminate a process that the county board will have to deal with."

Ness: "Correct. So, there... currently, there's still a tuberculosis board that oversees the small, very small, amount of money that's dedicated to this. I had spoke with the local pub... my local public health department, and even though it's a very small amount, they encourage us to continue funding it because we do have cases that come up yearly and we would hate to see that happen and then not have any funds. So, as long as this is not going after the board and just the sanitariums, then I agree it's a good piece of legislation. So, thank you."

Luft: "Correct. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Real quick, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Davis: "Representative, I just noticed that this Bill came out of committee unanimously, correct?"

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

Davis: "I just noticed that this Bill came out of committee unanimously."

Luft: "Yes."

Davis: "Do you have any idea why it was not on our Consent Calendar?"

Luft: "I do not."

Davis: "None whatsoever? And I... and I'm not trying to be funny, but the idea of having a Consent Calendar was so that we could expedite things. And yet, here's a Bill that came out of committee with no opposition, at least to my knowledge, and we're still debating it. I was just curious if you know why it was not put on the Consent Calendar."

Luft: "Now, pardon... pardon my ignorance on that, but I would've assumed that if would... there would've been a request to put it on Consent, that would've came from the Chair, the vice chair, or the spokesperson."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis, I was just informed by the Clerk that there was a 'present' vote."

Davis: "I see."

Speaker Hoffman: "Someone voted 'present'."

Luft: "Excuse me. I might have an answer to that. I think the reason it did not go to the Consent, I was just reminded.

There was a..."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Davis: "'Present' vote."

Luft: "...'present' vote."

Davis: "Understood. Thank you very much."

Luft: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Great minds. Great minds. Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Speaker Hoffman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Davidsmeyer: "In... in Pekin, at the city council, do you guys use microphones when you have your meetings?"

Luft: "Yes, Sir. We use lapel microphones."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... maybe we can look into getting lapel microphones for him. I couldn't hear you earlier as you were trying to discuss your Bill, so..."

Luft: "We used to use the tower microphones, Representative, and I got in a routine of staying very close it. Last couple of years, we've used a lapel where I have felt free to roam, so to speak, while I am speaking. So, I apologize."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you got away from the normal microphone because you wouldn't stay close enough to it to speak. So, I appreciate that. Now, it is my understanding that back in your district office you have an amazing staff member back there that keeps you in line. Is that true?"

Luft: "I wouldn't be here without her."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. All right. I've had the opportunity to meet her. I think she's a wonderful person. She's got her hands full, but I think you're going to do a wonderful job. Thank you, Representative."

Luft: "Thank you, Sir."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Severin."

Severin: "Will... thank you, Leader. Will the ..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, he will."

Severin: "Will you let me talk to you?"

Luft: "Yes, Sir."

Severin: "It's called yielded."

Luft: "Yeah."

Severin: "Are you nervous?"

Luft: "No, not at all."

Severin: "Well, I still am. I've been doing this four years and every time I push that button my blood pressure goes up, I start shaking. So, I thought, well I'm going to... it's my opportunity to talk to you so I can kind of get better at this. So, you're doing a fantastic job. I was just curious if you were nervous. It was obvious you're not, and... but I just wanted to say hello to you, how's it going, and tell me how you can do this and not be nervous. I'd like to know."

Luft: "Well, I have six years of municipal government under my belt, which, at times, can actually be a little more difficult than this, closer to home. So..."

Severin: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Luft to close."

Luft: "I appreciate the welcome. It means a lot to me. I'm very proud, as a freshman, to be here. And just one note, and I promised that I would do this the very first time I got to speak on this floor, and it'll be the last time I say this. But the most thing I'm proud of to be here standing here today, is that I'm standing on the same floor that my father did at one time. And my father also stood in the Senate. And

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

it makes me very proud, while he is still with us, to be able for him to see me stand on the same floor. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Your father's a great man. I served with him. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1926 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, there are 100... on this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar appears House Bill 147, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 147, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 147 is the CBD Safety Act. The CBD Safety Act is a public safety Bill. It's a public health Bill. This is dealing with a product that you have all seen in your communities and towns. Every one of us, every lawmaker in this chamber, has a CBD store on their corner, in a gas station, in a kiosk in a mall. And the reality is CBD products are not regulated in the State of Illinois. I'll say that again. CBD products are not regulated in the State of Illinois. This is a problem identify... I identified about three years ago. As we regulate hemp, we have a hemp pilot program and Illinois hemp growers. And we have a cannabis program where we regulate adult and medical use cannabis. We do not regulate CDB products on their own. And when you look at the stores around the country, and

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

particularly in the State of Illinois, the CBD products that they're selling did not start and were not created in the State of Illinois. They were processed outside the state and they contain things ... sometimes things like heavy metals, pesticides, contaminants. Sometimes they have more CBD than they say they will and sometimes they have less. But the truth is, the State of Illinois, right now, has no regulatory authority whatsoever. This Bill will give them that. This Bill has the support of the Illinois Retail Merchants. This is something I spoke with Walgreens and CVS about how they manage their products to make sure that these products are safe. And this is also, again, in support... is supported by the Illinois Department of Agriculture, as well as Illinois Department of Public Health. I want to just quickly put something on the record, specifically for legislative intent. These consumer products have something called cannabinoid ingredients. And when you use the word cannabinoid, it's a very technical term. It's expansive, it's something we're extracting from hemp. So, when we take something out of hemp, that's what we're talking about with cannabinoids. That includes something called Delta 8, which some of you have been reading about in the newspaper and some of our colleagues in committee we discussed. It's becoming more and more common that they're extracting very potent aspects of the hemp and selling it. And there's no regulation or oversight whatsoever. So, the intent, and the legislative intent behind this legislation, is not to require extensive ongoing testing. This is a very growing market. A lot of small retailers in the State of Illinois. This is intended to only

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

have a single lab test. And the Illinois Department of Agriculture will be developing rulemaking that is consistent with that. I'm happy to entertain any questions, but I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Bill, seeking recognition, Representative Willis."

Willis: "Actually I have an inquiry of the Chair. My analysis shows that there is an Amendment pending that's still in Rules. Is that true or is it... my analysis incorrect?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted previously."

Willis: "Okay, thank you. My analysis just wasn't updated. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hammond: "Representative Morgan, first of all, thank you for bringing this legislation. I never would've dreamed that you and I would have as many conversations about CDB, cannabinoids, Delta 8, Delta 9, but certainly, over the last several weeks, we have had very good conversations. And Illinois, I believe, was at the cutting edge of getting precursors for methamphetamine where they needed to be, behind the counters at our pharmacies. We also were at the cutting edge of bath salts and what they were doing to our young people. In addition, not that long ago, we were in the front of the vaping industry and what they were putting in their products. Because of this legislation, I believe, we will also be able to take a step forward for public safety

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

for the CDB products that are being sold at gas stations and places that they shouldn't be, when, in fact, they are not just a CBD as you and I would know it and expect it to be. But instead they are of the variety of the Delta 8, which used to be known as the Delta 9. And while it is a hemp derivative, I think I made the comment to you once, I also used to weigh 120 pounds. So, I appreciate you bringing the legislation and look forward to supporting it and would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "I am not opposed, in principle, to having some uniform standards for regulation of CBD products. But as someone who does deal with FDA packaging, labeling, and testing standards, you're really not putting any guidelines in here. And I don't know that the Department of Agriculture genuinely understands, particularly to the extent you're going to try to impose anything relating to potency standards, impurity standards. These are not things that are simple. These are things that usually require tens of thousands of pages to accurately identify and validate. And if you're not actually going to give the Department of Agriculture the type of staff that would be needed to actually do this, you're really going to... you're going to have a regulatory theory on... or regulatory scheme that, in theory, is on paper, but I have no idea what it's going to look like in practice. And I'm not sure that people are going to actually come into compliance because, if you don't actually set forth, like, genuine rules, standards,

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

quidelines for how you test on things on potency, how you're going to test for things on impurities, what things you are going to test for, what things you're not going to test for, this is not something really simple that you can just throw to a regulatory agency that doesn't actually have the in house experience to already do this. The FDA is a massive bureaucracy, an organization with professional scientists who are... you know, even with all of the work that they have, it takes them 30 months or more to process applications. And sometimes, up to five or seven years or more. So... and one of the ways in which that's been dealt with is to try to deal with that through higher user fees, if you want to get expedited approval and that sort of thing. But this is the type of regulation that, over the long run, if you're not careful, is actually going to swallow out the small... the small producer or the small manufacturer. Because just packaging manufacturing standards and impurity standards, those can actually be very, very difficult to be compliant from, from batch to batch, manufacturing batch to manufacturing lot. So, to the extent you are trying to support a small business model, by not putting any rails on the scope of what the Department of Agriculture can and should consider, I think you're going to create a regulatory agency that can also run amuck but may not actually even be affective at addressing thing you want to look at. So, I'm happy to talk with you about it further, but this is not as simple as it seems. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Demmer."

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

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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

Demmer: "Representative Morgan, I want to draw your attention to Section 5-45.8 about emergency rulemaking. The concern in this Section is that this Bill authorizes emergency rulemaking until January 1 of 2027. Six years of emergency rulemaking authority. Emergency rulemaking is typically used in very narrow application to... where time is of the essence. What is the rationale behind providing emergency rulemaking for a period of six years, instead of engaging in a normal rulemaking process that allows for comment, revision, and public airing of the potential rules?"

Morgan: "Excellent question, and I want to answer that and also address a previous related question from our colleague, Representative Mazzochi. Let me start with Representative Mazzochi's comments because she is exactly right. Ordinarily this legislation would not be a State Law initiative. It would not be a state rulemaking prerogative. This would be the role of the FDA. The problem is, since 2015, hemp and its derivatives have been legal at the federal level with zero regulations behind them and left the states to fend for themselves. We all know how that has worked out. Again, it has not worked. In fact, that's why there's a proliferation of CBD products in stores with no regulation. So, I agree with my colleagues comments, and that's why there's a provision in here that repeals this provision in the event that there... and it's superseded by Federal Law and FDA regulations. So, I agree, and I would not be here with this legislation otherwise had the Federal Government failed to do their job. And to Leader Demmer's question, the emergency

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

rulemaking is partially reality of we are already behind. As Leader Hammond mentioned, these products are being sold today and have been sold for years. It is only a matter of time before someone gets hurt. This is designed to give the Department of Agriculture immediate opportunity to develop and implement rulemaking so they can keep people safe for public safety measure. The rulemaking itself, the 2027 deadline, that was an LRB initiative, LRB language, which my understanding was based on when there is a sunset of emergency rulemaking, that is the way that they structure that. I'm happy to address that..."

Demmer: "But... yeah, Representative, I think that there's a real distinction between allowing for one-time use of emergency rulemaking authority for expeditious implementation of a new legislation. Even in that circumstance, I think this Body should give very serious consideration to the merits of the normal rulemaking process, which allows for, again, comment periods, public input, viewing of the rule by many, many parties, and I think that makes a better rule in the end. Emergency rulemaking exists for a very narrow and specific purpose. It may be warranted in this case, it may not. We should debate that provision. But thinking of granting... explicitly granting emergency rulemaking authority for a six year period doesn't just allow the first set of rules to be done by emergency rule, it allows any rules to be done by emergency rule. As a member of JCAR, our cochairman, House cochairman Representative Wheeler, is... often plays defense to protect the interest of the General Assembly in the rulemaking process to ensure that those emergency rules are used very

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

narrowly and are not claimed by departments to be broad and permissive articles that allow for, virtually, unlimited execute authority. So, I just want to really call attention to that. I don't think I've ever seen a Bill that would authorize emergency rulemaking for such a significantly long period of time. I mean, even consider we'll have... we could have a change of administration in the period of time that emergency rulemaking is allowed. Now, any attempt by the Legislature to go back and change the date retroactively, even an attempt by JCAR to intervene in a rulemaking circumstance can't happen immediately. Emergency rules take effect immediately. We'd have to wait until the next JCAR meeting. So, I just call the Body's attention to that. I think this is really a significant area where we should exercise restraint and very narrowly tailor any kind of emergency rulemaking authority that we grant."

Morgan: "And, Leader Demmer, I hear your point, and I think it's a valid one. And I agree that this should not be a permanent... this was not intended to be permanent rulemaking. I pledge to you and to the Body I will work with the Senate Sponsor to make sure that is changed, amended so it is a one-time emergency rulemaking and normal rulemaking beyond that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one further seeking recognition, Representative Morgan to close."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 147 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 26 of the Calendar, Representative Mussman on House Bill 816. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 816, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 816 makes adjustments to the existing statute regarding paid sick leave in Illinois' School Code so... to ensure that is a uniform application when it is used in relation to the birth or arrival of a child. The Bill clarifies that it has always been the intent of the original legislation for teachers and other eligible employees, whether male or female, to have the opportunity to use up to 30 sick days of accrued paid sick leave for the arrival of their child. The leave is not dependent on the need to recover from the physical act of giving birth. It does not need to be used consecutively, and it may be used anytime within the 12-month period following the arrival of the child. The leave may not be diminished as a result of intervening periods of nonworking days, such as summer holidays or winter break. Parents should not be denied paid time off they fairly earned, the same as any of their other colleagues, based on the uncontrollable timing of when their child arrives. The Bill also clarifies that it has always been the intent of the original legislation that days of accrued paid sick leave may be used for the adoption or placement for adoption. These days may be used

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

for reasons related to the formal adoption process prior to taking custody of the child, not only after taking custody, and also do not need to be used consecutively. There have been multiple court cases over the last few years regarding inconsistent interpretation of the law by districts around the state. The Illinois Supreme Court acknowledges the existing statute was intended to be uniformly applied by all districts and is, therefore, not subject to collective bargaining. This change will ensure parity across the state for paid sick leave legally accrued by both birth parents and adoptive parents. I'd love to have your 'aye' vote, and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, I was taking a well-deserved break cause I thought somebody was going to vet this Bill a little bit. Is there a court case surrounding this particular Bill?"

Mussman: "There's actually multiple court cases. There was one, I think, fairly well known recently. I want to say the person's name was Dynak."

Batinick: "Okay."

Mussman: "But there had been multiple cases."

Batinick: "So... and this is trying to fix, essentially if somebody has a child adoption, birth of a child, during the summer and whether they get to get paid sick leave off. Is that correct?"

Mussman: "Yes. It basically clarifies that paid sick leave is your paid sick leave whether you're using it because you're sick with your own personal health issue or you're using it

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

is relation to birth of your child. You accrue up to 30 days, and that doesn't get to be diminished just because your child maybe was born in July as opposed to if your child was born in November. You accrued 30 days, you get to use them."

Batinick: "Okay. And then the… with the accrual, are you able to accrue… accrue more than… you can accrue more than 30 days, correct?"

Mussman: "I think you might be... I... my understanding is... so, you can accrue up to 180 days of sick leave, but you can use up to 30 days of paid sick leave for the..."

Batinick: "Okay. So..."

Mussman: "...purpose of birth and adoption."

Batinick: "For the purpose of birth. But you can... when you accrue up to 180 days, you can use those for paid sick leave whenever you get sick, right, along the way? Let's say you have a more serious disease and you're going to be out for 6 months, you're still getting paid with the 180 days, correct?"

Mussman: "Yes."

Batinick: "So, there's a limit on the sick leave for having a child. There... there isn't necessarily a limit on other type of illnesses, right?"

Mussman: "Yes."

Batinick: "We won't call adoption an illness, obviously."

Mussman: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. I think I'm going to let couple of my other colleagues dig into this a little further. I appreciate your answers."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Bourne. Representative Reick."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry for the mix up. Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Reick: "Representative, I seem to recall the conversation that we had in committee dealt more... not so much with the eligibility for certain numbers of days off and things like that, but more with the timing of the... of those days off. You know, you have on instance where a person has a baby, like on the last day of school, and then they want to take their sick leave going into the next session, or the fall term, or however you want to put it. I would think that that could be something would be better served by having a discussion within the... as part of the collective bargaining process within the school board at the local level as opposed to us indicating a preference at our... at here at the... at the legislative level. Can you address that, please?"

Mussman: "Yeah. So, what we're doing is we are clarifying that it is the intention of the School Code to say you have earned up to 30 days of paid sick leave that you may use any time in the 12 months following the birth or adoption of your child. So, if you have your child on June 1, within the timeframe 12 months after that, you can choose to use up to 30 of those days. They do not have to be used consecutively. So, that is meant to be uniformly applied. You earned that benefit. It doesn't matter when you had your baby."

Reick: "That's all well and good, but again, you're dealing with situations where you've got school boards that are trying to... trying to set up their schedules for the following school year or whatever the period of time is. Again, I question

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

whether or not it is better that the school board and the union that represents those teachers have the ability to do that as opposed to doing it here through statute. The 30 days is one... you know, I'm not arguing with the fact that you're eligible for it, but the issue is one of giving the flexibility to local school districts to be able to determine. Maybe there's a little bit of leeway that needs to be given back to the school board because of their scheduling issues."

Mussman: "So, if you're not using it for direct recovery, my hope is that you can find a way to negotiate the days that work out for you and your administration. But you used... you earned them and you get to use them. Whether you had your baby June 1 or you had your baby November 1, you still get to use them."

Reick: "For that purpose or for any purpose?"

Mussman: "For that purpose. So, you can use up to 30 days in relation to the arrival of your child. So, if you choose to use... lose less... use less, that's your choice, but you have up to 30 that you can say is related to my child. My child has a well visit at the doctor. I'm going to take my paid sick leave, and I'm going to choose to use it to go there. Whatever the case may be, that is your time. You use it as you see fit, as long as you fall within those parameters."

Reick: "I guess I don't have a problem with that. It's a situation that I can envision where you have a parent who says, okay, school starts on September 1. I'll see you in October. And..."

Mussman: "Then that is a negotiation between them and their school district. But they would be authorized to choose to use 30 days of consecutive leave within their 12 months period. If they use them all up at that one time, that is their choice."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Reick: "Again, I think we're going to have a difference of opinion of this one because I believe that there should be some flexibility for scheduling purposes that is not being anticipated by this Bill. For that reason, I would recommend a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Lewis."

Lewis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Lewis: "To the Representative. We talked about this in committee.

Is this Bill retroactive, as it has affected a school district in my... in my district?"

Mussman: "It's effective immediately upon being signed law.

There's not retroactivity."

Lewis: "Okay. And another question we had in committee is, now that we lowered the FMLA laws, hours from 1250 to 1,000, is this Bill still applicable? Because, under FMLA, any teacher who's accrued or earned sick days can take them."

Mussman: "FMLA is unpaid leave. It's a completely different subject."

Lewis: "Under you can... under FMLA, you may use accrued sick days to pay while you take a FMLA leave of absence."

Mussman: "I can't speak to that. I'm... I'm sorry. I don't have that information at hand at this moment."

Lewis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you. I'll be super brief. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I saw education on the board and said, oh, shoot, maybe this is a Bill we've talked about.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

But we haven't, so I had a of couple quick questions. So, this expands... I just want to get, kind of, to the bare bones of it. This expands the way that they can use their earned sick time?"

Mussman: "No, it does not expand it. It just clarifies that the existing statute says they get up to 30 days that do not have to be used consecutively and are not diminished just because they may or may not occur during some other scheduled break."

Bourne: "Okay. So, this is not... you can already use your sick time..."

Mussman: "Yes."

Bourne: "...to care for your child that you just birthed, or adopted, or whatever the case may be? Okay. Perfect. So, this doesn't expand, doesn't add more days. It clarifies. It was... it arose out of a court case. Is that right?"

Mussman: "Yes. We... we found that the way original statute was worded just, I guess, wasn't clear enough. And some school districts were interpreting it differently and then being sued over that. So, we want... we want to be clear that it is uniform application and exactly what the parameters are."

Bourne: "And do you anticipate lawsuits under this?"

Mussman: "No. Our intention is to prevent lawsuits because we've made it so clear you can't make a mistake."

Bourne: "Okay. I appreciate that clarification. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman to close."

Mussman: "I appreciate all the detailed questions and would like an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 816 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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 100 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Yes, Members, we are going to move to the Order of Second Reading. Please be prepared to move your Bill if it is called. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 26, Representative Mah. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments #2, offered by Representative Mah, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mah on Floor Amendment #2."
- Mah: "Floor Amendment simply makes a technical change requested by ISBE."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Mah moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 26. All in favor... all in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Any further Amendments? I'm sorry."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On page 2 of the Calendar, Order of Second Reading, House Bill 58, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 58, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Didech, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Didech."

- Didech: "Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 58 modifies the process by which an individual or a community association may file a modification for an unlawful restrictive covenant. It was procedure developed in consultation with the Community Institute Association. It also imposes a \$10 cap on the fee that may be charged for filing such a modification. I ask for the Amendments adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Didech moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 58. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 3 of the Calendar, under Order of Second Reading, House Bill 75, Representative Flowers. Out of the record. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 60, Representative Stoneback. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 60, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment... Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Stoneback, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Stoneback."
- Stoneback: "House Amendment #2 would make the overall affect of the Amendment... would make it so inspections by the Department of Labor are not required for general park slides or slides

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

that are under private control. It clears up language from the underlying Bill, which was vague, on what constituted a slide which required inspection. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, Representative Stoneback moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 60. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar, House

Bill 96, Representative West. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 96, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative West, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment to House Bill 96 simply is a tweak to the language that was given to me by the Illinois State Police. There was an oversight in the original language to the Bill. And it takes out 'such as light sensitivity to the exemption' because we are making it... we're including traumatic brain injury due to light sensitivity. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative West moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 96. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

18th Legislative Day

- have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 4 of the Calendar, House Bill 121, Representative Guzzardi. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 121, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 165, Representative Bennett. Representative Bennett. Out of the record. House Bill 185, Representative Reick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 185, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 5 of the Calendar, House Bill 231, Representative Hernandez. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 231, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 253, Representative Buckner. I apologize, Representative Buckner is absent. House Bill 234, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 234, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was

18th Legislative Day

- adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 5 of the Calendar, House Bill 307, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 307, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving to page 6 of the Calendar,
 House Bill 351, Representative Yednock. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 351, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 357, Representative Hammond. Out of the record. Representative Smith on House Bill 374. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Ugaste on House Bill 381. Out of the record. Representative Moylan, House Bill 395. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 395, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Moylan, has been approved for consideration."

18th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Oh, I apologize. Mr. Clerk, move this back to Second Reading for a pending Amendment. On Floor Amendment #1, Representative Moylan."
- Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is just a clarification. Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, Representative Moylan moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 395. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 414, Representative LaToya Greenwood. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 414, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Greenwood, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Greenwood on Floor Amendment #1."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 inserts language about the use of federal funds under this Act."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no recognition, Representative Greenwood moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 414. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

18th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 427, Representative Yingling. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 427, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 434, Representative Ford. Representative Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 559, on page 7 of the Calendar, Second Reading, Representative... Leader Durkin. Out of the record. Leader Gabel on House Bill 573. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 573, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 648, Representative Stoneback. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 648, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 680, Representative McLaughlin. Representative McLaughlin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 680, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving to page 8 of the Calendar,
 House Bill 721, Representative Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, please
 read the Bill."

18th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 721, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On House Bill 722, on page 8 of the Calendar, Representative Costa Howard. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 722, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving along to House Bill 832, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 832, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Manley on House Bill 1068. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Manley, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Manley on Floor Amendment #1."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 1 is a gut and replace and becomes the Bill. House Amendment 1 makes changes to the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. It tracks guardianship and adoption side by side when talking about permanency."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no... no individual seeking recognition, Representative Manley moves for the adoption of Floor

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1068. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative... Representative Mason on House Bill 1290. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1290, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mason, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mason on Floor Amendment #1."
- Mason: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is a gut and replace that becomes the Bill. House Bill 1290 provides benefits at the state level for veterans who received an other than honorable or general discharge due to their sexual orientation or gender identity."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, Representative Mason moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1290. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving back to page 7 of the Calendar, House Bill 559, Representative Durkin. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

18th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 559, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving back to page 9 of the Calendar... moving on to page 9 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1428, Leader Evans. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 1739, Representative Hirschauer. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On page 9 of the Calendar, House Bill 1769, Leader Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1769, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Once again, Leader Harris. This time on House Bill 1776. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

18th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving on to page 10, top of the page, House Bill 1803, Representative Walker. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Walker, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Walker."
- Walker: "Floor Amendment 2 is a technical change that clarifies the impact of the effective date. I move that it be passed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative..."
- Clerk Hollman: "Correction, that was Floor Amendment #2 that was approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Representative Walker moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1803. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Zalewski on House Bill 1866. Out of the record. Representative McCombie on House Bill 1939. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1939, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Halpin on House Bill 1953. Out of the record. House Bill 1956, Representative Jones. Out of the record.

18th Legislative Day

- House Bill 1968, Representative Windhorst. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative DeLuca on House Bill 2371. Out of the record. Moving to page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Scherer on House Bill 2406. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2406, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 2521, Representative Gonzalez. Representative Gonzalez. Out of the record. House Bill 2546, Representative Friess. Representative Friess. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2546, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Chesney on House Bill 2548. Representative Chesney. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2548, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Chesney, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Chesney on Floor Amendment #1."

18th Legislative Day

- Chesney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just clarifying language. Has no other impact on the Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, Representative Chesney moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2548. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2568, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2568, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 2584, Representative Murphy. Out of the record. Representative Conroy on House Bill 2595. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2595, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Mussman on House Bill 2616. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2616, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No... Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mussman, has been approved for consideration."

18th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, Representative Yang Rohr or Representative Mussman, which one would like to... Representative Yang Rohr on Floor Amendment #3. Please proceed."
- Yang Rohr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Amendment #3 on House Bill 2616. This Amendment makes a technical change that was negotiated with the chief procurement officer to tighten the language to protect against misuse. And ask for this Amendment to be adopted. Thanks."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Yang Rohr moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2616. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving on to page 14 of the Calendar, Representative Ness, House Bill 2748.

 Representative Ness. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2748, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 2790, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Read the… read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2790, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Halbrook on House Bill 2811. Out of the record. Representative Swanson on House Bill 2863. Out of the record. Move to page 15 of the Calendar,

18th Legislative Day

- House Bill 2891, Representative Frese. Representative Frese. Out of the record. Representative Ramirez on House Bill 2908. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2908, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Hurley on House Bill 2911. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2911, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On House Bill 2928, Representative Mazzochi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2928, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Morgan on House Bill 2950. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving to page 16 of the Calendar, on House Bill 2994, Representative Butler. Leader Butler. Out of the record. Leader Batinick on House Bill 3004. Out of the record. Representative Sosnowski on House Bill 3020. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

18th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3020, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Wheeler, House Bill 3027. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3027, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Lilly on House Bill 3071. Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3071, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lilly, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Lilly on Floor Amendment #1.

 Floor Amendment #1, Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had a number of technical changes to the Amendment, and they have all been agreed upon as we move the conversation forward. Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Lilly moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3071. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

18th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. On page 17 of the Calendar, House Bill 3115, Representative Delgado. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3115, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Delgado, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado on Floor Amendment #1."
- Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. This Amendment removes the opposition from the Farm Bureau and it specifically takes out... it takes out... it essentially eliminates the opposition from the Farm Bureau. So, it's relatively technical in nature. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Seeing no... no individual seeking recognition, Representative Delgado moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3115.

 All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

 Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 3195, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3195, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving to page 18 of the Calendar, Representative Moeller on House Bill 3223. Out of

18th Legislative Day

- the record. Representative Ortiz on 32... House Bill 3286. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3286, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 3289, Representative Lawrence Walsh, Jr. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3289, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving to page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 3317, Representative Welter. Representative Welter. Out of the record. Representative Meier on House Bill 3355. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3355, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 3410, Representative Morrison. Out of the record. Representative Carroll on House Bill 3418. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3418, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Cassidy on House Bill 3443. Out of the record. Moving to page 20 of the Calendar, Representative Stava-Murray on House Bill 3452. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

18th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3452, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Crespo on House Bill 3461. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3461, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 21 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3657, Representative Robinson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3657, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 3697, the elite Representative Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3697, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving on to page 22 of the Calendar, Representative Willis on House Bill 3762... 3702. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3702, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. House Bill 3714, Representative Collins. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

18th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3714, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Williams on House Bill 3772. Out of the record. Representative Avelar on House Bill... excuse me, 3804. Out of the record. Representative Williams on House Bill 3772. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3772, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Moving to page 23 of the Calendar, Representative LaPointe on House Bill 3850. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3850, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Page 24 of the Calendar, Representative Croke, House Bill 3968. Representative Croke.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3968, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Representative Severin on a point of personal privilege. Why do you rise?"
- Severin: "Thank you very much. I appreciate it. So, April 14 is a very special day to me. In 1974, a constituent that's in my district, I met her. She was in 8th grade, I was a sophomore

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

in high school, 15 years old. I met her playing basketball on Easter, April 14, 1974, on a dirt basketball court. She wouldn't be on my team 'cause she said I was a ball hog. So, three years later, I married her. But we've been together 47 years, been married 43 years. So, I just want to give a shout out to my wife, Penny Severin, today. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Congratulations. Representative Robinson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I can have the Clerk please add me as a 'yes' vote to HB1711. House Bill 1711. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The record shall so reflect. Leader Bourne, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Bourne: "Thank you. I rise with, kind of, a question and a question of the Body. Today one of our very first Bills that we passed was House Bill 2828 that my colleague, Representative Caulkins, passed. And I find it really interesting that it passed without much debate because it decreased a fee. Imagine that, we would decrease a fee. Well, I have a Bill with 60 Sponsors and cosponsors, House Bill 636. But I'm not alone. I think there are nine identical Bills in this chamber that repeal the trailer fee increase. Some of you have probably heard from your constituents on this. I know Representative Mason has a Bill. I know Representative Stuart has a Bill. I don't need my Bill to be the one to pass. But this is a terrible, terrible thing that we are not able to repeal this huge increase. It went from \$18 for the boy scouts to have a

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

trailer to pull a parade float to \$118. And I was told that it may not be able to pass because of the American Rescue Plan not allowing the state to decrease any taxes. Yet today, we passed a Bill first hand. One of the first Bills that decreases a fee. So, I would just ask this Body why we are not passing this Bill. It has a majority of the House of Representatives cosponsoring this Bill. This should be a super easy vote to take. I've also written a letter to the U.S. Department of Treasury asking for clarification to make sure that this does not conflict with the American Rescue Plan funding that's coming to the states. I would ask anybody who's interested to sign on to my Bill, Representative Mason's Bill, Representative Stuart's Bill. We've got House Bill 682, House Bill 837, House Bill 1898, House Bill 2895, House Bill 2917, House Bill 3315, House Bill 1929, House Bill 36, and my Bill, House Bill 636. Sign on to any of them, all of them, let's vote on one of them. One of our very first days in this chamber, I stood up and said, 'It's a pretty common sense thing to include in the House Rules that we able to vote on a Bill.' And I said, 'In your House Rules, if we have a majority of cosponors, can we vote on it?' And the answer was no. And I was kind of laughed at. They said, 'That doesn't happen. We don't get a majority of the Body cosponsoring a Bill and not getting a vote.' But it's happening right now. So, I would ask you all for an opportunity to vote on this common sense Bill. We have, most likely, a hundred and fifty thousand people in Illinois who are out of compliance because they can't afford this fee increase. Please join me. I'll

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

sign you on as a cosponsor. Let's get 118 cosponsors. Heck, maybe then it'll pass. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Costa Howard: "I rise today in honor of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. We did a Proclamation that I would like to read because I think it's important for us to remember each and every individual who has served our country with honor.

- WHEREAS, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America (JWV) was established on March 15th, 1896 by Jewish Civil War veterans, and now enjoys memberships ranging from World War II through all current conflicts and active duty personnel; and
- WHEREAS, the Jewish War Veterans is the oldest, continuously active veterans organization in the United States; and
- WHEREAS, the Jewish War Veterans was chartered by Congress on August 21, 1984 under Public Law 98-391 as a patriotic, wartime veterans' organization; and
- WHEREAS, JWV encourages the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all races and genders; and WHEREAS, the Jewish War Veterans are celebrating their 125th anniversary this year, on March 15; and
- WHEREAS, today, we honor those of the Jewish faith who have served in wars of the United States of America and humbly risked their lives to protect us all. This Proclamation was signed by our Governor, JB Pritzker, and passed in this chamber on March 9 in 2021. I thank all of you for standing

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

in honor of our veterans and I... the gentleman who asked for this... brought this to my attention is one of my constituents. He is the commander of this post for the entire State of Illinois, and he lives in my district. And I'm very proud to do this for them. And thank you all for honoring everyone who has served our country. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Zalewski, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

"I want to respond to the previous, previous speaker about the trailer fee issue 'cause there were a couple of misstatements of fact that need to be addressed. First of all, Representative, the reason the Bills aren't moving rest squarely over here with myself. So, you can, any time you want, make your way over and discuss the Bills. There's no need to make a point of personal privilege. Second of all, those Bills would reduce the funding for the horizontal capital Bill. A Bill that your side of the aisle considers important and my side of the aisle considers important. And until I'm provided with a funding alternative, I'm not going to willy nilly send every single Bill to the floor. So, it's criticism that I take personally and I think was irresponsible on your part. Third... third, you mentioned the stimulus funding piece and you misstated what the facts are. To be eligible for stimulus funding, if we finance a tax cut, we lose the chance to get the funding. It's not a fee decrease. It's not however else you described it. It's the idea that we cannot recklessly deal with the Revenue Code.

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

So, at the end of your remarks, you mentioned the reason the rules don't work. And I would say you mischaracterized the dynamic by which you were able to criticize what just occurred. So, in this new era where we're all trying to get along, I would urge you to seek out chairpersons individually, state your concerns, as opposed to making a point of personal privilege in which on several points you were mistaken. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. We will go to… back to the Order of Second Readings, go to page 6 of the Calendar, pick up a couple that were missed. Representative Ford on House Bill 434. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 434, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendment have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "On page... page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 3443, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3443, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Consent Calendar-Second Reading-Second Day?"
- Clerk Hollman: "On the Consent Calendar-Second Reading-Second Day, the following Bills were removed today by various Members. House Bill 41 was removed. House Bill 86 was removed. House Bill 182 was removed. House Bill 694 was removed. House

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

- Bill 734 was removed. House Bill 1721 was removed. The other Bills have been read a second time today."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session. Meeting immediately after Session is Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools in Virtual Room 3. Labor & Commerce is meeting in Virtual Room 1. State Government Administration is meeting in Virtual Room 2. Immediately following the conclusion of those committees, the following committees are meeting. Appropriations-Public Safety will be meeting in Virtual Room 3 after Elementary & Secondary Education. Appropriation-General Services will be meeting in Virtual Room 1 after Labor & Commerce. And Higher Education will be meeting in Virtual Room 2 after State Government."

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

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 206, offered by Representative Bennett. And House Resolution 208, offered by Representative Mazzochi."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, April 15, at the hour of noon. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

18th Legislative Day

4/14/2021

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

Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 205, offered by
Representative Morrison; and House Resolution 207, offered by
Representative Evans, are referred to the Rules Committee.

There being no further business, the House Perfunctory
Session will stand adjourned."