19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

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 2425, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2426, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2427, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2431, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2432, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2435, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2438, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2454, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2491, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2499, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2533, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2543, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2550, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2554, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2567, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2569, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2570, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2589, a Bill for an Act concerning substance use disorders. House Bill 2620, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2621, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2643, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2755, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2766, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2770, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2778, a Bill for an

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Act concerning education. House Bill 2795, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2806, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2825, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2826, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2833, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2834, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2860, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2870, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2894, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2914, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2922, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2939, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2947, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2985, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3031, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3065, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3069, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3080, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3097, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3113, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3116, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3136, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3138, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3167, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3173, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3174, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3175, a Bill for an

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3178, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3190, with Committee Amendments #2 and 3, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3202, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3217, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3240, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3248, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3255, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3262, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3265, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3267, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3280, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3295, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3302, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 3310, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3313, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3329, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3359, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3372, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3445, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3470, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3474, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3484, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3504, with Committee Amendment #1, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3515, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 3520, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3534, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3561, a Bill

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of these House Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Consent Calendar-Second Reading-Second Day."

Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Almighty and sovereign God, who art the giver of life, you have given us grace at this time with one accord to make our common and sincere supplications. We pray today that you would bless this august Assembly. May your hand and blessings be upon the Speaker of this House, upon all of its Leaders, and upon all of its Members. Oh God, you have promised us that when two or three of your people are gathered together in your name that you would not only join us, that you would hear us and grant our requests. So, we ask of you today, gracious God in heaven, to fill us, for we are empty. Fill us today, oh God, with your wisdom to make us wise with sound decisions. Fill us today, oh God, with your strength to make us strong and courageous. Fill us today, oh God, with your love to make us loving and unselfish. Fill us today, oh God, with your mercy to make us merciful and kind. Fill us today, oh God, with your weariness and care to make us thoughtful and attentive. That it may overflow out of us, that it may flow into everything that we do, flow into

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- everything that we say, and flow into everywhere we go. This we calmly pray in your son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Manley: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Mason."
- Mason et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Manley: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect that Representatives Halpin and Buckner are excused today."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hammond is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Marron is excused for the day."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all who recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 113 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 156, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2814. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

& Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: do pass as amended Standard Debate is House Bill 3437; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 731, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 836, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3431, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 3714, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 3743. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 594, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 1953, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3928, House Resolution 29, House Resolution 36, House Resolution 41, and House Resolution 55. Representative Stuart, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on April 14, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 796, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Police & Fire reports the following committee action taken on April 15, 2021: do pass as amended Standard Debate is House Bill 2769; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2408, and Floor Amendment (s) 2 to House Bill 2408. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on April 15, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 268, Floor Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 2994. Representative Willis, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on April 15, 2021: recommends be

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3462, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3886. Representative Halpin, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 15, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1428. Representative Ann Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 15, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 165, Floor 2 to House Bill 418. Amendment(s) Introduction Resolutions. House Resolution 212, offered by Representative Gabel; House Resolution 215, offered by Representative Avelar; and House Joint Resolution 33, offered Representative Harper, are referred to the Rules Committee." Speaker Manley: "Members, an announcement. This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear face coverings that cover both your nose and mouth, except when you are 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. Good afternoon, Members. We're going to start on Third Reading where we left off yesterday. On page 26 of the Calendar, House Bill 3286, Representative Ortiz. Leader Ortiz. Out of the record. Moving on to page 25, House Bill 2908, Leader Ramirez. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2908, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Ramirez."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Ramirez: "Good afternoon, Madam Chair. I am here today to present to you House Bill 2908. I'm going to make sure that my mask is nice and tight and you could hear me. House Bill 2908 is something that some of you feel very, very familiar, déjà vu. It's the elected representative school board Bill for Chicago. As many of you know, Chicago is absolutely the only, only district in the State of Illinois without an elected representative school board. This Bill will allow, for the first time in a long time, for Chicago to have that democracy. This is a Bill that many of you have voted for before and comes before you as a fourth time with our State Senator Martwick. I urge an 'aye' vote. And I welcome any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Should this Bill get the required amount of votes, we'd appreciate a verification."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Batinick has requested a verification. All Members should be voting their own switches. Chair recognizes Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Willis: "Thank you. Representative, I just have a couple of quick questions. I have supported this in the past. I do believe that all school boards should be elected. But it has come to my attention that there is a... another Bill out there that does similar to this that is a compromise Bill that has a partially elected board and a partially appointed board. Is that correct?"

Ramirez: "Representative, I have no idea what this compromise Bill is because I have not seen absolutely no language for

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

anything else. This is the Bill that we have voted for and we have been heavily negotiating for the last seven years. And what I look forward to is that we can move this Bill out of the House today and I will continue to support our Senate Sponsor and any other additional conversations that need to happen in the Senate."

Willis: "So, you're not aware of a compromise Bill that another Member of the House is carrying that has a partially elected and partially appointed board?"

Ramirez: "I am aware, through a lot of media, that there is a Bill that will be filed. I have... the Bill, as far as I know, as of 12:00 now, had not been filed. And I have no idea what's in the language of the Bill because it is my understanding it has not been filed yet."

Willis: "So, it has not been filed yet? This is just media talk."
Ramirez: "That is my understanding."

Willis: "All right. Well, thank you for clarifying that. I appreciate that. Thank you."

Ramirez: "You're welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Durkin: "Now, Representative, I'm going to go through the Bill, some aspects of it. But before I do that, I want to talk about your last comments. I talked with the Mayor of Chicago yesterday. She told me that the House and Senate Leadership had walked away from doing a hybrid alternative. Have you talked to the mayor's office in the last 24 hours?

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Ramirez: "I have talked to a member of the mayor's office. I have not talked to the mayor. The mayor has not called me. And what they said is, we're working on a proposal, we're hoping to have some language to talk about."

Durkin: "I know they've been working on a proposal but..."

Ramirez: "They're working on something they said, but I have not seen anything."

Durkin: "No, no, no. I don't think you understand what I'm saying is that..."

Ramirez: "I understand."

Durkin: "...the Leadership in this chamber and also in the Senate, as of yesterday, said that they were not going to take up the city's alternative proposal. So, when you said earlier, what I'm hearing is definitely in conflict of what you're telling Members on this floor that this is just a... keep the Bill going so we can work on a better product."

Ramirez: "Representative, this is about House Bill 2908, the elected representative school board in Chicago. I live in Chicago. I'm not sure if you do or not, but I live in Chicago. And this is about House Bill 2908. So, I'd be happy to talk to you about House Bill 2908."

Durkin: "Well, I'm just going to talk to you about comments that you make 'cause I think I have the opportunity and the right to make statements or question statements that you have made. So... oh by the way, I do live in the suburbs, but I spend a lot of money in the City of Chicago. And I also work in the City of Chicago. Okay? So, I have an interest in the City of Chicago, so does everybody else here. So, let's get into the Bill, what you're trying to pass. Now in this particular Bill,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

it states that the Legislature will be responsible for drawing school board maps, correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Durkin: "And how many school districts will be drawn within the City of Chicago?"

Ramirez: "Twenty districts to be representative of the entire City of Chicago, from north to south, west to east."

Durkin: "Well, that's super. All right. Tell me what is going to be the basis of the criteria that the Legislature must look into when they draw these districts?"

Ramirez: "Representative, when those are drawn, they will be drawn according to the law the way we have drawn others."

Durkin: "Well, tell me what the law is then. Because it's silent in here. And if you're asking people of this General Assembly to support your Bill, I think I need to know and I think other Members need to be educated on what the law is that you're referencing."

Ramirez: "Representative, you and I both know what this is about."

Durkin: "Why don't you answer my question first?"

Ramirez: "What I... I mean, I don't... I think that we need an elected representative school board and those districts have to be according to Federal Law. Federal Law that we are going to follow the way we have done for every school board district, including yours 'cause you don't live in Chicago. You don't go to Chicago Public Schools. You don't have children in Chicago Public Schools, but my family does."

Durkin: "I asked you a question and... you know, can you tell me what this Federal Law is going to... how is that going to direct the General Assembly? Because right now we're just saying you

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

guys are responsible for drawing these districts, but there's absolutely no guidance that is provided in this Bill on how these districts should be drawn."

Ramirez: "So, if you look on page 26, if you want to look at the Bill now 'cause I know you've been looking into that. Substantially equal population, it has to be compact and it has to be contiguous."

Durkin: "Is that in the Bill?"

Ramirez: "That is, page 26."

Durkin: "Okay, great. Now will these elections... tell me when these elections will take place?"

Ramirez: "These elections will take place with municipal elections."

Durkin: "Okay. Would they coincide with the aldermanic elections in Chicago?"

Ramirez: "Yes, because municipal elections happen with aldermanic elections."

Durkin: "Has the city council, as a whole, expressed any concern with having their elections being run with the school board elections?"

Ramirez: "No, I have not heard any."

Durkin: "Have you reached out to any of those members of the city council to see if whether or not this something that they're comfortable with?"

Ramirez: "Every city council member that has reached out to me has said, what's taking you guys so long? Get us an elected representative school board now."

Durkin: "Now? Okay, great. Right now. All right, a couple other questions. I saw something odd. In the engrossed Bill there

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

is an adjustment made to the water reclamation district. Why is that in this Bill?"

Ramirez: "Representative, what page are you looking at?"

Durkin: "Page 2 of the engrossed Bill. You can come... we can go back to that if you want. Question, will the members of this elected board be compensated for their elected position?"

Ramirez: "Representative, no."

Durkin: "Will they be reimbursed for any expenses?"

Ramirez: "Give me one quick second, let me look."

Durkin: "I'm sorry?"

Ramirez: "Give me one moment. So, it's my understanding that they may be able to submit requests for reimbursement. And I just wanted to go back to when you asked me about compensation of board members. It is my understanding, by the previous Sponsor who has been working on this Bill for the last six years, that initially the board members would have been compensated but, in conversations with the Republicans and their request that they not be compensated, we removed that language. It is why, I think, in many ways you have voted for this Bill three times."

Durkin: "Okay, but let's get... into expenses. Who is going to pay for those expenses? Is it the City of Chicago or is it coming out of the CPS budget?"

Ramirez: "Well, it's an elected school board for Chicago's public schools, so Chicago Public Schools budget."

Durkin: "Very good, okay. Can you talk about some of the prohibitions for an individual... I saw that you do have some prohibitions on individuals who could qualify to be on the ballot. Could you go through that with me?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Ramirez: "Can you give me a specific question, Representative?"

Durkin: "Yeah, the question is what are the prohibitions... are there any... this is very specific, what is... are there any prohibitions that are in your Bill for a person to run for that specific seat?"

Ramirez: "Upon request from your side of the aisle, Leader, any employees of the district or employers of the district are not eligible to run for these elected seats."

Durkin: "So, when we're saying... I don't recall making that request, didn't come from me. So, I... don't say that this was from this side of the aisle. Okay. So, we're saying that a person... Representative, question. You're saying that a person who is working for the school district is not allowed to run for office, correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Durkin: "Can a person who's part of the Chicago Teachers Union bargaining unit run for election?"

Ramirez: "They are not able to, no."

Durkin: "Excuse me?"

Ramirez: "No."

Durkin: "Where does it say that in the Bill? If they're not an employee of the city of the CPS but they are working for the Chicago's Teacher Union, wouldn't that allow that person to run as a candidate?"

Ramirez: "You know, it's interesting 'cause I'm talking here with someone who's worked on this Bill and all this legislation for a very long time. So, we're talking about just all the different questions that have come up in the past. No, they are not able to. The Chicago Teachers Union cannot."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Durkin: "So, I want to make it perfectly clear that no employees of the Chicago Public Schools, nor anybody who is on the payroll or is a member of the CTU, can run for this elected office, correct? This is important. This is legislative intent."

Ramirez: "Leader Durkin, that is correct."

Durkin: "All right. A few other questions. Tell me, in your words, the problems that are currently happening... what is the biggest problem at the Chicago Public Schools which is prompting this Bill to come before this Body?"

Ramirez: "Well, Leader, as someone that lives there... and I understand you're asking me because you're not in Chicago."

Durkin: "I can't hear you very well."

Ramirez: "Let me tell you a little bit about it because I am a Chicago public school graduate. For 37 years I have lived in Chicago. And I've gone to kindergarten there, and I've gone to grammar school there, that's elementary school. Grammar school is what we call it in the City of Chicago. And I've also gone to high school there. And, of course, I've gone to a public university in Chicago, of course. So, I will tell you... and I can do that for about 7 hours, but I'm not going to do that because we have important Bills to pass after this Bill... on all the reasons why we need a school board and why for the last seven years we have been begging for it, we've been talking to people. I've had hundreds of parent mentors, parents, students, my niece, my cousin, hundreds of children asking, why do we not have a process where people in the neighborhood can ask for support to represent something so critical as our Chicago Public Schools? So that schools are

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

not just closed because the mayor has appointed... or her appointed board decided to. To make sure that we understand that anything that doesn't have a democratic process to be elected, to us, is denying democracy. Now here's the thing that I don't understand because now you asked me and you got me all riled around it..."

Durkin: "Speaker Manley, she's using up most of my time. I would ask that I have additional time be placed on my ability to ask questions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader, you're not on a timer."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Ramirez: "So, what I will... I will end in saying to you is this.

We need democracy in the City of Chicago. Every other district, every district on your side of the aisle, every district on anyone here that's not in the City of Chicago has it. We just want to make sure we extend it. It's beyond time, and it's time today."

Durkin: "You just haven't given me a good reason of what the problems... and I know that you live there, you went to school there, but do you believe the graduation rates would have... would be a reflection on the quality of work that is doing... that has gone on with the Chicago Public Schools?"

Ramirez: "I think that when you have everyday people be able to be part of the democratic process, who understand their local schools, their local neighborhoods, running for those seats, they understand... and I trust black and brown parents, individuals, former students who can, can help ensure we continue to improve the achievement in Chicago Public Schools."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Durkin: "Are you aware..."

Ramirez: "I actually believe that if we have people who are not appointed by the mayor, handpicked by a mayor but came from our communities, that those graduation rates for black and brown students would even significantly go up to where they are now. They would have a seat at the table they don't have now."

Durkin: "Do you know what the graduation rate from CPS was in 2010?"

Ramirez: "Why don't you tell me?"

Durkin: "55.8 percent."

Ramirez: "And what is the graduation rate today?"

Durkin: "The graduation rate today is 82.5 percent in 2020. So, that's why I asked you the question. Is the graduation rates coming out of the CPS a reflection upon the Chicago Public Schools and its administration?"

Ramirez: "Leader, 82 percent is not enough. And we also don't think about all the things that happened leading up to graduation. Why don't you tell me exactly what you're most concerned about on this Bill in Chicago?

Durkin: "I'd like to actually get a response from you that's actually that's... something responsive to one of my questions of what the problems are. I see a significant, significant increase of graduation rates. And that's how we basically... and we traditionally have judged the quality of schools, of if kids are getting an education and getting a diploma. So, that's my... if you think that 82... from 55 to 82 over a 10-year period is not sufficient, I'm sorry you feel this way. But I look at it as a strong indication that things are much better

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

off at that school district. Next question, here we go. I'd like a direct answer on this. What has the Chicago Board of Election stated about implementing the 2022 election that you have proposed in this Bill?"

- Ramirez: "I just needed to double check because we've been at this for so long. I'm like, could it have been in the last six, seven years the Chicago Board of Elections express any concern? And the answer, they have not expressed absolutely no concern with having 21 people run to represent their local school board."
- Durkin: "In the 20... I'm saying specifically for the 2022 election that you have in this Bill. 'Cause I'm telling you right now the Chicago Board of Elections has stated and I've heard from them that they cannot implement this Bill for a 2022 election."
- Ramirez: "Well, Representative, the election is in 2023 in the City of Chicago. That's our municipal elections, in the event you didn't have that on the calendar."
- Durkin: "So, how much money does the City of Chicago put into the CPS budget?"
- Ramirez: "The mass amount of the money that is dedicated that goes to CPS is for the legacy pension fund, and it's required to be able to pay that into it. And so, therefore, that's why we have that amount going."
- Durkin: "That was not the response. I wanted to know what the City of Chicago's contribution to CPS was this fiscal year."
- Ramirez: "I don't know the exact number."
- Durkin: "Three hundred and seventy four million. It's projected to be 516 in FY2023. And 24, it will be up to almost 600

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

million. That is coming from the City of Chicago, from the mayor's office and the city council. By separating and taking the mayor away from the operations of the Chicago Public Schools, is that really a good thing based on the commitment that has been made by this administration and prior administrations?"

- Ramirez: "Leader Durkin, you're not going to vote for this Bill it sounds like. I don't know exactly your concern because it seems to me that every single district here, you support that they have an elected representative school board. Why not Chicago? You thought it was okay when you voted for it three times before. So, you can keep asking me questions. What I'm going to tell you is, we need an elected representative school board, we need a democracy to make it happen."
- Durkin: "I would suggest you may be able to... you would do yourself much better if you would just listen to the question and respond instead of drifting off, what you're doing right now."
- Ramirez: "So, will you be voting for it if you... if I continue to answer your questions in a way that is perhaps not what you want to hear?"
- Durkin: "Well, my questions have been very direct, and I stand by everything I've said. Now let me ask you this, there has been some discussion or at least I will say that some people believe that if Chicago... if the separation occurs and the mayor's office is kind of taken out, there has been some suggestions that Members of your side of the aisle will take money away from suburban districts to make up the difference. Have you ever stated that to anyone?"

Ramirez: "Leader, I'm confused. Who said that?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Durkin: "It was third party. It came back to me."

Ramirez: "Well, who said that, Leader? Because when we we're talking about rumors about a third party... no."

Durkin: "I'm asking you, did you ever say that?"

Ramirez: "No."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Ramirez: "Who said that to you, Leader? Because I think it's important to be able to put that on record if we're going to be saying that."

Durkin: "Well, I've had a... I would say that the nature of our exchange has been more than dilatory, and I think that I've had enough questions to you. So, I'm just going to go right to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Durkin: "I'm not sure what the problems are that has prompted this. It seems to be more of a personality conflict that happened when Mayor Lightfoot was elected. Because she was the candidate that was not sent. What happened immediately after she was sworn into office? Controversy with the CTU, strikes, more strikes threatened. I will say this, from a person who does work, makes a contribution to the City of Chicago, but I watch these operations and the politics of Chicago. What's driving this is clearly not substance but a personality conflict with the sitting mayor. So, I would encourage Members to vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Members, we're going to move to a three-minute timer after this. The Chair recognizes Representative Delgado."

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

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Delgado: "Thank you. Thank you, Leader. You and I had a pretty good conversation not too long ago about some of the concerns I had with this particular legislation. And for those of you who haven't yet had a chance to get to know me a little better, I represent the Northwest Side of the City of Chicago. And I have a pretty significant number of undocumented parents in my district. And a number of them are incredibly involved with their local schools, and they are very engaged in their local school council. Where they're able to... to actually be able to make changes within their own schools. And so, you and I had talked about these concerns that I have. And I know you had shared what your plan was moving forward, aside from this piece of legislation, and I was hoping you'd share it with us today."

Ramirez: "Say that last part. I think you asked me a question, but it's a little loud in here."

Delgado: "Yes. Yes. So, you and I had talked about this concern I had and you had mentioned there was a plan moving forward, that there would be a way to continue to engage these parents.

And I was wondering if you could share it with the Body?"

Ramirez: "Sure. You had asked me about particularly undocumented parents having access and being able to be included in the conversation. It is my understanding that Senator Villanueva has Senate Bill... give me one sec... 1565, which is a Bill that in sense would be a trailer Bill that would be introduced to ensure that undocumented parents can vote in these elected school races in Chicago."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Delgado: "Thank you very much, Representative. I appreciate it.

Leader, thank you."

Ramirez: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ford for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Ford: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for this Bill. I think it's a law the people of Chicago would like to have.

Just a few questions that I think is important. How does the mayor feel about 2908? The Mayor of the City of Chicago that is."

Ramirez: "Would you repeat the question? I heard mayor, but I didn't hear the rest of it."

Ford: "Does the mayor support 2908?"

Ramirez: "It is my understanding... she has not talked to me, but from her city officials, it is my understanding that she is currently not supportive of the Bill."

Ford: "Has the mayor been... or her office, since you haven't talked to the mayor, been given the opportunity to work with you in order to get her desires in this Bill?"

Ramirez: "Yes, a number of times. As a matter of fact, right before committee about a week before that, I begged the city to please bring us together so that we can sit and talk. Unfortunately, the meetings continue to get rescheduled. And we've continued to make ourselves available for any possible way to work with her."

Ford: "And to this point, you have gotten no language that would satisfy the Mayor of the City of Chicago?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Ramirez: "That is correct. I have not seen any language whatsoever."
- Ford: "If the mayor would work with you, are you willing to compromise so that the language would address her concerns as well as assure that the City of Chicago has an elected school board?"
- Ramirez: "Representative, we've been wanting to do that. And I know it's been one of those Bills that we have been working on for six or seven years. The Bill will move as it is today. I have full intention to continue to work with the Senate Sponsor in anything that continues to be done with the city or any conversations that we could have with the city and the Senate."
- Ford: "Well, I think it's very important to note that I want to support this Bill, and I'm going to support the Bill, but it's also very important that the Mayor of the City of Chicago has a say in this process. Whether she's late to the game or not, she should have a say in this process. And so, I hope that moving forward that we and she get the act together so that we can have the best Bill that becomes law in Illinois. I have a few more questions, but time is running out. So, I have to ask real quickly this one. Why do you have 2500 signatures needed to be on the ballot? That seems like a steep number."
- Ramirez: "Representative, that's for the at-large seat that would be the citywide."
- Ford: "Okay. I think that number should be looked at. My time has expired. Thank you for answering the questions. I urge an 'aye' vote."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Ramirez: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi, three minutes."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll go straight to the Bill." Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Guzzardi: "I want to share a quick story with the Members of the Body to speak to a point that's been made on the floor today. So, many of you may know, I ran for office for the first time in 2012 for this seat. And I lost, lost by 100 votes. It was a close race. We had a recount, whole thing. After the election, a month later, I got a meeting together of my volunteers. And I said, hey, y'all. I know I'm not going to go the Legislature just yet, but I know all the issues we care about so much are still important to us whether I won this race or not. So, I'd like to keep this group together, and I'd like us to advocate for some state policy that matters to this community. What do you guys think we should get engaged on? This is the summer of 2012. And you know what that group said, of course, that's why I'm talking about it today. They said we want to fight for an elected representative school board for Chicago. There's been a movement building around the city for years, and we want to join that movement. We collected signatures for a nonbinding ballot referendum in precincts across my district. We later collected signatures in wards across Chicago. We had ballot referenda, and ballot referenda, and ballot referenda. And over and over, by overwhelming margins, the people of the City of Chicago have said we want an elected representative school board. So, I bring this up because I didn't terribly

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

much appreciate the tone in which these remarks were delivered but certainly didn't appreciate the content of the idea that this Bill is before us simply as some sort of personal grudge against the current Mayor of Chicago. Because when we started working on this in 2012, that was the previous mayor and there have been groups working on it under the previous mayor than that. And when the people sitting on that side of the aisle voted for this Bill the three previous times it was on the board, it wasn't the current Mayor of the City of Chicago. We all supported this idea, not as some sort of personal petty grievance, but because we believe that the same democracy that's good enough in every other district in the city of ... in the State of Illinois to govern our schools is good enough for Chicago. Every district ought to have the same basic principles of democracy and governance of right to the access for students and their families. I support this Bill strongly. I've supported it since 2012. And I appreciate the Sponsor for working on it. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ramirez to close."

Ramirez: "So, we started really passionate this morning on our third day of Session. This is simple, denied democracy is no democracy. There is no way that we can talk about caring about students anywhere or children when we decide to deliberately, because of whatever reason, deny them from that. We've been working at this for a long time. Senator Martwick now has been working on this for so, so long. And I apologize for those of you who ask yourself, we have to vote on it again and again, when are we going to pass it? So, I want to thank you for your commitment to democracy for our children and the

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

City of Chicago, for every student, for every parent. And I want to ask you to vote again for this Bill, this time House Bill 2908, because we just can't continue to tell our children we care about them and not have a school board that represents them. I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2908."

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2908 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, take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting in 'favor', 39 voting 'against', 3 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the..."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk... Representative Batinick withdrawals his Motion... his request. Thank you. On this question, there are 71 voting in 'favor', 39 voting 'opposed', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to page 27 on Third Reading. House Bill 3657, Representative Robinson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3657, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Robinson. Representative, while you're getting your notes together there, I want to remind everybody we're moving to Short Debate, which is the Sponsor and one Member in opposition with a three-minute debate timer. Representative Robinson."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Robinson: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that I have been working on with SEIU. It is a Bill that I believe will help us with the hospital closures that certainly I have faced in my district. The Health Facilities Planning Act provides regulatory instructions in regards to qualifications necessary to establish, construct, or modify health care facilities, avoiding unnecessary duplicate of facilities and planning and development of facilities in areas which... with unmet needs. Certainly in my district and many districts across the state. The regulatory body under the Act, the Health Facilities Review Board, the chief responsibility is issuing and denying permits and exceptions. I am asking for an 'aye' vote for this Bill and, Speaker, open for any questions that any of the speakers have."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Batinick, we have three people with their lights on. This is Short Debate. Would you like to be the one?"
- Batinick: "If you have somebody else on our side that would like to go first you can..."
- Speaker Manley: "You are my favorite. So, I will pick you."
- Batinick: "Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Batinick: "Representative, listening to your introduction, as eloquent as it was, it seemed to talk about the need for the Bill more than the actually meat of what the Bill does. Can you review that for me a little bit?"
- Robinson: "Sure. Again, Leader Batinick, this Bill was brought to me by SEIU. This Bill, again, really moves forth as it relates

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

to hospital closures as I have had in my district. I'm... we're trying to strengthen the hospital statute that way, again, hospitals cannot close in the midst of a pandemic. That happened to me in my district.

Batinick: "Okay. So, the meat of the Bill that I got out of there is this stops a hospital from being able to close in the midst of a pandemic. Is the Bill specifically related to just pandemics and how hospitals close?"

Robinson: "That is correct."

Batinick: "Okay. And then, what was the nature of the opposition by the IHA and the Illinois Health Facilities and Service Review Board?"

Robinson: "So, the review board has not reached out to me regarding their opposition."

Batinick: "Okay. There was... in committee there was no committee testimony as to why they opposed this legislation?"

Robinson: "No."

Batinick: "'Cause this looks like... was it a partisan leave in committee looks like? I can look that up myself. So, I just want to... during a pandemic it's harder or what... harder or impossible now for a hospital to close during a pandemic?"

Robinson: "The issue that the Bill was brought up is that, again, in the midst of a pandemic, no safety net should be closed and/or critical access hospital should be closed."

Batinick: "Okay."

Robinson: "Really no hospital at all, Leader Batinick, should be closed. Again, we're in the midst of a pandemic and hospitals shouldn't be closing. Whether it be a pandemic or not, safety

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

nets and critical access, as you and I both know, cover the most vulnerable folks."

Batinick: "Okay. I don't want to belabor the point too much. I think we have some other people on our side of the aisle that would like to speak. We'd like to move to Standard Debate. I know Representative... Leader Demmer has some important info to share. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Members, we're going to be moving to Standard Debate. The Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Thank you for the answering the questions from Representative Batinick. I want to talk about two specific aspects of this Bill. The first is the creation of a right of action for a person who... an individual, any individual who had a negative impact on their access to health care because of a discontinuation of a hospital or discontinuation of a category of service at a hospital. I want to focus on that piece because that's a significant new right to grant to an individual to say that they are able to file a lawsuit and seek damages from a hospital if even a single line of service at that hospital was discontinued. I think all of us during the course of this pandemic would have recognized that sometimes discontinuations of certain lines of service can be very unpredictable and caused by a number of factors. In many communities, specifically the inability to find a specialist to provide services there. So, Representative Robinson, my question is, if a hospital has an inability to offer a service

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

because of personnel shortages, would a person still be able to file a right of action against that hospital?"

Robinson: "Leader... excuse me, Speaker, I would like to take the Bill out of record. I have an Amendment, and I'll bring it back. Okay?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please remove the Bill from the record. Page 23 of the Calendar, there is House Bill 185, Representative Reick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 185, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. HB185 is a request of the City of Woodstock, Illinois, which is in my district. They are doing... undergoing road construction. And part of what they're doing is putting a roundabout at an intersection of about five streets. The need for the quick take is such that we're looking to... or the city is looking to gain access and title to a very... two very small pieces of property. One of which is about less than one hundred square feet in size. The person who owns it has not been able to be contacted. And the other one is a piece of property that is not much bigger but is also part an estate that consists of forty some people, none of whom are able to be contacted. The estate was never filed with the county. And so, what we're trying to do is put a roundabout in an area where there's about 250 to 500 square feet of land that has not been voluntarily given over to the city as part of it. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you." Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is,

'Should House Bill 185 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting in 'favor', 4 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 22 of the Calendar, House Bill 20, Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Scherer."

I'm presenting House Bill 20 with Amendment 1. This... I talked about it last week. This is the Gold Star plates that passed, I believe, unanimously, or close to it, last year before COVID. And it allows a spouse of... in a Gold Star family or the parents of the lost soldier to get free plates. They don't have to pay the registration fee. I feel that's the least that we can do for our fallen soldiers. And I would be happy to answer any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion is needed, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 20 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23 of the Calendar, House Bill 374, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 374 simply permits community colleges and housing authorities to develop affordable housing for students. It amends the Public Community College Act by permitting the board of trustees to coordinate with their local housing authority in the community college jurisdiction to develop affordable housing, dormitories for community college students as they currently do not have any. This Bill has no opposition, and it is no cost to the state. This will be a public-private partnership between a local housing authority and a private developer. I have one community college in my district in particular that is very excited about this Bill. And I've spoken to many Members of this august Body who are also in favor. Therefore, I urge everyone an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Members, a reminder. We will be moving to Short Debate, which is the Sponsor and one Member in opposition with a three-minute debate timer. Leader Mazzochi, do you rise in opposition?"

Mazzochi: "I do."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. I am just going to speak to the Bill because..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "Yes. So... thank you, Madam Speaker. So, this Bill... again, this is one of the Bills that we see in this chamber that is very well intentioned but does not include the

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

oversight and accountability mechanisms that are going to need to be in place if we are going to allow these types of public-private partnerships. In the past, there have been scandals associated with misuse of public funds in connection with development contracts. And this particular piece of legislation does not include any type of oversight that's going to ensure that funds are not misspent, to ensure that the actual housing goals are met, and to also ensure that, to the extent a community college is going to try to develop housing, that you are not going to run afoul of the crediting agencies and that you are actually not going to be improperly diverting funds that should be going towards the classroom and education into housing. And because there in particular, you have a situation under... what this Bill would allow is a private developer to get all of the benefits but the public institution to assume all of the risk. Particularly if this is going to be a lended project, you simply are putting a lot of public funds at risk. I was the chairman of the board of a community college. We looked at this particular issue in terms of whether we could actually do affordable housing. We thought it would be a great idea. And when we studied the issue further, we realized it would be a bad idea. So, again, while I understand the purpose and the intent, the way in which this language is drafted, you are going to probably see in another 5 or 10 years all kinds of problems that will result if our community colleges start going down this pathway. So, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall...' oh, I'm sorry. Representative Smith to close."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Smith: "Contrary to the previous speaker, this is a great opportunity for community colleges to provide affordable housing for low-income students. I trust that the board of trustees at these particular colleges have the integrity to move forward with such a project. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 374 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting in 'favor', 31 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 26 of the Calendar, House Bill 3452, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3452, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I'd like to tell the Members of this Body a story about a woman named Sophia who was... who lived in my district. Sophia was the mother of two small children. And she was exiting, unsuccessfully, a transitional housing program and needed some help getting on her feet. And so, she looked to the county programs and found the Emergency Solutions Grant. And this ESG program was awesome because it was going to help her pay for housing. And there was money available in the fund. And all she needed to do was find somewhere that she could rent that was under the threshold of a certain amount. And so, we went off, and my office manager, my chief of staff, and I were helping her

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

look for apartments. We were finding as much as we could. But what we found when she went to apply for apartments is that these landlords, some of them were requiring 100, 150 dollars, excessively high fees to process applications that she just didn't have access to. We were able to pay for one of those fees for her from our office and... out of the pocket of my chief of staff in fact. And it took only a matter of 20 minutes or an hour before they had declined her application because of the amount of debt that she had. Now that's a different Bill all in of itself, but what I'm going to talk about today are those application fees that are a barrier to the usage of these public dollars that we have and the ability keep people housed and not homeless. And unfortunately for Sophia, she ended up having to go to another state to live with family to pile in probably too many people into too small a space and really disrupted the lives of her and her children. So, in order to address this issue, this Bill says that Emergency Solutions Grants recipients would not have to pay those fees. And the fees would be absorbed then by the other applicants. So, I urge an 'aye' vote and welcome any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Mazzochi, do you rise in opposition?"

Mazzochi: "I do. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will. Please proceed."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. The Emergency Solutions Grant Program Act,

who actually provides the funding for that?"

Stava-Murray: "The county."

Mazzochi: "I'm sorry?"

Stava-Murray: "But... the Federal Government."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Mazzochi: "Okay. And..."
- Stava-Murray: "It's run through the county, but it comes from the Federal Government. And it's put into the different areas and it's... I believe it's run through the county. That's who she had to go through, but it may be just whatever the federal housing units are."
- Mazzochi: "Right. Is a landlord required to accept the Emergency Solutions Grant funds currently?"
- Stava-Murray: "No, they are not required to accept them, but they would be required to look at an application."
- Mazzochi: "Okay. And the whole point then of trying... of a landlord looking at an application is that it requires the landlord to conduct credit checks and that type of thing, right?"
- Stava-Murray: "There's another Bill that would suggest that that's... that, that would be discriminatory, but I'll leave that to another Bill. I'm here to talk about 3452."
- Mazzochi: "Right. But... well, the problem is though is you're essentially... as I understand the Bill, you're creating... you're saying that it is an unlawful practice if a landlord or someone who is going to verify credit wants to actually evaluate an applicant, right?"
- Stava-Murray: "So, the fees that I'm talking about aren't just about evaluating credit because there were actually two different fees. There's application processing fees that they tack on beyond the credit check itself as well, which is how you get to \$150 for a fee because you don't get \$150 checking someone's credit. And it's clear that they're abusing this ability to try and keep people out and to deny housing. And I think that that's disgusting that we had have... you're also

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

in DuPage County. We have ESG money leftover year after year, unable to be used because they can't access the actual housing."

- Mazzochi: "Right. And... you know, I think part of the problem is though is that you're assuming that every person who just happens to show up to meet with a landlord is actually going to be qualified to live there. I mean, every landlord is going to have to look at an individual person and see are they going to be able to pay rent. I mean, if someone shows up for a \$5,000 luxury apartment, are they then going to be... can a landlord then say..."
- Stava-Murray: "They can't possibly show up to a \$5,000 apartment because that would be, as I said, above the threshold of what they're allowed to spend on the ESG program."
- Mazzochi: "What are they allowed to spend on the ESG program?"
- Stava-Murray: "This Bill is about... it depends on what area they live in, Representative. I mean, you're asking a lot of questions but... that are... that seem to be against this Bill, but the ESG program is not the largest necessarily program that exists in terms of helping people. The Transitional Housing Program is a much larger federal program."

Mazzochi: "Right, but..."

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi, your time has expired.

 Representative Batinick, do you want to go on Standard

 Debate?"
- Batinick: "If we could go on Standard Debate. I think we'll just have probably two speakers. That'd be swell. Deanne will finish up and then I have something to say. Thank you."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi, would you like somebody's three minutes from that? Representative Severin will give you three minutes. Go... please continue."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you. So, what total dollar amount are you proposing or do you expect that people are going to be able to get as emergency housing... as one of these emergency housing grants?"
- Stava-Murray: "So, this isn't about establishing an Emergency Solutions Grant program. I think you're misunderstanding. This is saying that applicants to this program... this is about taking away arbitrary, unnecessary fees from applicants to this program to remove a barrier to housing, to keeping people off the streets, to keeping children off the streets, and housed appropriately. And it makes our tax dollars work better because we'll actually be able to have people access this ESG money."
- Mazzochi: "Right. Here's the problem though..."
- Stava-Murray: "We're not changing the program at all, and that's what you keep talking about. We're not changing the ESG program."
- Mazzochi: "No, but what you're changing is you're basically saying that it's going to become a deceptive practice if somebody charges fees that you believe are not necessarily appropriate or... and I believe you said you don't even want people to charge people at all. But the types of..."
- Stava-Murray: "That's not what I said. That's an inaccurate summarization."
- Mazzochi: "Well, the only the thing..."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Stava-Murray: "I said they shouldn't be charging grant recipients, correct. The ESG grant recipients, why do they need \$150?"

Mazzochi: "Because you have..."

Stava-Murray: "It's unethical."

Mazzochi: "There's a whole host of reasons why. There's reasons why... because you're going to have to do a credit check, because you want to do a background check, because you want to do a check on the on whether the tenant is actually qualified because you need to have a staff person who is going to be responsible for actually running this... all of this type of paperwork. Or alternatively, you're going to outsource it to a third-party vendor who is also going to charge for those types of services. They just don't come for free."

Stava-Murray: "This isn't about specific services... fees for services. This is about arbitrary fees that are tacked on as administrative fees. So, I'm not sure what your concern is, that they can't hustle another thousand dollars out of a poor person trying to stay housed."

Mazzochi: "Look if somebody is..."

Stava-Murray: "And I think probably, for the rest of the side of your aisle, there are people who are in higher need areas than perhaps your district. And it will benefit people from both sides of this aisle."

Mazzochi: "You know what? There are people in my district who actually do need affordable housing and who live in affordable housing. And there's people..."

Stava-Murray: "Then why are you opposed to this Bill?"

Mazzochi: "Because the reason why you're opposed to this Bill is because when people actually..."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Stava-Murray: "Because you care more about the landlords than the people who need the affordable housing?"
- Mazzochi: "No, it's because when you are a landlord, if you are trying to provide affordable housing, and all of the sudden you get a hundred applicants for one thing because you've got very desirable housing that's low cost..."
- Stava-Murray: "Oh, please. Oh, please. There aren't hundreds of applicants in DuPage County. Have you ever been to the county to see… even learn about this program?"
- Mazzochi: "Have you ever actually worked as a landlord? Have you ever actually run affordable housing?"
- Stava-Murray: "No, I don't have enough money to own a building."
- Mazzochi: "I have. I know how it works. And the fact of the matter is, is that if you want to actually encourage landlords to accept these types of grants, you have to accept that sometimes there is going to be a fee involved."

Stava-Murray: "I'm not about encouraging."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Mazzochi, your time has expired."

Mazzochi: "Thank you."

- Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick, you indicated you'd have a few more speakers. Do you want to just give Leader Mazzochi the time from those speakers?"
- Batinick: "I'll go ahead and finish up 'cause I think I want to take it to a different tone level here. 'Cause I understand what everybody's saying. I understand both sides issues here. But let's think about what's been going on during this pandemic. The Governor has said it doesn't matter how much money you make or how much you can afford to pay in rent as a tenant, the landlord cannot evict you. There's an eviction

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

moratorium. There's no qualifications for that. So, the landlords have had a tough time here. So, in this instance, there are situations where there's some really nice housing. And I've seen it personally, in the real estate world, where you will have dozens of applicants at 100 to 150 dollars of ... look, there's a credit check. I know it can be cheap, but then there's a background check. If you have a lot of housing, you're paying someone to do those things or it's your time. So, we're putting more cost on the landlord who simply want to sift through this in advance. There's all kinds of ways to get around this. The grant program could pregualify people. We could change the grant program to prequalify people. We could change the program where they pay for the background check or whatever it is, some amount that's reasonable. But if you have ... if you don't want somebody that can't pass a background check in your building, 'cause it's not just about... I believe the Sponsor said earlier that, like, they're guaranteed money. It's just... when a renter comes it's just not about the guaranteed rent money. It's about what happened to the last place that you left in terms of damages and everything. So, I greatly understand the intent of this Bill, but there's two sides of the equation. And what Representative Mazzochi had was trying to get to is I know a lot of landlords that are like I'm not being a landlord in Illinois anymore. I'm going to other states because of the burdens that are put on the landlords. And the net effect of that is, there isn't affordable housing. We need more people to want to be landlords that have to part of the system. It's balance. It's all about balance. So, I would be willing to work with the

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Sponsor on maybe changing these grant programs, but, at this time, I think we have to urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Costa Howard for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Costa Howard: "Representative Stava-Murray, you had mentioned a threshold amount. Could you please explain what that means?"

Stava-Murray: "Yeah. So, when people are applying to the Emergency Services Grant program, they aren't allowed to just apply to... they aren't allowed to just get any apartment. There's a blended average that's based on each region. So, for example, in my area, it's the Joliet, Naperville region that's done by the U.S. Census that determines the amount that the average cost of housing is in our area. Now that in itself is an aspect that we could even look at changing because in my area that number is so low that we couldn't even find housing in my city under that."

Costa Howard: "Okay. So, if I understand you correctly, I mean, this is potentially poverty level... people who meet the threshold poverty level in DuPage County, for example. Is it actually quite low..."

Stava-Murray: "Yes."

Costa Howard: "...compared to what the actual cost of housing is.

Is that fair to say?"

Stava-Murray: "Absolutely. And I would add on, just because the prior speaker was mentioning it, that we had a Bill to help landlords, but I believe the prior speaker voted against HB2877 that you and I, I think, both voted for. And I think

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- that when we're talking about these funds, they are clearly being used in a discriminatory kind of way. And so, that's what we're looking to take out is that discrimination."
- Costa Howard: "Okay. So, in addition to that, is there anything in this Bill that prohibits a landlord from conducting a background check?"
- Stava-Murray: "No, it doesn't. And I would also like to add, that just because someone is an ESG applicant doesn't make them a criminal. Being poor is not a crime. So, I think the emphasis on background checks particularly needed for these grant applicants was very offensive."
- Costa Howard: "Well, and I actually, believe it or not, the former... one of the other speakers, I understand it... in looking at a applicant for housing, it's background checks, it's credit checks. There's a whole process that they go through, and... but there's nothing in the Bill that prohibits a landlord from doing that, correct?"
- Stava-Murray: "No, correct. They can still do whatever process they want. They don't have to accept the grant recipient, they simply have to consider them."
- Costa Howard: "Okay. And so, your Bill is just removing a fee that... for individuals who are applying to a grant program 'cause they don't have the funds to have a living... a place to live with their families, right?"
- Stava-Murray: "Exactly."
- Costa Howard: "Okay. To the Bill. Understand that this is a... this is not trying to hurt our landlords in any way, shape, or form. But the point of the Bill is to actually help people who are... who don't have a place to lay their heads at night.

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Again, if we're going to talk about families and do what's right by people, this is a Bill that helps them. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stava-Murray to close."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. I would just ask that everyone, as they press the button, look inside their hearts and think about someone that you could possibly know that might be in the position where they suddenly need some help and whether or not it's okay to fleece... for landlords to fleece people in this situation of the kind of money that is very hard to obtain. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote and put the needs of our most vulnerable ahead of those landlords. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3452 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting in 'favor', 43 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 26, House Bill 3019, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3019, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today on House Bill 3019. This was brought to me by a state's attorney in my district. And we had an unfortunate circumstance of a drunk driver hit a police safety vehicle, instantly killing a rescue K-9 that was within that vehicle. Unfortunately,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

what came out of this was, that there's actually nothing that could be charged to that particular drunk driver if nothing else had happened. So, what I mean by that is, if just the K-9 was just killed in that incident, there was no actual potential charge. So, they brought this as a concern. Obviously it's impacted the law enforcement community. But again, this just adds that... the death of a police service animal, detection or search and rescue dog, would be added to those provisions able to be charged. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi. We're back on Short Debate. Do you rise in opposition to this Bill?" Guzzardi: "With some clarifying questions, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you. Sorry, Representative, this is the first time this Bill is coming across my desk. I don't think I was in the committee that it came through. So, can you just clarify the change in the offense category that you're proposing?"
- Sosnowski: "So, this would allow a driver under the influence, if that person committed the violation of hitting a... and killing. So, causing the death of a police animal, service animal, or a detection dog, search and rescue dog."
- Guzzardi: "I'm sorry. So, it would permit that person to do what?

 It would..."
- Sosnowski: "This would allow somebody in violation... so, a drunk driver who killed a police animal could be charged under this statute. Currently, like I mentioned in this particular case,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

there actually was nothing that could be charged for the cause of death of that animal."

- Guzzardi: "Well a DUI could be charged of course, right?"
- Sosnowski: "Yeah, interestingly enough, they were still charged, but it was... they were charged because the driver hit the vehicle. But again, if the... if that dog was the only one hit, that would not have been something that could have been charged. So, this is just adding that as a chargeable offense."
- Guzzardi: "I'm sorry. Forgive me for struggling a little here. If the driver's drunk, and they hit a dog, they can get charged with a DUI irrespective of the current law, right? Irrespective of the law you're proposing. If you're drunk, you can get charged with a DUI. You're proposing an increase from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class 4 felony. Is that what you're suggesting?"
- Sosnowski: "With the death or injury of a police animal, service dog."
- Guzzardi: "Okay. And is... and the reason for this change... sorry to be asking you for a little bit of clarification here. Can you just walk us one more time through the reason for the change here?"
- Sosnowski: "So, according to my state's attorney, that act of actual injury or death is not a chargeable offense. For the death or injury of that animal, there wouldn't have been a charge that she could have filed."
- Guzzardi: "Okay, but we're... so, you're saying that... I just want to be clear that we're creating a new category of felony

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

offense here with this Bill involving striking a service dog while driving?"

Sosnowski: "Under the influence."

Guzzardi: "Okay. But driving under the influence is already illegal, but we're moving it to a felony offense if you strike a service dog during the course of driving."

Sosnowski: "If the death or injury of a service dog, correct."

Guzzardi: "Okay. I know that I and many other colleagues on this side of the aisle have some caution about creating new felony offenses. So, I would simply urge Members to consider that question. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "We are on Short Debate, one person in opposition.

We already had one person in opposition, Leader Mayfield.

Representative Sosnowski to close."

Sosnowski: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3019 pass?' All in favor say (sic-vote) 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 26 voting 'against', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed. On page 22, House Bill 60, Representative Stoneback. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 60, a Bill for an Act concerning safety.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stoneback."

Stoneback: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Trampoline parks in this state are currently an unregulated industry and there are no

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

federal regulations. The industry only uses voluntary safety standards. HB60 would regulate trampoline parks in Illinois by adding it to the regulations currently used for the amusement parks in the Amusement Ride and Attraction Safety Act. In 2011, there were approximately 40 trampoline parks nationwide. That number has soared to more than 800. The incidents of injuries at these facilities has grown even more rapidly and emergency room visits caused by trampoline park injuries has skyrocketed. According to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, in 2013 there were 2500. And that number has increased to almost 18 thousand in 2017. Trampoline parks can cause both minor and severe injuries. Injuries include broken legs, compound fractures, head trauma, brain injuries, spinal fractures, neck injuries, dislocations, and sprains. The severity of the injuries is because of the design of the parks and the forces involved. With all of these injuries occurring, trampoline park equipment is still completely unregulated. When parents take their children to an amusement park or jump facility, they expect that the facility has their child's safety in mind. They do not expect that facilities with an unsafe design and ineffective safety measures, leading to injuries and potentially life-long disabilities and death, are allowed to operate. Seeing similar issues with a lack of regulation, nine other states have passed laws to regulate trampoline parks. We've been working with the Department of Labor on this Bill. We've also consulted with the industry and come to agreements. I would like to thank Leader Gabel for her current support of this important legislation. The Bill will proactively prevent injuries and

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- even death by children and adults who frequent trampoline parks. So, I appreciate your time, would be happy to answer any questions. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "We are on Short Debate, which means there will be the Bill Sponsor in favor and then one Member in opposition for three minutes. Leader Batinick, are you in opposition... rising in opposition?"
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker I rise in opposition-ish."
- Speaker Manley: "Opposition-ish."
- Batinick: "I used to use that. We haven't used it in a little while. So, would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "That's the best. Okay. She will. She indicates she will."
- Batinick: "She may... I just want to clarify some things, 'cause we're on Short Debate here, as quickly as I can. There is a fee associated with this for certain people that care about that, correct? There's a fee of some sort?"
- Stoneback: "Yes, there would be a fee to inspect. The Department of Labor anticipates \$135 for their annual inspection."
- Batinick: "Okay. So, that..."
- Stoneback: "And then, there's a third-party inspection that would also require a fee. It is a technical inspection. So, like other amusement park rides."
- Batinick: "And then, is there a penalty, some sort of... any penalty?"
- Stoneback: "So, the penalties would be the same. If there are violations of the permit, they would be the same as if those permit violations were violated by other amusement park rides."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Batinick: "Okay. So, there's a fee, not a new penalty. It's similar to other amusement ride penalties. This is your first Bill, Representative, correct?"

Stoneback: "It is."

Batinick: "Now, I'm aware, I believe, the former Representative, Senator Martwick have this Bill previously? The trampoline park Bill?"

Stoneback: "Potentially. I think it was Leader Gabel. Was it Senator Martwick as well?"

Batinick: "I believe at one time... have you seen the cartoon of him on a trampoline?"

Stoneback: "I've heard about it."

Batinick: "Okay. Are you prepared to have that, you know..."

Stoneback: "I guess I don't have a choice in the matter."

Batinick: "I just... I mean, this is the type of legislation that they create cartoons out of."

Stoneback: "I've been warned about this being my first Bill."

Batinick: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "I just want to make my side aware that there's a small fee increase in here like the Representative said, I believe \$135. And then, the penalty enhancement matches whatever the amusement park thing is. I'm not sure if we have the staff at the department that regulates this, but everybody can decide for themselves. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stoneback to close."

Stoneback: "Yes, just one thing, the Department of Labor did assure me they did not anticipate any additional staff would be needed to regulate trampoline parks and there is an

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

advantage because they operate year round. So, they can actually inspect trampoline parks during the off season for other carnivals' attractions. So, they didn't anticipate any additional staff needed. I... again, this is a proactive measure to prevent injuries that could result in death of children and adults who go to trampoline parks. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "On this question there... pardon me. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 60 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting in 'favor', 36 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 24, House Bill 641, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 641, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. House Bill 641 simply requires our colleges and universities to have menstrual hygiene products in their restrooms. In their restrooms."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 641 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting in 'favor', 31 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- 24, House Bill 1803, Representative Walker. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walker."

- Walker: "Thank you. House Bill 1803 is a Bill that attempts to make sure that funds collected in IDFPR for the regulation of the collection agency business end up in the right spot so that the staff in IDFPR who do that regulation actually are supported by those funds. Given that we all like fees collected to be used properly, I believe an 'aye' vote is worthwhile on this Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "We're on Short Debate, one person in opposition for three minutes. Representative Davidsmeyer? Nope. Okay. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1803 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', O voting 'opposed', O voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23, House Bill 220, Representative... Leader Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Chair. It's good to see you in there.

Better than the guy yesterday. Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House, House Bill 220 is an initiative of the Illinois...

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Associated Firefighters of Illinois. And it's a response to a decision from the Illinois Labor Relations Board. HB220 makes the following changes in regard to determining supervisory status for firefighter bargaining units. It adds that a company officer may be responsible for multiple companies or apparatus on a shift, multiple stations or entire shift. Clarifies that there may be more than one company officers per shifts. Specifies that the bargaining unit shall consist of firefighters of the highest rank of company officers. And specifies that all ranks above the highest company officers shall be supervisors. And removes reference to new bargaining units. By adding this language that the company officer may be responsible for the things mentioned above, it basically is changing the definition of what a company officer is and clarifying that and going along with the ruling from the Illinois Labor Relations Board. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Reick, do you rise in opposition?"
Reick: "I voted for this Bill in committee, but I still have some questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed. You have three minutes."

Reick: "Thank you, Ma'am. Representative, I'd just really like you to go through again and explain why it is that this has to be something that we talk about instead of being able to be done at the local level with the local... in a local fire house?"

Walsh: "So, Representative, what I would say is that, through this ruling from the board, there needed to be some clarification of what a company officer is. And basically

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

that's what this Bill is doing. And it gives them the availability of then being part of a collective bargaining agreement, if they so choose to go that route. There's multiple fire departments throughout the state that already do this, but there's been some issues with the Illinois Labor Relations Board as far as the definitions were concerned. And this is what that's clarifying."

Reick: "We've had an awful lot of opposition to this Bill according to our analysis. Has there been any... since we are in committee with this Bill, has there been any discussion with the IML or the other stakeholders in opposition?"

Walsh: "Representative, I have not heard from one bit of the opposition since the Bill got out of committee."

Reick: "You have not?"

Walsh: "Nope."

Reick: "Thank you."

Walsh: "You're welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 220 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting in 'favor', 19 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22, House Bill 24, Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 24, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative West."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 24 provides the sex education course material and instruction in grades 6 through 12 must include an age appropriate discussion on sexting. This is a Bill that I brought to the floor last year, House Bill 2407, that passed unanimously. One thing that has happened since its passing last year was I received calls from schools, parents, and the media, having conversations about how sexting has gone to a whole new level with our students being remote and on host sites such as Zoom, WebEx, and the like. And so, what this does is, as we know, sex education is not required in Illinois as of yet. However, only for the schools with sex education courses, they're asked to have an age appropriate discussion on this topic so that students understand the repercussions and our consequences to sexting. More information that I've received is that 60 percent of sextortion, as the detective told me who I had a conversation with, 60 percent are from individuals that they know, 40 percent comes from gaming, the games that they play. And so, our students need to understand the consequences to what they may deem as short term pleasure. I would entertain any questions, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 24 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,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 26, House Bill 3025, Representative... Leader Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3025, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. As a parent of an exceptional and wonderful child, who is actually now an adult named Chad, who lives with epilepsy, my family understands how important access to epilepsy treatment is. And I want to just put a couple of facts on the board. So, if you don't have anyone with epilepsy in your circle, understand how prevalent it is. Epilepsy is the fourth most common disorder behind neurological migraines, strokes, Alzheimer's. In the Chicagoland area, more than 140 thousand people live with epilepsy, and a third of those people are on Medicaid. So, what House Bill 3025 does is allow for HFS to reimburse for already covered treatment now being delivered by telehealth. It's that simple. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3025 pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

declared passed. On page 23, House Bill 351, Representative Yednock. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 351, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill. Speaker Manley: "Representative Yednock."

Yednock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. HB351 is a follow up to Public Act 101-522, passed unanimously in the last General Assembly. It requires that the chief of a secondary employer fire service send the same report that is sent to the pension funds to the Department of Insurance also. Secondary employers are already required to report illness and injuries to the pension funds and within 96 hours of those occurrences. Additionally, they were already required to file an annual report to the pension departments on all hours worked, wages, and salaries earned in the secondary employment... employers jurisdiction. This merely requires the secondary employers to send the same information to the Department of Insurance. The Department of Insurance does audits every three years on the pension funds. So, we might say we're helping them by already adding the information that a lot of times they look at. HB351 does not provide for additional benefits or allow for creditable service to be established for a secondary employee working at a secondary employee. So, I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick, do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "I do, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Not ish?"

Batinick: "Not ish this time."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. Please proceed."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Batinick: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield? Oh, that's thumbs up? Okay. Hey. We had a great debate on this. I don't want to rehash it all. Probably can't do it in three minutes anyway. So, I know we passed the Bill. We really watered down what they were trying to do. What were they trying to do with the previous Bill before it was amended last time?"

Yednock: "It was a matter... I think in the previous Bill there was some talk about who might be responsible to paying the pension funds and insurance retirement funds. And that was taken out because of the opposition. And that was negotiated down to say, look, we want to file reports, people can do studies over the lifetime of a firefighter and see where injuries and the other things that add to the insurance rates and pension costs come from."

Batinick: "Okay. And I'll be... I won't even use my last two minutes. It's kind of came out during committee that this was, as opposed to just something about really studying it, it felt like this was about trying to staircase a small step towards what they were looking for last year that there were so much opposition for. So the FFI and AFL-CIO support this. However, the IML and the Illinois Fire Chiefs Association are opposed. And I think there are some concerns about some of the downstate or the volunteer fire departments eventually having to go away because of the slow path on the firefighters. Essentially what happens, folks, is you have firefighters that work their main job and then they volunteer at a smaller firefighter. And it deals with injury. So, I appreciate the intention. I'll be voting 'no'. You'll probably have a split decision over here, but thank you for those clarifications.

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Once again, IML and the Illinois Fire Chiefs Association are opposed. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Yednock to close."

Yednock: "I will just say to Leader Batinick that I think that was an inference, and I understand that. And we did talk about that. And so, I think that it's clear in this Bill that that is not what we're doing in this Bill. So, I'm urging an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 351 pass?'
All in favor say (sic-vote) 'aye'; all opposed say (sic-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 92 voting in
'favor', 22 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill
680?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 680 is on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please return House Bill 680 to Second Reading. On page number 24, House Bill 832, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 832, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair, Members of the committee. House Bill 832 is an initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission. Many of you have heard me describe it before, Budgeting for Results is housed at the Office of Management and Budget. It is a entity designed to review or...

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

it's about budgeting and ways to do budgeting better overall, but we have a subcommittee called the Mandates Subcommittee. And what the Mandates Subcommittee seeks to do is to seek from all the agencies of the state where they have unused, seldom used, outlived, outdated areas in their statutes that need to be removed to make things better for that agency. It's a way to address making changes to remove audit findings, among other things. House Bill 832 focuses primarily on the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. And again, it's the result of reaching out to them and them sharing with us those things in their statutes that they would like to, again, remove because they are seldom used, unused. A commission that has finished its work, it's still in their statute. They want to remove it. And matters such as that. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 832 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25, House Bill 2548, Representative Chesney. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill.

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2548, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This extends the antique vehicles license plate by a few months. I know of no

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

opposition. It was brought to me by a constituent. And I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2548 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 23, House Bill 176, Representative DeLuca. Out of the record. On page 22, House Bill 58, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 58, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you. House Bill 58 creates a process by which an individual or a community association can file a modification to remove an unlawful restrictive covenant. An unlawful restrictive covenant, under state law, is anything that restricts the conveyance, encumbrance, occupancy, or lease thereof on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. These are restrictive covenants that have been unlawful for several decades now in Illinois, but they do continue to exist on many pieces of property and in many community associations. This Bill creates a process that is modeled after a process that exists in three other states right now. We would be the fourth state in the country to create a process to remove these unlawful covenants. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. I'm happy to answer any questions."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "Leader Mazzochi, do you rise in opposition?"
Mazzochi: "In support."

Speaker Manley: "We are... boy, I hate to miss this. We are on Short Debate. So, one person in opposition, along with the Sponsor. Thank you. Appreciate that. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 58 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23, House Bill 559, Leader Durkin. Out of the record. On page 23, House Bill 434, Representative Ford. Out of the record. On page 23, House Bill 573, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 573, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Speaker. As many of you remember, the Illinois Higher Education Savings Program, which allows children born or adopted in Illinois to receive a \$50 seed deposit into their college savings account, was passed and signed into law in 2019. This is essentially a cleanup Bill which clarifies that the Higher Education Savings Program will be established as part of the Treasurer's existing 529 college savings program, Bright Start. And that changes program eligibility to children born on or after January 1 of 2023 rather than 2021. And it updates and clarifies provisions regarding the birth and adoption information that will be shared with the

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Treasurer's Office by Department of Public Health and Revenue. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Brady, do you rise in opposition?"

Brady: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "You have three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Brady: "Representative, could you... 'cause I know we had some discussion in committee, if I recall correctly. Could you walk us through again the actual data that's being collected on this particular piece of legislation, what's being asked for by the Treasurer's Office?

Gabel: "In this Bill?"

Brady: "Yes."

Gabel: "In this Bill, we are just asking to..."

Brady: "That's the Bill."

Gabel: "...move the date to 2023 because it was subject to appropriation, and we don't have appropriation yet. And..."

Brady: "But... go ahead."

Gabel: "And to clarify how the Department of Public Health would let the program know that there was a birth of a child and... or adoption."

Brady: "And I guess just... that centers into my question directly, as the department is going to collect data or share data. Is that correct? And who..."

Gabel: "Correct."

Brady: "...who exactly are they going to be sharing the data with and collecting it from?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Gabel: "The Treasurer's Office."
- Brady: "And that's the only way and the only agency that's going to be trusted?"
- Gabel: "Correct."
- Brady: "Then the Treasurer's Office is going to be charged with utilizing that particular information in a way that they see fit regarding the savings program itself."
- Gabel: "Well, it's only for that program. They can only use it for that program."
- Brady: "But it would still be information that would be out there and part of the cyber world, if you will, of the department."
- Gabel: "I mean, they will have signed an agreement on how that data can be used. That will be very limited."
- Brady: "And when you say they will sign an agreement, who's going to be signing that agreement?"
- Gabel: "The Office of the Treasurer and the Department of Public Health. It will be like an inner-agency agreement."
- Brady: "So, inner-agency agreement, but those who... what I'm trying to get at here, Representative, is...."
- Gabel: "What's the problem?"
- Brady: "...those who are... those who they have attained the information from, are they any part of this agreement or any knowledge that any information's being shared?"
- Gabel: "Oh, well it's birth certificate data. It's birth certificate data."
- Brady: "And so, they're going in off of electronic filing of birth records and taking information and not... those parents knowing that this information is being utilized for some type of program is... that's what I'm getting at."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Gabel: "They will... they will let the parents know that there is this account set up for them and that child."

Brady: "And is this then subject to appropriation?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Brady: "So, subject to appropriation. You believe they're going in and utilizing the method of electronic filing of birth records, taking that information, and then we have an agreement between the Treasurer's Office and the Department of Public Health of how they can or can't use this information that I believe most parents wouldn't know a thing about."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Brady, can you bring your questions to a close?"

Brady: "Sure. Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my concern is, as being one of the architects of the electronic filing of births and death records in the State of Illinois in 2001, that... why the intent of that legislation was to do some things, I'm not sure this was the intent of that legislation. So, I'll be voting 'no' on the legislation. I know the Representative has worked hard on it, but I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Thank you. This is cleanup language. This program currently exists in law. It is a program that will provide a seed fund for students to go to post-secondary school, post-high school. And what the data shows is that, if children just know that there is a college fund for them, they are four times as more likely to go to college or some other type of other program after high school. So, I would... we want this program to be able to work. This is cleanup language that

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

will make the program work more effectively. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 573 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25, House Bill 2790, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2790, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2790 is a relatively simple Bill that would enable the Cook County Public Defender's Office to provide continuity of counsel so that they can truly represent those in need. I could, of course, describe at length the indispensability of counsel in immigration proceedings to our notions of fundamental fairness and due process, but the question before this Body, on this Bill, is much narrower. House Bill 2790 is a permissive statute that would authorize the public defender's office to represent immigrants in removal proceedings. To be clear, it is not a mandate. And the scope of the public defender's authority to provide representation in immigration removal proceedings would ultimately be a decision entirely within the discretion of the Cook County Board. This is an initiative of the Cook County Public Defender's Office and

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

the Cook County Board. I know of no opposition, and I'm happy to answer questions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick, do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "I do, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Representative, we had a spirited debate in committee.

I think that the committee vote had one 'no' vote. It was a split decision on our side in the committee. You may find that today. Basically what this does is, this allows the, I believe, Cook County, right? Because they're the only county over 3 million. This allows Cook County to have a nonprofit, that I believe is funded by the Governor, pay attorneys to work with immigrants who find themselves in the court for criminal proceedings to deal with their civil issues and their immigration status. Did I button that up tight enough?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Well, I think what you're referring to is a current grant program funded through private dollars that is currently supporting an immigration unit in the Cook County Public Defender's Office related... so, I would take some issue with your characterization of what this statute does. Which is really just to authorize the public defender's office to represent clients in removal proceedings under the Public Defender's Act. It doesn't speak to where that source of funding would come from. So, that... I just want to make clear that this statute does not speak to that particular question that you just raised."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Batinick: "Okay. But this allows private funds to go to the public defender's office, should that county choose, to deal with the immigration status of someone who finds themselves in front of the court for any particular reason? What I'm... I really thought that's what the Bill did."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "So, again, if you read the language of the statute, Representative, what it does is just ensures that the public defender would be authorized under statute to provide that representation. Says nothing about the funding."
- Batinick: "Okay. So, then... say that back... that last part again.

 It says nothing about the funding, but where are they getting
 the funding? It allows them to deal with the federal issue,
 the state public defender, correct?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "It would allow them to represent clients in removal proceedings, correct."
- Batinick: "But there is private funds involved in this whole process. We talked about that in committee."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes, you're referring to the specific program currently in the public defender's office that, yes, has private funds that provide grants."
- Batinick: "Okay. I think that's going to be the concern of myself and some Members on my side. I just wanted to vet that out. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "This is an important initiative to the Cook County Public Defender's Office that currently provides constitutional representation to clients and advises them, as they're required to do under the Padilla decision of the United States Supreme Court, on the immigration consequences

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

of crime. This would enable them to provide continuity of counsel, represent immigrants in their removal proceedings. In the interest of justice and fairness, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2790 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there is 72 voting in 'favor', 42 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22, House Bill 121, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 121, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, colleagues. House Bill 121 amends the Illinois Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of work authorization status. This prohibition on discrimination of... on the basis of the status already exists in Federal Law. So, this kind of discrimination is already illegal in Illinois. But we want to bring it into Illinois statute as well so these claims can be perceived... sorry, can proceed in state court. The Bill, we had a clarifying Amendment that was requested by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, which will be coming in the Senate, to clarify something we believe is already in the Bill. Which is to say nothing in statute requires an employer to sponsor a worker with an H-1B visa or anything like that and will not

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

conflict with existing requirements. This simply amends the Illinois Human Rights Act to bring it in compliance with existing Federal Law. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Members."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, we had... thank you for that Amendment. That was incredibly important. It helps quite a bit. So, basically this changes nothing, we're just matching federal... there's absolutely nothing different? Because something that I brought up during debate is, let's say somebody has a work authorization card that's about to expire. Why would I, as an employer, want to hire and train somebody only to find out that after a month or two of work that they will no longer be able to work at my firm?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. So, this... discrimination on the basis of work authorization is already illegal under Federal Law. So, this simply makes Illinois Law comply with Federal Law. The only thing that would change would allow for claims to be brought in state court as well as in federal court."

Batinick: "Okay. So, that's the change, is that particular..."

Guzzardi: "That's the only change, exactly."

Batinick: "What about the situation that I just brought up to you?

Guzzardi: "If you're making a decision based on hiring or promotion, something to that effect, strictly on the basis of someone's work authorization status. So, for instance, they're a DACA recipient, and therefore, you don't want to

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

hire them or promote them. That is... again, currently illegal and would be made illegal under Illinois Law as well if this Bill were to become law."

Batinick: "Thanks for clarifying."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. Thank you, Members. Again, we appreciate the work of the Chamber of Commerce. We worked closely with them on this amendatory language, which has brought them to neutral. And so, as a result, I know of no opposition to the Bill. I think it's, again, a simple measure to bring us in line with existing Federal Law. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 121 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Ammons, for what reason do you seek recognition? Moving on to page 26, House Bill 3404, Representative Haas. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3404, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Haas."

Haas: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise today to present House Bill 3404, which is my first Bill as a freshman Legislator on the House Floor. I am very honored to bring this Bill to the floor today, not only because it's my first Bill, but because it's a piece of legislation that's imperative to my district. House

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

3404 creates the Pembroke Township Natural Gas Investment Pilot Program Act and directs the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to create a pilot program for the distribution of grants for the construction of new natural gas pipelines and infrastructure to Pembroke Township in the Village of Hopkins Park. Pembroke Township is located in the eastern section of my district on the Illinois-Indiana border in a rural area with many disparities, limited access to jobs, services, little to no economic development, and food deserts cheap among them. Energy accessibility has the potential to change all of that. According to 2019 census estimates, the median income of Pembroke Township was \$18,900 a year, with an unemployment rate of 30.2 percent. We can and must do better. This Bill has bipartisan support from local, state, and federal government officials because it makes a decades old dream of extending a natural gas pipeline into Pembroke Township a reality. Currently they rely on propane, wood-burning stoves, and electric space heaters. Providing safe, reliable, and clean energy to Pembroke Township presents a unique opportunity to chart a better trajectory for our neighbors who have, to this point, been left behind. Natural gas is both an economic driver for underdeveloped communities, keeping residential fuel costs affordable and attracting new businesses. This Bill preservers... presents a way forward for Pembroke Township and Hopkins Park. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I grew up near Pembroke Township, played basketball against a bunch of the guys who

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

lived there who went to St. Ann and Clifton Central High School. And growing up, Pembroke Township served as what we pointed to, to what maybe we once were but no longer wanted to be. There's a little history about Pembroke that I think is important that we understand before we vote on this Bill. This area was... three years ago, WGN did a study on this... or a story on this township. And it's one of the poorest in the entire nation, not just in the State of Illinois. It was settled in the 1850s by runaway slaves. It's been overwhelmingly African American since it was founded. The people there have had a bad draw, and they haven't gotten much help. And as one who grew up wanting to see Kankakee County thrive and Otto Township and Pembroke Township, places I used to go to, become better for the residents there, for the people who I know. I can't help but say that this Bill... Representative Haas, the fact that this is your first Bill. Many times the first Bills that we pass really have very little impact, but this is one that truly, truly has an impact upon people that Representative Haas is here to represent. I cannot too strongly urge you to give her the support of this first Bill that she passes that will mean so much to the people of a place that time seems to have forgotten. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please remove this Bill from the record. Stand at ease, please. On page 24 of the Calendar, House Bill 1776, Leader Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill extends the special rate for psychiatric lockout children at... who are DCFS wards. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Davidsmeyer, are you wanting to speak in opposition to the Bill?"
- Davidsmeyer: "I don't really want to, but I'm trying to figure out what happened on the last Bill that was removed."
- Speaker Manley: "As I mentioned, we're working on it. We're on House Bill 1776 now."
- Davidsmeyer: "And I appreciate you being in the Chair, I think you do a wonderful job."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you."
- Davidsmeyer: "But I don't think that's good enough. I think we were in the middle of debating a Bill that is... was unanimously came out of the committee."
- Speaker Manley: "I understand. Like I said, we're working on it. We'll get back to you."
- Davidsmeyer: "Did you see the..."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1776 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting
 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On this question there are 112 voting in 'favor', 0 voting
 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received
 a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader
 Brady, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Brady: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Brady: "Thank you very much. Also, an inquiry on the heels of what we're experiencing right now, which none of us seem to know what that is. And we appreciate the opportunity and the explanation hopefully here forthcoming shortly. I'm going to read to you a headline from the Chicago Sun-Times, February 10 of this year. And in that it says, 'A historic break from the ways of the past - or just more of the same old game?' That was the day that, as Minority Spokesperson on the Rules Committee and my colleagues that were on the Rules Committee on both sides of the aisle discussed, debated House Rules and the new House Rules. And not only were we led to believe a number of different things on this side of the aisle, but with our Speaker, Speaker Welch, he's quoted as saying, 'It was a historic first step in reforming the ways of the past and injecting more transparency and accountability.' More transparency and accountability. As we... all of us are getting ready to participate into some degree, we think, the consent agenda, there's quite a bit of apprehensive... apprehension from many of us on this side of the aisle. And I think understandably so after a letter came out taking off of the consent agenda close to a dozen Bills of House Republicans with no explanation, no insight, no discussion from our side of the aisle that we're aware of. And so, when those type of things start, what happens? Well, we look at Bills from your side of the aisle. And on the committee I serve on with Representative Demmer and Representative Avery Bourne, then we look at some Bills closer that should be maybe taken off that consent agenda and the tit for tat begins. Remember, more transparency, historic break from the ways of past.

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Obviously there's many of us who have questions about that. So, my inquiry is, at this point in the day, especially after what has just transpired that many of us are left scratching our head and asking for an answer, I want to follow up with Majority Leader Harris and maybe he can clarify for me and all of us that there was discussion on that day when we were here as Members of the Rules Committee. That there was a working group, a Democratic working group, if memory serves me correctly, that would continue on with many of the questions, many of the concerns, many of the suggestions that many of us on this side of the aisle had. And my inquiry with all that is swirling around the chamber is simply this, did we miss, Leader Harris, a meeting? Have the meetings been going on about further discussions of Rules and potential changes or ideas that we had on this side of the aisle? And if so, would you let us know when the future meetings would be? And if we're not invited, could we be invited? Thank you very much. And I would suspect Leader Harris has a comment. Thank you, Madam Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you. And thank you, Leader Brady, for your inquiry.

On the Democratic side of the aisle, we've been focusing on passing our priority legislation and working on a balanced budget. We will be continuing to have meetings on rules in the future, and we will certainly notify you when those discussions happen."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Leader Harris. That's very nice. And just... I want to go on the record of making a request that we on the House Rules Committee in the Minority Party would like

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

to be part of that and ask you, have we missed any in the past? Has there been any rules meetings in the past from the working group that we have missed somehow?"

Harris: "No."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ford. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Ford: "First, I want to say that today is a special day for a number of reasons. One, if Harold Washington was alive today he would be 99 years old. He made a big difference in all of our lives, whether we know it or not. But we have someone here today from the West Side of Chicago that's 16. Please join me in wishing Representative Camille Lilly a happy birthday. Happy birthday, Representative Lilly."

Speaker Manley: "Happy birthday, Representative. On page 26 of the Calendar, House Bill 3293, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3293, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3293 is an initiative of the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission. It has been agreed to by business and by labor. It is also supported by the Illinois Trial Lawyers. I know of no opposition. It would, first of all, address an audit finding from the Auditor General by consolidating the workers' compensation self-insured funds

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

into a single fund. It would also deal with the issue of compensation, tying compensation for the commissioners to 70 percent of the Circuit Court judges, an arbitrary of 65 percent of Circuit Court judges. It would also give the chairman discretion to assign arbitrators by county. And it removes the provisions from a 2011 Bill that an arbitrator couldn't hear cases in any other county other than Cook for more than two years. This would just give the chairman the discretion to run the commission as he sees fit. And finally, it makes sure that it's clear in the law that you must be a licensed attorney to be an arbitrator or a commissioner."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 3293 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hurley, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hurley: "Point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Hurley: "Along with our wonderful Camille Lilly and Harold Washington, we do have another birthday on the House Floor today. It's Craig Willert. He is... I don't know how old he is, but if you'd wish him a happy birthday that would be great."

Speaker Manley: "Happy birthday, Craig. Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "I would be remiss if I didn't talk about one of our own who has a birthday today. That would be the very young and

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

spry Bradley Bolin, our Assistant Clerk. Bradley, happy birthday."

Speaker Manley: "Happy birthday, Brad. Moving on to page 23, House Bill 231, Leader Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 231, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hernandez."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 231 is an initiative of the Mexican American Defense Education Fund, also known as MALDEF. House Bill 231 clarifies the definition of population in the county and municipal codes to mean the jurisdictions total population as determined by the last federal census. The census counts everyone in the United States every 10 years, regardless of their age or citizenship. Currently counties and municipalities use census information to apportion local government election districts, such as city councils or community commissions... or county commissions. The use of the total population constitutional and standard across the county... country, including in Illinois. House Bill 231 protects the total population standard. The Bill helps ensure all community residents continue to be equally represented in their counties and municipalities by preventing attempts to exclude children and nonvoters from being counted when apportioning their districts. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "A reminder that we're on Short Debate, which means the Bill Sponsor and then somebody in opposition will get three minutes. There's a few lights on. Leader Butler, are you rising in opposition to the Bill?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Butler: "I'll say I'm in opposition, but that might not be how my fingers work at the end of this."

Speaker Manley: "Okay, ish."

Butler: "Ish."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Butler: "I just... thank you, Madam Chair. And to the Bill. And we had a bit of a discussion on this with Leader Hernandez in committee. And I... I would just make the point that this is legislation we need to do. We need to make sure everyone, the population in our counties are accurately reflected with everyone who lives there. But, as we are... as anyone who has tuned in to the redistricting hearings that have happened, this goes against what is basically going to be put forward, I believe, through the Redistricting Committee. If we enact redistricting legislation without using the decennial census data, we're going against the spirit of this very piece of legislation that we're voting on here. We have spent enormous amount of money in the State of Illinois, \$30 million plus of dollars that we appropriate to ensure we have a complete count. Probably all of us participated in complete count efforts in our communities. Yet, yet in the rush to enact partisanly drawn redistricting maps... legislative maps by the June 30 deadline for the Legislature to act, we're not going to use the decennial census data. We're going to use American Community Survey data or we're going to leave it up to other data, old data that underrepresents minority communities, that underrepresents rural communities and is not the data that we should use. So, while I rose in opposition-ish, I will be voting for this legislation 'cause it's the right

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

thing to do. But I would implore the Majority, as we redistrict, let's use the data that we're supposed to use that won't be available until August at the earliest. Because that would comply with the spirit of this very legislation we have in front of us today. If we don't use that data, the districts that get drawn won't be right. They won't be right. It's as easy as that. So, thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opposition-ish. I would actually urge an 'aye' vote on this."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill...' excuse me.

 Leader Hernandez to close."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you. All I ask is for an 'aye' vote. Let's get everyone counted."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 231 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar, House Bill 2807, Representative Halbrook. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2807, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Halbrook."
- Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the chamber. So, this Bill is an extension of what we did a couple years ago in townships to cap the funds at two and a half times the annual expenses of the previous three years. This just applies it to all local units of government. I urge an 'aye' vote."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further debate, House Bill 2807... 'Shall House Bill 2807 pass?' All vote... all those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 2 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25, House Bill 2911, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2911, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. HB2911 states that the Chicago Fire Department will be governed by the same Promotion Act that governs the promotion of every other full-time firefighter in the State of Illinois. I'm here for questions, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick, do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "Ish. Yes, Madam Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Representative, you're good. That was a great intro.

There's actually quite a bit of opposition to this. What's the reason for the opposition?"

Hurley: "I know City of Chicago, and I'm not sure because they haven't really contacted me since committee. And IML sent me a generic letter, and I'm not sure of their concerns either."

Batinick: "Okay. So, you... none of the opposition actually spoke with you?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Hurley: "Commissioner Ford and I spoke briefly before the Bill was in committee but not since."

Batinick: "Okay."

Hurley: "And it was on the Consent Calendar because it did get out of committee unanimously."

Batinick: "How does this differ from HB220 that Representative Walsh had?

Hurley: "Didn't do the comparison. So, I'm not sure."

Batinick: "Okay. So, in terms of... so, this is an Act governing the testing and evaluation process of the promotion, not just the process of promotion. Okay. So, it's the testing process, you want the testing process to match what the rest of the state does?"

Hurley: "Correct."

Batinick: "Thank you for answering my questions."

Hurley: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2911 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23, House Bill 307, Representative Kifowit.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 307, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Body. House Bill 307 is talking about dignity for DCFS foster youth. Current practice is that all their belongings get put into a black trash bag. And this would mandate, subject to appropriations, that the department provide travel bags or duffle bags for the youths' belongings. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 307 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting
 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting
 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received
 a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair
 recognizes Leader Welter."
- Welter: "Madam Speaker, please let the record reflect that Representative Tony McCombie is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you. On page 23, House Bill 577, Representative LaPointe. Representative LaPointe, it's my understanding there is an Amendment. Would you like to adopt the Amendment? Representative, would you like to adopt the Amendment? Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill back on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 577, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendment. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative LaPointe, has been approved for consideration."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative LaPointe on the Floor Amendment 1."

LaPointe: "There we go."

Speaker Manley: "Did you have the wrong microphone?"

LaPointe: "I did. I mean, Leader Ramirez and myself do have a lot in common, but that's her mic."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed, Representative."

LaPointe: "House Floor Amendment 1 changes the effective date of this Bill to July 2022, which provides the Illinois State Board of Education and local school boards more time to adjust to new youth suicide prevention policies."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to clarify the opposition from committee. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "Leader, would you be okay with adopting the Amendment and debating on Third?"

Bourne: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Representative LaPointe moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 577. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 577, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Bourne."

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

Speaker Manley: "She will."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Bourne: "Thank you. I know there was some opposition in committee and some questions about increased liability for schools.

 Were you able to get an answer for the floor?"
- LaPointe: "Yes, I was. And the answer is that there is no increased liability for school districts with this Bill."
- Bourne: "Okay. And it's your intention that this would not add any kind of new liability on the schools? This is adding to an existing list that's already in statute. Is that correct?" LaPointe: "That's correct."

Bourne: "Okay. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, House Bill 577... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 577 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22 of the Calendar, House Bill 26, Representative Mah. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Body. HB26 requires third-party curriculum providers to comply with Web content accessibility guidelines, making their content accessible to students with disabilities. In Illinois, 17.8 percent of schools... of students are students with disabilities. And under current law, all students, including students with

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

disabilities, are entitled to a free and appropriate education. With students increasingly online now, HB26 ensures that online curriculum provided in schools is fully accessible to students with disabilities. HB26 is based on existing provisions in Illinois law and extends the requirement to Web services... that Web services are accessible to people with disabilities to online curriculum providers. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 26 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to House Bill 3404, Representative Haas. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3404, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Haas."

Speaker Manley: "I'm going to take this off Short Debate and whoever would like to talk on the Bill can. Moving to Representative Didech."

Didech: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Didech: "Well, thank you for bringing forth this Bill. I think many on this side of the aisle, we're very sympathetic to the issues in Pembroke Township. We are also being pulled in the other direction with concerns about expanding the natural gas consumption in our state. I think a lot of us feel strongly that we need to move, in a general sense, in the opposite direction. Can you speak to that concern and anything you can say on that issue?"
- Haas: "Sure. The... as I mentioned in my opening, this has been an issue for many, many years. And the question of renewables and why that hasn't been... no one has really offered that to the extent that the energy company that's at the table now and the cost for bringing renewable has been estimated to be about \$25 million to bring that. And that would... is not a covered cost. So, the folks that are wanting that to come to the community have not brought that to the table."
- Didech: "So, the one other issue is there's been some concerns raised that there may not be unanimity coming from Pembroke Township itself. There may be some leaders in the community, some residents who don't feel this Bill is right for their community. Can you speak to that concern?
- Haas: "Sure. So, the leaders in the community are supporting. The Mayor of Hopkins Park is supportive and the new township supervisor that was just elected in the recent municipal election is in supportive as well. The energy company has done surveys of the community, and the Village of Hopkins Park has received over 50 percent response rate from the community. And of those responses, they have over 97 percent

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- positive response. And the Village of Pembroke has a 93 percent positive response rate to those surveys as well."
- Didech: "And is it accurate to say that it is permissive for the residents to opt into this? This doesn't mandate that they get the gas line brought to their home. It will be their choice if they want the gas line to be hooked up into their home."
- Haas: "Yes, Representative. That's correct."
- Didech: "And my next question is, my understanding is there's a sunset in this Bill. Can you explain how the sunset works?"
- Haas: "So, that... there's a five-year pilot project to get it setup."
- Didech: "Can you give a little more details on how the pilot project works? 'Cause that's an issue I'm a little confused about. Because if we... if these pipelines get built, they go into people's homes, and then the sunset... suppose we don't renew the sunset, what happens next? Do they get pulled out of people's homes? How exactly does that work in practice?"
- Haas: "So, the pipeline would be paid for at the five year... the investment would already be made."
- Didech: "So, what would be the effect if we don't renew this after five years? Or is it... I'm just a little... I'm confused on what the sunset actually does."
- Haas: "Yeah, we wouldn't be building anymore at that point."
- Didech: "Okay. So, essentially there would be building taking place for five years. If we do not renew the sunset, at that point, the building would cease and there would be no more additional building done after that?"
- Haas: "That's how this Bill is written, yes."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Didech: "Okay. So, then my last question, and then I'll go to the Bill. A lot of us, like I've said, we're very sympathetic to the issue in Pembroke Township. I think we want to be supportive of the residents in your district. Would you be willing to commit, over the next five years, with the caveat of course that we don't know if you or me or anyone else will be here over the next five years, to work with us in good faith to try and bring renewable energy options, not just to Pembroke Township, but everywhere in the state? It's something that's a very high priority for us. And is that an issue you'll be willing to engage with us in good faith and support as many of our initiatives as you can?"

Haas: "Of course."

Didech: "Okay. To the Bill. I am going to vote 'yes' on this Bill today. You know, I am somebody who takes the issue of energy and the environment very seriously. And I think it's important to remember that when we talk about energy policy in our state, one aspect of it is, yes, we want to protect the environment, but the other aspect, which is very important, is it needs to serve the people in our state too. And the current status quo energy policy in our state is not effectively serving the people of Pembroke Township. And I think this Bill is an opportunity to materially improve their lives in a very positive way with a very modest investment. The Sponsor of the Bill has committed to work with us in good faith on clean energy proposals. I think we should take her at her word on that. And I am going to be voting 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Ammons."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Ammons: "Pembroke, Illinois is one of those communities like Cairo, Illinois that was established by formerly enslaved people and have been treated as such ever since the establishment of these communities. I applaud the Sponsor of this legislation for taking this initiative up because, although I am an environmentalist at heart, I do understand that when you don't have access to natural gas and you have to use wood burning stoves there's a problem of equity here. And does that equity question rise above the question of energy? Is it as important? Is it less important? Should we have solar panels on every home in poor communities? Absolutely. Can we afford solar panels on every home in every community? No. Is the State of Illinois going to invest enough money to put solar panels on every house in every community in Pembroke? No. So, at this time, in this reality, as I have visited Pembroke, going to the horse shows with my son, and saw the conditions of Pembroke, we should actually be ashamed of ourselves. In the State of Illinois that we have people living like in East St. Louis, and Pembroke, and Cairo the way that they are living, and we are not providing the adequate support to them. And this Bill, although small as an effort, will at least bring some sense of semblance of normalcy to the people of Pembroke. I'm just going to remind the chamber that just a few weeks ago the Governor visited Pembroke to sign a piece of legislation done by the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus. And part of that legislation was to bring equity and justice to the people of Pembroke and to

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

provide resources to them in an area where they have little of nothing. So, if we actually care about equity and justice, and if we want solar panels on everybody's house like I do, then the State of Illinois needs to invest seriously in making equity available in renewables. But if you put that renewable on the table and I can't afford it, and then you tell me I have to burn and heat my house with wood, there is something terribly wrong with this situation. So, I stand in support of this legislation. And I understand that we're going to have to put a pipeline in to do it, and I get all that. But the reality is, the people of Pembroke deserve better than this. And so, I urge an 'aye' vote on 3404. And I do thank you. And I thank Leader Flowers for seeing this all of her years to try and address the issues in Pembroke. And this is one way for us to do it. So, I urge a 'yes' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not going to belabor the point because my colleague has said it all. But I just want to take this opportunity to thank you, Representative, because the last time someone tried to do something..."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Flowers, I'm so sorry to interrupt you.

You have to wear your mask, sorry."

Flowers: "It was... it was Governor... hold on, let me think 'cause I need to give thanks to him. Governor Ryan. It was Governor Ryan who really tried to do something. So, thank you so very much for taking the initiative and willing to fight this through because those people have been suffering for a very long time. And I'm just proud to be a part of it. Thank you very much. And thank you, Representative Ammons, for your

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

remarks. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Jones."

Jones: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Jones: "Representative, this is a pilot program, correct?"

Haas: "Yes."

Jones: "How long is this pilot program going to go?"

Haas: "Five years."

Jones: "And the objective of the pilot program is to put a gas pipe, gas line in. Is their objective to build new houses improve the lives of the community in Pembroke?"

Haas: "Certainly the hope is that when this energy source is brought to the community that it will help build economic growth for the community, which is severely lacking now."

Jones: "And I see in the Bill that you say you're going to collect data. What kind of data are you going to collect for the residents of Pembroke? It says you're going to ask the department to collect data regarding the pilot program. What... do you know what other kind of data they're going to collect besides the natural gas part?"

Haas: "Well, I know that we will be collecting... asking the department to collect data... since it's an optional program, there will be people that may not want to be connected... on data of residents that are connected and those that aren't and energy sources that are utilized. So, that will continue to be studied."

Jones: "And... to the Bill. When I was growing up in Ford Heights, they listed the three communities the worst, the most poorest

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

communities, Pembroke, Dixmoor, Ford Heights. And for years these communities have not only had a lack of investment, they've had a lack of opportunity. But it's my hope that... and I'll take you at your word, Representative... that this Bill is going to improve the lives of residents in Pembroke. And if that happens, we can all be a part of that success. And I would just encourage the Representative to keep on this for the residents and help build them new homes and improve their lives. But if this pilot program creates the kind of success that you're imagining, we all can congratulate the Representative on her first Bill and improving the lives of the residents of Pembroke. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Harper."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Harper: "Or you know what? I'm just going to speak straight to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Harper: "You know, I think it's very important when we talk about helping poor black communities and labeling them as such, that we make sure we're actually taking their feelings into account. I've been working with the people of Pembroke Township for a very long time, longer than I've been a Member of the General Assembly. And for the past two years they have been crying and begging for my help and my support because they didn't understand how a company was down in Springfield trying to bring a gas pipeline through their community. Pembroke Township did not want this. The Mayor of Hopkins

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Park wants this. And he put on an entire public relations campaign by bringing down Jesse Jackson from Chicago, and lots of people from Chicago, and Nicor and holding meetings and saying, oh, this is what the poor people of the entire Township wants, when it's just what the mayor wants who only covers three square miles of an entire township. I understand there have been efforts in the past to bring pipelines to Pembroke Township and that the residents there had to get up out of their homes and stand in front of the bulldozers to stop that from happening. Now, I don't know who you guys are having conversations with in Pembroke Township, but I know for a fact it isn't the entire population. And I know that here down in the General Assembly we don't like Chicago making decisions for the rest of the state. And so, why should we allow Hopkins Park make decisions for the entire Pembroke Township? Pembroke Township is a very small, poor township. And they tell me that natural gas is something that they will be looking for in the future, but it's definitely not something they want right now. They said that there are much more pressing concerns going on there. Like the fact that they don't have don't have good water supply, or sewer, or how about the fact that they don't even have a police department. With dozens of new residents coming in and shootings going up on a daily basis and it takes an hour for police to go there. The people of Pembroke Township want you to know that there are much more important issues that we should be in here fighting for and passing Bills on, other than a natural gas pipeline that's going to do nothing but raise prices for people and not even benefit the entire

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

population but just a small segment of it. So, I would advise us to really get the facts, all of the facts about this pilot program, about the fact that we're going to drive a pipeline through an entire community that is already been the subject of thousands of land grabs. We have all types of entities trying to get their hands on the beautiful natural resources that we have down in Pembroke Township. And I, as the Agricultural Chairman, have been working with them to try and boost their economic development through agriculture and protect their natural resources when all we see corporations and entities coming to try and take them. And so, that is what I wanted to say, that this Bill does not reflect the true intentions of all of the true people of Pembroke Township. But yet, a tiny small city inside of it where one mayor has seemed to be making the decisions for everyone. And I know for a fact the township supervisor, when decisions were being made, her comments, these collaboration was not made part of this deal. If we decide, as the state, to make decisions for this community, we'll be doing the same thing that people are doing for black communities all over. We're thinking they know what's best for us, when we know what's best for us. And I'll close by saying, I am from the City of Chicago, but my family is from Pembroke Township. My great grandmother Agnes Strong raised 12 kids in Pembroke Township, and I look forward to returning there to my family's land to continue to help to grow that community. For the wonderful rich people that live there, I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "The question... Representative Haas to close. And again, my apologies for my mistake earlier."

Haas: "Thank you. As I stated in my opening remarks, House Bill 3404 has bipartisan support of the leaders in my district and beyond. I may be new to this floor... to the floor of this chamber, but I'm not new to the community or to public service and I know my district. I have lived there my entire life. In fact, I grew up in the community next door to Pembroke Township. This is not a new issue. This has been an issue for as long as I can remember. It's been a fight to get resources to this community for my entire life and beyond. What people don't see, and what most of us in this room don't see, is the effect that something we take so much for granted in our daily lives can have on someone who doesn't have it. When the temperature drops below freezing, when we hit those sub-zero degree temperatures, we don't think twice about walking over to our thermostat and turning it up and we're nice and warm. How can we even think about forcing others to not have the same access to that basic need? To force others to wait for something cleaner and greener, while you and I enjoy the warmth of the comfort of our homes, that's hypocrisy, not justice. To further close, for those of you who are concerned about improving the environment and promoting racial equality, vote in favor of this Bill. For those of you who are interested in encouraging economic development and growing jobs, vote in favor of this Bill. I came to Springfield to represent and fight on behalf of all residents of my district. We have the unique opportunity to change lives

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

for the better and to transform a community in need... in need of our help. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote. Thank you." Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3404 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting in 'favor', 14 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar, House Bill 2568, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2568, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I'll be brief. This Bill just basically says that if an employer offers health insurance to one employee that that same health insurance plan has to be available to all employees."

Speaker Manley: "A reminder, we're moving back to Short Debate, which means that the Sponsor speaks on behalf of the Bill and there is one person speaking in opposition for three minutes.

Leader Batinick, do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "Ish. Yes, Madam Speaker. And I... it's just a shame we're not going to be on unlimited debate."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "There was some opposition in the committee. Can you talk about the opposition in committee to this Bill, Representative?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Mayfield: "Well, there was no opposition that came forward in committee."
- Batinick: "All right. Let me rephrase. Two people voted no. What was the nature of the discussion? I mean, you have a list... a laundry list of opponents here. You've got IML, Village of Lincolnshire, Fire Chiefs Association, State Association of Counties, Village of Hoffman Estates. I won't read them all for you, but..."
- Mayfield: "I'm not sure who voted no. They did not state on record why they were voting no. There was no opposition in committee."
- Batinick: "Okay. Was there any opposition... so none of these entities reached out to you about opposition?"
- Mayfield: "The IML did not reach out to me at all."
- Batinick: "Okay. And simply what the rule is... and this is any employee? So, if somebody offers health insurance to a employee, they have to offer it to every employee? Is there any restrictions on how long you have to work there? Any restrictions on job class or anything like that?"
- Mayfield: "No. What this Bill does, this Bill is basically... is more for police and fire. This is an initiative of them. We want to make sure that our police and fire, if they do suffer... I'm sorry. We want to make sure our police and fire are offered quality health care plans. You cannot tell a policeman or a firefighter that you do not deserve quality health care that is available to secretaries and janitors, when they are out here risking their lives for our cities, our municipalities, and so forth. So, all I'm saying with this Bill is, that if you offer it to a secretary or a janitor,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

you have to offer it to a policeman and a fireman as well. We want to make sure that our police and fire are taken care of."

Batinick: "Okay. Is there any exception for full time, part time, anything like that? So..."

Mayfield: "If you offer health insurance to one entity, you offer it to all."

Batinick: "Madam Speaker, instead of trying to pull this out with less knowledge, I would like to get seven hands up and maybe have the spokesperson finish this out."

Speaker Manley: "I'm sorry, Leader Batinick. What was your request?"

Batinick: "Oh, I needed his hand for seven people to go to Standard Debate. So, I need Marty to..."

Speaker Manley: "We'll put it on Standard Debate."

Batinick: "And then, I'm going to go ahead and let the spokesperson close this out for me. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Reick, are you the spokesperson?"

Reick: "Believe it or not, they gave me that responsibility."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. Please proceed."

Reick: "Representative, I think the reason that there was... there were two votes in opposition in committee, mine being one of them, was there was a concern about the impact of this Bill upon an intersection, shall we say, of this Bill with provisions of ERISA because of the number of people who would be covered. I think that there are coverage issues where ERISA is part of the... it is brought into play and below which there are not. And I don't think that that question was adequately or completely answered in committee. And I think... that was

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

the motivation of my 'no' vote on that Bill. Can you explain what kind of intersection there is between this Bill and the provisions of ERISA, please?"

Mayfield: "Representative, to my knowledge, these plans are not governed by ERISA."

Reick: "I'm sorry. Say that again. I didn't hear you, Ma'am."

Mayfield: "To my understanding, these plans are not governed by ERISA."

Reick: "Okay. That was the basis of my and... we just didn't get a clarification on the... at the time. So, I just pulled my vote on it at that point. Thank you for that answer. I appreciate it."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Reick: "Thank you, Ma'am."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall...' Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "Everyone, I'm simply asking that we provide our police and firemen, individuals who are out here risking their lives daily, to be offered the exact same health insurance that you would offer a secretary, that you would offer to a janitor and for there not to be any type of division in the type of health plan that they are offered. So, I'm asking everyone to please vote 'yes' for our police and our fire so that they can have peace of mind when they are going out and doing their jobs. Knowing that, should they be injured on the job, that they will at least have an adequate health plan to take care of themselves. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2568 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

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 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 25, House Bill 2950, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. This Bill is an environmental Bill. It becomes a permissive Bill which allows counties to choose, if they so choose, to use Motor Fuel Tax funds to not just rebuild roads but to rebuild roads and create pedestrian and bike paths. It's is very simple. This was an initiative of Lake County. When we started to discuss it with other counties we got tremendous support, particularly from the collar counties and the Illinois Association of County Engineers. At this point, this, again, is permissive. It allows counties to be able to use their Motor Fuel Taxes as they, elected officials, choose fit and appropriate. So, this is a good environmental Bill. It will help increase access to those who don't have it right now, to bike paths and pedestrian paths.

And I urge an 'aye' vote, and I welcome any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick, do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ish, yes."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Batinick: "Representative, I see that this was a split vote. You may see a split vote on our side. So, I want to vet out, kind of, the pros and cons that our side might see here. What was the nature of why... why people didn't want to vote for this? It had to do with the transportation lockbox, correct? So, we passed a Constitutional Amendment and the idea was that we passed this Constitutional Amendment so that the Motor Fuel Tax would specifically go to roads and bridges and whatnot. Does this not expand that thought process?"
- Morgan: "There were a few items that were discussed in committee. There was reference to the lockbox Amendment, the constitutional protection of the funds for construction. This does expand the definition of a highway. Again, this is focused on counties, but it would extend to the state as well as to the City of Chicago, those that use those Motor Fuel Taxes for rebuilding roads and building new roads. So, that was some of the discussion. I think there was a little bit of concern about where we go from here. But again, this is limited to specifically road construction. This is building roads with pedestrian bridges. This is building bike paths. So, it's... it really does have an actual limit."
- Batinick: "Do you consider a bike path... so if you considered a bike path transportation, then you would be okay with this. If you thought the transportation lockbox was meant specifically for roads and bridges, then you might not like this Bill, correct?"
- Morgan: "No, I actually think that this doesn't change the fact that these are funds that are dedicated to transportation.

 So, to your point..."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- Batinick: "Correct, right."
- Morgan: "...the definition of transportation is changing by being more inclusive."
- Batinick: "It's... okay. We want... you want to be inclusive. Why those specific counties laid out in the Bill?"
- Morgan: "I think this Bill has three different sections for the Motor Fuel Tax Code, which is broken up already in statute. So, there's references to the collar counties in the separate Act. There's also reference to the City of Chicago in a separate Act, same with state transportation funds. So, I believe that was just redundant to cover all of them."
- Batinick: "So, are those funds that come through the state or is there any Motor Fuel Tax that's derived locally now?"
- Morgan: "I believe it's both. It depends on which code. So, for the Motor Fuel Tax for the counties, that is coming obviously through county. For the state Motor Fuel Tax funds, that's coming, as I understand it, aggregation of those funds to the state."
- Batinick: "Again, let me clarify one last time. Are we… would this be… so, I live in Will County. Let's say Will County decides to adopt this. Are they able to use funds derived from state Motor Fuel Tax or is it just if they have some sort of charge for Motor Fuel Tax for them to use? Is it both or just the…"
- Morgan: "It would be the latter. It would be the latter. The counties would only have control over their own Motor Fuel Tax fund."
- Batinick: "Okay. That's what I wanted to get to. So, if these counties choose to spend their own MFT funds that they've

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

levied against their residents for transportation, that includes bike paths, walking paths, and what not, that's how the process would work, that's what you're allowing this to do?"

Morgan: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for letting me vet all that out. I appreciate it."

Speaker Manley: "A reminder, this is on Short Debate. Okay, now we're on Standard Debate. Chair recognizes Representative McLaughlin for three minutes."

McLaughlin: "Thank you, Mrs. Speaker. Representative, quick question. I know we discussed this in committee, but the MFT tax, as a mayor, I'll be a former mayor in five weeks, my concern is this will essentially create a precedent on MFT on a claim on MFT as it relates to roads and road construction. And I know the towns and villages are extremely concerned with any dilution of MFT funds away from what their intention was, specifically for roads and bridges. So, in this Bill and the way that it's written, can you assure mayors and towns and villages that this will not create a precedent that will allow the dilution of those funds in the future?"

Morgan: "My answer to that would be, this does not change the determination of Motor Fuel Tax funds, which already happens at the county level. So, it does not change the municipal role or powers in any way. Right now our counties, as you know, in Lake County our county board determines the projects that happen as a result of those funds coming to the county through Motor Fuel Tax. So, this does not change, expand, or contract those powers. So, I would answer that, it does not

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

have impact. I understand those who might choose not to use Motor Fuel Tax for purposes of transportation other than roads, right? So, bikes and pedestrian paths. And that's the whole point of the Bill, that it is discretionary. There's nothing mandatory about this legislation."

McLaughlin: "Thank you. And then, a follow up is... we had a discussion about regional planning agencies. CMAP is one that I know at the time was not backing this. There were a number of metropolitan planning agencies. Do you know where CMAP is on this legislation or have they weighed in?"

Morgan: "Representative, I know you referenced we did discuss CMAP in committee. I have not heard from CMAP I... honestly don't even know the nature of their concerns. So, I have not had any conversations with them."

McLaughlin: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Harris in the chair. And, Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "A few questions of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your questions."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I just... for some clarity for me. First of all, when we... and I am usually a very good supporter of bike paths and alternative sources of transportation and have cosponsored a Bill by Representative Moeller regarding IDOT funds for the purpose. But anyway... so, when we passed the Capital Bill I think we put an extra \$50 million a year into funding for alternative, nonhighway. So... so, we've made that commitment. So... and there was a lot of discussion around that. So, a couple questions. One, have you had discussions with the road builders or anyone, did they...

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

did you talk to them during the formulation of this legislation?"

Morgan: "Yeah, I have spoken with Local 150 Operating Engineers.

I don't know of any opposition from any road builder association or alliance. To your point, there is 50 million dedicated to the capital funds. This would not impact those funds. This is an additional use..."

Butler: "So, it would be additional on top of... the money that gets dived up for the 50 million, this is local, would be added on top of that. Is that correct?"

Morgan: "To the extent that anyone chooses to, yes."

Butler: "Correct. So, I was... and you mentioned that... I think what you said was that it changes the definition of highways or something like... is that correctly... am I stating that correctly?"

Morgan: "That's correct."

Butler: "So, does this... and I'm reading it, and I'm trying to understand. Would this add to the number of miles... since you said it's changing the definition of highways, would add to the definition of highway miles in a community or county or anything like that? Would you have additional highway miles under this legislation?"

Morgan: "No, this is limited to the definition of highways, it relates to use for the Motor Fuel Tax. Those are the only aspects of the Bill that define highway. So, there's separate definitions of highway within each of these three Motor Fuel Tax Codes. This expands that definition of highway limited to those three sections."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Butler: "Okay. So, if you... if you build a pedestrian walkway or a bike path under this, it would not add extra highway miles to your community? Just to be clear."

Morgan: "That's correct."

Butler: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, you asked a question?"

Speaker Harris: "I asked why you're standing up."

Reick: "Oh, well I'm tired of sitting down. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Harris: "He'll yield."

Reick: "Representative, you said a few things in... here in debate.

And I just want to clarify. I believe you said earlier that...

something about roadways with adjacent walkways or bike
paths. Is this... is your Bill limited to adjacent bike paths
and sidewalks to road projects or is this standalone... are
these standalone projects?"

Morgan: "That's a good question. It would be both."

Reick: "It would be both. Okay. Final question, the Motor Fuel Tax. You're saying Motor Fuel Tax... there's, as you know and you've pointed out, there are several ways counties and municipalities obtain Motor Fuel Tax funds. They're obtaining Motor Fuel Tax funds through the state because of the normal, the old fashioned tax and then the additional tax that was passed. Is your... is the money that's going to be used in this particular... for these particular purposes... let's say Lake County goes out and passes a county-wide fuel tax or one of the municipalities in Lake County passes a municipal fuel tax

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

say under their Home Rule provision. Is the money that is going to be used on these projects limited to that money that was passed pursuant to local ordinance or local county board ordinance or municipal ordinance? Or are you taking money out of the transfer from the state lockbox funds into those counties and municipalities? Where's that money coming from, please?"

- Morgan: "It's the former. This Bill does not change the flow of the funds as it may be, as you noted. It depends on exactly which unit of government is receiving the funds. This does not change the direction, the flow of the money, or interrupt the delivery of that money."
- Reick: "But a project is then limited to using funds only raised as a result of the tax imposed by the local ordinance or is it the money that comes from the state through the Motor Fuel Tax?"
- Morgan: "You know, it really would be subject to the way it is now. It's not being changed. So, those elements are not changed in any way from the statute. So, again, the way the Motor Fuel Taxes are delivered right now to the state, to the county, to the municipals, that is not being changed by the statute."
- Reick: "No, I understand that. But the use to which those funds are going to be put... you want to build a bike path through a community or through a park district or something like that, what's the source of that money?"
- Morgan: "Again, it depends on where that source of money is today.

 Those are different sources of funds. The Motor Fuel Tax, as you know, it's a complicated multi-level fund structure. So,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

it depends on where the money is going as it is today. This Bill does not affect any of that."

Reick: "So, it's your intention that if a standalone bike path or pedestrian walkway or something is going to be proposed and built, that money can come from any of those sources, not just something that's passed via local ordinance?"

"Well, again, a little bit to the earlier question from our colleague. This does not create a new pathway of funds for a local municipality to take Motor Fuel Tax funds from the State of Illinois that would ordinarily not go to local municipal entities. So, this does not create opportunities to access new funds. This literally only gives the opportunity to units of government, again, counties or city, in the City of Chicago or the state to... if they so choose, to use those Motor Fuel Taxes, in addition to highway renovation and restructuring and new highways and new roads, to also include... as we already have waterways, waterways are already included in the definition of highway. So, waterways, highways, again, already in the definition. And the highways also now would include, if this were to pass, pedestrian bridges and bike paths. So, I think that, again, it doesn't change the pathway of any of those funds."

Reick: "To the Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative, your time has expired.

Representative Weber."

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

Speaker Harris: "Yields."

Morgan: "I do."

19th Legislative Day

- Weber: "A couple questions. So, coming from county government, I know this won't affect the quantity or the amount of MFT funds that the county would get. Currently I know with, like, the Lake County Department of Transportation, if I remember correctly, when there's a resurfacing, they did not add sidewalks, but when they do a road replacement, they do automatically add sidewalks now. I guess my concern is reading through here is that it says that will allow the MFT funds to purchase property. Is that property alongside the road or is this property that could be purchased through a farm field or something not necessarily next to the road?"
- Morgan: "Representative, I don't... can you point me to where you're seeing that? 'Cause that does not talk about purchase of property anywhere in the changes of my legislation."
- Morgan: "Yeah, it would not... that is not in the Bill itself. It does not include any changes to legislation."
- Weber: "Okay. So, it says for funds for pedestrian use. So, this would not allow MFT funds to be used to purchase property that is not next to a roadway?"
- Morgan: "It doesn't change the possible use of MFT funds that exist today."
- Weber: "Mr. Speaker, could I give the rest of my time to Mr. Reick?"
- Speaker Harris: "Actually we did not start the timer on you. So,

 I don't know if you have any left. We have two other people
 who are waiting to speak. Let's hear what they have to say.

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Representative Yednock, are you in support or opposition? So, you're in support?"

Yednock: "I think."

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Yednock: "Representative Morgan, I just want to clarify this because I do know Local 150, I think, is not in opposition and probably supportive of this because it is road building in its sense. But you're not taking any of the Rebuild Illinois funds that we passed through the Capital Bill with the gas tax raise and using them for a purpose other than actual infrastructure work, right?"

Morgan: "If I understood your question, Representative, this does not use any of the capital funds.

Yednock: "This is for that... the taxes, the MFT funds that particular counties can raise on their own, in addition to what we already do through the MFT that goes through the state, it's that portion that they're able to use for this purpose?"

Morgan: "Yes, it's only funds that are available currently from the MFT statutes for counties to make determinations about where to invest in highways."

Yednock: "Okay. And many times bike paths can be sidewalks and bridges that go over highways, like Route 80 in Ottawa where they built a bike path that was essentially a walk path to go over because the citizens couldn't get to the other side. So, this is just like that, in other words?"

Morgan: "That's correct."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Yednock: "And it will be using mostly local workers on this... on these projects because it's still going through the regular MFT prevailing wage, et cetera?"

Morgan: "That's correct."

Yednock: "Okay. I wanted to clarify that 'cause we were a little concerned that we were going to be using funds outside of the nature of the Capital Bill and MFT funds. And I think that I have my answer. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "And the final speaker on this will be Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Luft: "Representative Morgan, just two quick questions. Was there any discussion in committee or during the writing of this Bill to limit this... taking this first step to distribute these funds for bike paths and walkways, was there any discussion on limiting that to a certain percentage so that the bulk of the MFT funds could go what they were originally designed to go for?"

Morgan: "I don't recall a discussion in committee about limiting a percentage of MFT funds towards these additional expanded definitions of highway. Again, I would just reiterate it is 100 percent discretionary of any county in the state to choose whether this is 0 percent and 0 dollars or a larger greater percentage for those bike paths and pedestrian bridges."

Luft: "And the reason I ask that about breaking it down to percentage as a start is, coming from multiple councils and being a mayor of a community, I could see how easy... without a clear directive and with councils changing, how easy it

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

would be for them to change this, that a good step, a good first step would have been maybe 25 percent could go for that. My fear is with this, that the backlash as soon as community members see these MFT funds not going into their roads and going into bike paths, which I'm all for as well, but going into these bike paths where will this expansion stop? 'Cause once people see that then we're going to be standing here talking about MFT funds going into boat launches and other hobbies that other peoples in the community will be asking why are state funds helping this hobby out and there isn't a nickel going to my hobby?"

Morgan: "I think that's an excellent question. And again, I cannot emphasize enough, the definition right now that every county in the State of Illinois gets to choose to use their MFT funds already includes waterways. So, your excellent discussion and really, I think, very important point is if a county chose to put money into some boat docks, right now they could, independent of my legislation. It's because we hold our county board members responsible and accountable through elections and through our relationships with our county board members to make the decisions that are best for our community. I just want to reiterate, this idea started with a single county. And as county engineers and administrators and board members learned of this idea, wanted this to be statewide. And again, it's optional and discretionary. I don't think this is a slippery slope other than the idea that we're really going to encourage and support transportation in all its forms, including pedestrian and bike paths. And I really... I think that as an important point that this is already expanded to

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

what we may think of in terms of a road. It already includes waterways. And there's a reason for that. It's because counties have to make the decisions for us and for our constituents about what to do with these Motor Fuel Tax that are appropriate."

- Luft: "Thank you for the response. I had to ask those questions 'cause I was sitting here listening. And, of course, being involved myself in MFT funds, I had to ask the question. So, I appreciate the response. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Harris: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Morgan to close."
- Morgan: "Thank you. And I really do appreciate the questions on this. I think it is very important. I do want to encourage those that might wonder, well where this is coming from, could we be the first? We are absolutely not the first in the country to do this. We are behind the eight ball. States like Washington, and Colorado, Oregon, they put money already, dedicated money from their Motor Fuel Taxes, into these things. This is a purely discretional, optional opportunity to really invest in new forms of transportation. Our districts want this. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2950 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Speaker... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With a vote of 90 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 2950, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

24 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1068, offered by Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1068 is an initiative of DCFS. In the course of achieving permanency, which is what we want for kids that find themselves in DCFS care, they want to change the statute to consider adoption alongside quardianships. Right now, per statute, you have to first consider adoption, but what happens a lot of the time is a family member will step in and care for a child whose parent is unable to care for them at the moment. And they don't want the parent to have to terminate parental rights. So, they don't want to adopt. But the quardianship would give them a path. Unfortunately, it takes a lot of time once adoption... the idea of adoption has been interjected to get to the quardianship path. Ideally the quardianship is perfect for a child in this situation and whomever is serving as... whoever is fostering the child because the foster parent can act without DCFS intervention as that child's quardian. The quest is always to put a child in a state of permanency and always think about the child's best interest. And I'll take any questions."

Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, Representative Manley to close."

Manley: "Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1068 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'.

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

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 a vote of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1068, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was away from my desk when House Bill 3404 was voted on and my switch was not voted. And had it been, I would have like to have been recorded as a 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "The record shall so reflect. On page 23 of the Calendar appears House Bill 395, Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 395, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Moylan."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 395 amends the Ivory Bill Act and changes the short title to Animal Parts and Products Ban Act. There is no opposition, and I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Manley in the Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "That was an excellent introduction, Representative Moylan. I'm reading a bunch of things about rhinoceroses and something about holding the Bill on Second. So, can you tell me what... was the Amendment adopted and passed in committee or what happened there, and what's with the rhinoceroses?"

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Moylan: "Well, I think it's very important that we actually try to ban certain exotic animals that are being taken advantage in this day and age. In the committee meeting, there was a question from Brookfield Zoo, and we said we would surely accommodate them. And that's what the Amendment was."

Batinick: "Okay. And so, the Amendment was adopted in committee, and you're... okay."

Moylan: "Yeah."

Batinick: "And the Bill does exactly what to rhinoceroses?"

Moylan: "It protects them."

Batinick: "How?"

Moylan: "By not letting their vital parts be sold."

Batinick: "I really appreciate you explaining that further. Thank you, Representative."

Moylan: "Thank you very much. And I really respect and hopefully have your vote and support of the General Assembly."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moylan to close."

Moylan: "Thank you very much, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 395 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23, House Bill 434, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 434, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I'd like to adopt House Floor Amendment #3. I think I should table 1 and 2 first. Is that right? Yes, please table House Floor Amendment #1 and House Floor Amendment #2. And I move to adopt House Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "This Bill's on the Order of Third Reading. The Floor Amendments 1, 2, and 3 are currently in Judiciary - Criminal."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford, do you wish to adopt?"

Ford: "I want to adopt Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Manley: "That Amendment is still in committee."

Ford: "I still want to adopt it."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. Good try. On page 26,
House Bill 3418, Representative Carroll. Mr. Clerk, please
read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3418, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Just give me one second. Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. I apologize for that little tardiness there. 3418 is a Bill that a colleague... a friend of mine... not a colleague, but a friend of mine from New Mexico ran last year that basically says that employees, when they start a job, do not have to sign an agreement that says they have... they don't have to disclose any issues of sexual harassment or sexual assault. Now again, what this Bill clarifies is, they can sign it after the fact as a nondisclosure... it is a

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

nondisclosure agreement after the fact, but when they start employment it's not a reason of employment. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote and happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "We're on Short Debate. And, Representative Stava-Murray, do you rise in opposition?"

Stava-Murray: "In support."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. On Short Debate you have the Bill Sponsor and then one person for three minutes in opposition. Representative Williams, are you rising in opposition?"

Williams, A.: "No."

Speaker Manley: "We're on Short Debate."

Williams, A.: "I'm rising just... to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "We're on Short Debate. So, you have the Bill Sponsor and one Member in opposition."

Williams, A.: "Fine, then I'm in opposition."

Speaker Manley: "You want to be in opposition?"

Williams, A.: "I spoke to the Representative earlier and told him I'd make a comment about the Bill and our future plans for discussing this initiative in light of the fact we passed a comprehensive discussion. So, you decide how you'd like to go about..."

Speaker Manley: "So, you are in opposition. So, please proceed."
Williams, A.: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Thank you so much for the helpful conversation earlier. I think this is a great item that is going to hopefully supplement the work we've already done. But I just wanted to reiterate that we will be having a conversation ongoing about this issue because we did, if everyone recalls, pass a significant omnibus Bill related to sexual harassment just a few years ago that was

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

agreed to by all parties. So, just looking forward to, if you're willing, to continue the conversation to make sure that we don't undo anything we did and that we work to improve it and make it further beneficial for those who are impacted by harassment."

Carroll: "Absolutely. And I think every piece of legislation we work on is always an evolving process and should be. So, I'm always looking for feedback and the opportunity to improve what's done. But I think this is a really important issue because I know this has affected a lot of people. So, I'd like to do this. And again, always open to the conversation and working through it."

Williams, A.: "Well thank you for that. And with that, I think you've changed my mind."

Carroll: "Thank you. Wow, thanks."

Speaker Manley: "Per the rules of Short Debate, we now... are you rising in opposition, Sir? We've already had somebody in... we want to go on Standard Debate? Oh boy, okay. Representative Reick, please proceed."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Reick: "Representative, quickly, originally in our conversation the chamber was against this Bill. Have they... have you done anything to resolve their opposition at this time?"

Carroll: "I believe they're actually neutral on the Bill. That's what we have."

Reick: "Very good. Okay. That... that's good. Thank you."

Carroll: "No problem."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Representative Carroll to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3418 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the
voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are...
oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this
question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against',
0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader
Butler, believe it or not, I can see you. What reason do you
rise?"

Butler: "A point of personal privilege, Ma'am, while the Body is at ease."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Butler: "I'd like to address a little discussion that happened at the end of yesterday. And just remind the Body that, as somebody who participated in the negotiations over the Capital Bill and had no discussion whatsoever of a \$118 trailer fee as part of those discussions and who was told... our side and your side have been told repeatedly over the last two years that this was a drafting error, I'd really like to underscore what Representative Bourne said yesterday. Peeling back this trailer fee is something that we're in broad agreement on in this Body. If anyone visited the ABATE reception last night, you would know from the ABATE folks that this is one of their top issues. It is something we need to address. As Representative Bourne pointed out yesterday,

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

there's multiple pieces of legislation on both sides of the aisle that could address this situation. And let me just remind the Body that when the Governor rolled out his budget this year, he's sweeping part of the cigarette tax, which goes to vertical capital, and I didn't hear a moan and cry about that when the Governor proposed taking money out of the capital program to pay for his budget. And on top of that, we've already passed a Bill today, a license plate Bill that I voted for that was the right thing, HB20, that peeled back a fee for licenses. People who get Gold Star plates don't have to get... well spouses and so on, don't have to pay that extra money. So, let's be consistent on this. It was not meant to be \$118. I know it. Representative Spain knows it. He was in the room. Representative McDermed, who is not here anymore, she was in the room. She knows it as well. It's time that we address this and get it done. And I really appreciate Representative Bourne bringing it up yesterday because it is something we have talked about, talked about, talked about. And it drives the public nuts when they contact our offices and nothing ever gets done on something that would be easy to fix. There are 150 thousand less trailer renewals this year than were 2 years ago. And why is that? Because I'm sure there are people in this Body possibly that haven't renewed their trailer fees because they're not going to pay 118 bucks for a trailer to sit in their yard and only be used once a year. And that's what people tell me. That's what the ABATE guys told me last night. So, let's get it done. Let's stop playing games. Let's get it done for the people of Illinois because it's something we need to do."

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Moylan. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Moylan: "Personal privilege, please."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

- Moylan: "I agree with Representative Butler a hundred percent. I think there are certain Bills that need to be called, and we have to stand up for what's right for the citizens of the great State of Illinois. Representative Bourne and Representative Katie Stuart both have fantastic Bills. And there's a bunch of other ones on the same topic. Sometimes we have to take a stand, and I think this is one. We need to call this Bill and call it this Session. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Manley: "Moving to Bills on Second Reading. Members, I want to remind you to be prepared to move your Bill. If you have an Amendment, make sure that you have fulfilled your agreement that you made in committee before you move your Amendment. This way Representative Batinick has promised not to stop every single time and ask you if you fulfilled your obligation. On page 2, House Bill 9, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 9, a Bill for an Act concerning health.

 Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note and a state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Manley: "Then we'll hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Page 2, House Bill 13, Representative Tarver. Out of the record. House Bill 55, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

19th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 55, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Didech, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech on the Amendment."
- Didech: "Floor Amendment 1 corrects a typographical error. It has no substantive effect on the Bill. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 55. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. On page 3, House Bill 75, Leader Flowers. Out of the record. House Bill 118, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 118, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. House Bill 126, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 126, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. House Bill 192, Representative Harper. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 192, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

19th Legislative Day

- Amendments. Floor Amendment #1... correction, no Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. House Bill 219, Representative Carroll. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 219, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Page 5... excuse me, page 4 still. Representative 232... that's House Bill 232. I'm not sure which Hernandez. Lisa... Leader Hernandez, House Bill 232. Out of the record. On page 5, House Bill 247, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 247, 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 Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Yingling on House Bill 268. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 268, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Yingling, has been offered and approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling on Floor Amendment 1."
- Yingling: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor number... excuse me. Floor Amendment #1 puts restrictions in terms of contractual engagements after a township election."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Yingling moves to adopt Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 268. All those in favor say 'aye';

19th Legislative Day

- opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. On page 6, House Bill 591, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "House Bill 591, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read for a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please hold that Bill on Second Reading. On page 5, House Bill 357, Representative Hammond. Out of the record. On page 6, Representative Ugaste, House Bill 381. Out of the record. On page 7 of the Calendar, Representative Vella, House Bill 734. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 734, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was a read a second time a previous day. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Harris in the Chair."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Williams on House Bill 1795. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1795, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 9 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 1838, Representative Mah. Representative Mah. Out

19th Legislative Day

- of the record. On page 9 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1853, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. I'm sorry. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1853, 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 Harris: "Third Reading. On page 9 of the Calendar is House Bill 1866, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. On page 10 of the Calendar is House Bill 1956, Representative Jones. Jones. Out of the record. On House Bill 10 is... I'm sorry. On page 10 is House Bill 2374, Mr. DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2374, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 10 of the Calendar is House Bill 2400, Representative Hirschauer. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2400, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 10 of the Calendar is House Bill 2408, Representative Evans. Representative Evans. Oh, there you are. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2408, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Evans."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Evans on Floor Amendment #1."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of the General Assembly. I want to adopt them both, but the first Amendment is a technical change at the request of the State Fire Marshal's Office clarifying that the standard use for certification will be the applicable codes and the authority having jurisdiction."

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

Batinick: "I know we're talking about this Amendment. We've had a couple of people on your side of the aisle that have Amendments to be adopted. It has nothing to do with committee, but I don't know if you want to remind your side to adopt the Amendments if they need to be adopted. And some of the Amendments are in Rules. So, I don't know if they want to move them to Third in the first place. So, we're just seeing..."

Speaker Harris: "We can always move it back, Representative."
Batinick: "Okay."

Speaker Harris: "Okay. Seeing no further discussion, Representative Evans moves that Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2408 be adopted. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Evans and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Evans on Floor Amendment #2."

19th Legislative Day

- Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker for the previous adoption. The second Amendment excludes nuclear facilities from the certified inspector requirement as they are inspected in house by specially trained individuals using a more stringent Nuclear Regulatory Commission Code. I request your adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Evans moves Floor Amendment 2 be adopted. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2408 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 11 of the Calendar is House Bill 2412, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2412, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mayfield, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Mayfield on Floor Amendment #2."
- Mayfield: "The Floor Amendment just changes the language from language of origin. We just wanted to clarify the type of language that will be in the Amendment... in the notices."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, Representative Mayfield has moved that Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2412 be adopted.

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

 Mr. Clerk."

19th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 11 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 2584, Representative Murphy. Out of the record. On
 page 11 of the Calendar is House Bill 2523, Representative
 Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2523, 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 Harris: "Third Reading. On page 11 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 2521, Mr. Gonzalez. Representative Gonzalez. Mr.
 Clerk please, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2521, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 12 of the Calendar is House Bill 2622, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2622, a Bill for an Act concerning unemployment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 12 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2777, Representative Burke. Kelly Burke. Kelly Burke. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On page 13 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2811, Representative Halbrook. Out of the record. On page 13 of the Calendar is House Bill 2863, Representative Swanson. Representative Swanson. Out of the record. On page 13 of the Calendar is House Bill 2891, Representative Frese. Out of the record. On page 14 of the

19th Legislative Day

- Calendar is House Bill 3058, Representative Lilly. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On page 14 of the Calendar is House Bill 2994, Mr. Butler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2994, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Butler, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Butler on Floor Amendment #3."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 just limits the legislation to Capital Township."
- Speaker Harris: "There being no questions, Representative Butler has moved that Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2994 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 14 of the Calendar is House Bill 3004, Representative Batinick. Out of the record. On page 15 of the Calendar is House Bill 3165, Representative Yednock. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3165, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Yednock, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Yednock on the Amendment."
- Yednock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment merely changes some technical language that was messed up in the original Bill."

19th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "There being no questions, Representative Yednock has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3165 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3218, Representative Smith. Representative Smith.
 Oh, there he is. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3218, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Smith, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Smith on Floor Amendment 2."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 simply changes vocational education to career and technical education throughout the Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, Representative Smith has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3218. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar is House Bill 3223, Representative Moeller. Out of the record. On page 16 of the Calendar is House Bill 3281, Representative Ortiz. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3281, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

19th Legislative Day

- Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ortiz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Ortiz is recognized on Floor Amendment #1."
- Ortiz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 is a minor technical change suggested by ISBE. Thank you."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, Representative Ortiz has moved that Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3281 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3317, Representative Welter. Mr. Clerk, please
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3317, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Welter."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Welter on Floor Amendment 2."
- Welter: "Floor Amendment #2 just makes a minor change indicating the dedication of the task force."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the Motion is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3317 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is approved for consideration."

19th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "Representative Welter on Floor Amendment #3."
- Welter: "House Floor Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker, is also a minor adjustment clarifying the name of the task force."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the Motion is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #3 be adopted to House Bill 3317?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3283, Representative Costa Howard. Please read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3283, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 17 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3440, Representative Robinson. Representative
 Robinson. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3440, 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 Harris: "Third Reading. And on page 17 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3410, Representative Morrison. Out of the record. On page 17 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3485, Representative Stoneback. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3485, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments

19th Legislative Day

- have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 17 of the Calendar is House Bill 3496, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3496, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 18 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3523, Representative Wheeler. Out of the record.
 Mr. Clerk. On page 18 of the Calendar is House Bill 3512,
 Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3512, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment... no Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Slaughter on Floor Amendment 1."
- Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know there was a Floor Amendment to adopt on this, is there?"
- Speaker Harris: "Do you want us to take this out of the record for the moment and come back to it?"
- Slaughter: "Please, Mr. Speaker. Take it out of the record. I'm sorry."
- Speaker Harris: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. And we will come back to you. On page 19 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3620, Representative Collins. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

19th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3620, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 19 of the Calendar is House Bill 3703, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3703, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 19 of the Calendar is House Bill 3637, Representative Bennett. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On page 19 of the Calendar is House Bill 3738, Representative Ness. Out of the record. And going back to Representative Slaughter. On page 18 of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 3512?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3512, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Slaughter, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Slaughter on Floor Amendment #1."
- Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3512. An effective date was inadvertently left out of the Bill. The Amendment provides an immediate effective date."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #1 be adopted to House Bill 3512?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment

19th Legislative Day

- #1 is adopted to House Bill 3512. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 3716, Representative Davidsmeyer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3716, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 20 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3793, Representative Ramirez. Please read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3793, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ramirez, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Ramirez on Floor Amendment #1."
- Ramirez: "Hi. House Bill... Floor Amendment on 3793 is a Floor Amendment to ensure we clarify how the visitation for children and care go through the Department of Children and Family Services. This was something that we did in negotiation with the Department of Public Guardian, Department of Children and Family Services. And this is a Floor Amendment for that."
- Speaker Harris: "No questions? The question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3793 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

19th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 20 of the Calendar appears
 House Bill 3803, Representative Avelar. Mr. Clerk, please
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3803, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 20 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3870, Representative Mason. Out of the record. On page 20 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3756, Representative Meier. Meier. Out of the record. On House Bill 20... on page 20 is House Bill 3861, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3861, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 20 of the Calendar is House Bill 3865, Representative Walker. Out of the record. On page 21 of the Calendar is House Bill 3881, Representative Windhorst. Out of the record. On page 21 of the Calendar is House Bill 3940, Representative Walsh. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3940, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. On page 21 of the Calendar is House Bill 3950, Representative LaPointe. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3950, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment 1 was

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

- adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're returning to the Order of Third Readings. On page 23 of the Calendar appears House Bill 427, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 427, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Yingling."
- Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 427 places a question on the ballot in Lake County to ask the voters if they would like to convert the Office of County Assessor into an elected office. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

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

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

- Batinick: "Just... I'm frankly, Representative, buying some time for my Members to get back to the seats. I don't think we were expecting Thirds. So, you're putting on the ballot... and this was unanimous in committee, correct?"
- Yingling: "Yeah, this passed off the floor unanimously right before the pandemic. So, it was unable to move in the Senate. So, we're running it again."
- Batinick: "And the... what was the reason for wanting to put this on the ballot to have a... you're not an elected assessor now and you want one?"
- Yingling: "Correct. There are two ways to put this on the ballot.

 It either has to be done through the General Assembly or

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

through a petition initiative. So, this would ask the voters, this would give them an opportunity to weigh in on it."

Batinick: "Okay. Are you... you said the vote last time in the House was unanimous?"

Yingling: "Yeah, I think it was 115."

Batinick: "Okay. No concerns about politicizing that office?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry, say again."

Batinick: "No concerns about politicizing that office?"

Yingling: "What size is the office?"

Batinick: "No concerns about politicizing the assessor office?

You don't have any concerns about that?"

Yingling: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. Fair enough. Mr. Speaker, if we could excuse Leader Durkin for the rest of the day that would be swell."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk let the record reflect Leader Durkin is excused the rest of the day."

Batinick: "No further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Seeing no further questions, the question is... oh
I'm sorry, would you like to make a closing statement,
Representative? Representative Yingling to close."

Yingling: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 427 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? LaPointe. Manley. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 427, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Representative Nichols, for what reason do you seek recognition?

Nichols: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Harris: "State your point."

Nichols: "I'd just like to bring to this... attention to this great chamber that today we celebrate not only an American hero but an international hero. Today Major League Baseball celebrates Jackie Robinson. Yeah, you can give him a hand on that. It's Jackie, you know? And I'd just like to say that he was more than the baseball player. He was an activist. He set a lot of firsts. Be it in baseball, banking. He actually lobbied in some political areas. I think it's so important that a person that not only stood up for African Americans, but he stood up for equality for everybody. And I couldn't imagine what he went through and how he got through it in those times. And he also had the help of people such as Branch Rickey, the person that gave him an opportunity to actually participate in the Major Leagues. So, I just think... I wanted to do this earlier, but I guess I had to wait or whatever. I'm the new dude. But I just think it's so important that we acknowledge that. And for me, I know that people such as Jackie Robinson paved the way for myself and others. So, I thank this great chamber for standing and acknowledging today what Major League Baseball annually acknowledges. Thank you very much."

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

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Tourism will be meeting in Virtual Room 1.

Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies will be meeting in Virtual Room 2. Child Care

19th Legislative Day

4/15/2021

Accessibility & Early Childhood Education will meet in Virtual Room 3."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 209, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 210, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 211, offered by Representative Carroll. House Resolution 213, offered by Representative West. House Resolution 214, offered by Representative Hammond. And House Resolution 216, offered by Representative Kifowit."

Speaker Harris: "And now, leaving... oh, wait a minute. I'm sorry. Wait for it. Leader Manley moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Manley moves that the House stand adjourned until Friday, April 16, at the hour of 10 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."