38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Evans: "The House will be in order. The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in the prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of 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: "Let us pray. Gracious most sovereign God, who are the author and the finisher of our faith, the giver and sustainer of our life, in whom we move, and live, and have our being. We pray your goodness, your endless mercies, your unwavering love and constant guidance be present amongst this great House today. We pray your blessings upon this august Assembly, the Speaker of this House, its Leaders, Members, and all of its staff. We pray that you would grant them, in the midst of great divide and separation, a spirit of unity. We pray that in the presence and the face of many challenges that you will give them a spirit of renewed hope. We pray that, even when they may be at odds, we ask that you would grant them a spirit of compromise and cooperation. We pray that your steady hands and guidance will be upon the task that lies before them. We pray that they go forward in their charge and in their efforts with courage and with clear insight. We pray that they see you as their light in dark moments and hear your voice when their day becomes loud. We their deliberations, be you bless that understanding and with wisdom. We pray that you bless their decisions to be with accuracy and with impartiality. This we

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- humbly pray and humbly ask, in the presence of your son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Evans: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Leader Ramirez."
- Ramirez 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 Evans: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absence on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that there are no Democrats absent today."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Harris. Leader Welter is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Morrison is excused for the day."
- Speaker Evans: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 116 Members present, answering the roll, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 19, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 34. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Economic Opportunity & Equity reports the

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

following committee action taken on May 19, 2021: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 263. Representative Kifowit... corrected Committee Report... for Chairperson from Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 19, 2021: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 921; recommends be adopted is 922, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 1539. Representative Ann Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 19, 2021: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1089. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, Chairperson from Committee on Immigration & Human Rights reports the following committee action taken on May 19, 2021: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2665. Representative Stuart, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 19, 2021: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 43, and House Resolution 270. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2021: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2182; and recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 157, Floor Amendment (s) 1 to Senate Bill 2244. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2021: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2520. Representative Halpin, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

20, 2021: do pass Consent Calendar is Senate Bill 2103; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 1056. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2021: do pass as amended Consent Calendar is Senate Bill 60; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 581; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 4 to House Bill 1443, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 104. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2021: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolutions 39, 40, 41, and 42. Representative Guzzardi, Chairperson from the Committee on Housing reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 154, and Floor Amendment(s) 5 to Senate Bill 154. Introduction 316, offered Resolutions. House Resolution by Representative Welter. House Resolution 318, offered by Representative Mah. House Resolution 323, offered Representative Gong-Gershowitz. And House Joint Resolution 48, offered by Speaker Welch. These Resolutions are referred to the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Evans: "Members, an announcement. This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face mask covering that covers the nose and mouth, except when necessary for eating or drinking. This includes when speaking on the microphone at your desk and prior to Session. Again, please remember to wear a face mask covering, including while speaking on the microphone, as pursuant to House Rule 51.5.

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Thank you. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Leader Harris on that Motion."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I move the posting requirements be waived so the following Bill can be heard in the Judiciary - Civil Committee, House Resolution 323."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mayfield: "Personal privilege."

Speaker Evans: "Please state your point."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. For the Members of the Appropriation-Public Safety Committee, just want to remind everybody that we have a meeting at 4:00 in Room 114, followed by another meeting at 5:15 in Room 413. The second meeting, there will be pizza provided to the Members of the committee. So, please be on time. 4:00 in Room 114, 5:15 in Room 413. There are two meetings for Public Safety-Appropriations today. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Bourne, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Evans: "State your point."

Bourne: "Thank you. I rise today to share with the Body the passing of Grace Herschelman and to honor her life. I'm sorry. Grace was a nine and a half year old from Hillsboro whom you

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

all got to meet when we came up to honor Rare Disease Day. I got to speak about her again on this House Floor when they did the Flat Gracie Campaign to raise awareness for INAD, the rare disease that Grace was diagnosed with. She passed away yesterday, and she has been such a light in our community. She brought people together from every walk of life, every way of thinking, and was truly a force of connection and good in our county and in our area. So, I just want to tell her parents that we are thinking of you. And I know that many of you participated in the Flat Gracie Campaign that they had to raise awareness. So, I wanted to share with you all and thank you for being a part of their journey, and thank Grace's parents for allowing me to be a part of hers. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you. Let's take a moment of silence for the memory of Grace. Thank you. Proceed to the Order of Senate Bills on Third Reading, page 4. Calendar under Third Readings, we have Senate Bill 2183, offered by Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2183, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Zalewski is recognized."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2183 extends the Transportation Network Act... Transportation Network Provider Act 18 months. We did this Bill a few years ago. The sunset is upon us. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Is there any discussion? Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "Sponsor will yield."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Gong-Gershowitz: "Representative Zalewski, I understand that there currently is a Supreme Court case that is reviewing particular elements of this Act, particularly as it relates to the passenger safety and liability of TNC rideshare companies for the actions of their drivers. Is this Bill intended to influence the outcome or ruling in that case?"

Zalewski: "Thank you for the question, Madam Chair. No. While we contemplate the short term renewal of this law, which is currently on appeal before the Illinois Supreme Court, the intent of this Bill is solely to extend the sunset of the Act by a year and half to allow the court ample time to consider the issue. It is not the intent of the Bill to guide, interrupt, intervene, or... in any way with the courts proceedings on the merits of the case. The Act would sunset without our action and Illinois would be without a functional regulatory scheme absent the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Are your remarks for a close Representative?" Zalewski: "No, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz, you have additional questions?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you. That answered my question."

Speaker Evans: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2183 pass?' All those in... again, 'Shall Senate Bill 2183 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, under Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 64, offered by Representative... Leader Ammons. Out of the record. Again, on page 2 of the Calendar, under Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 71, offered by Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 71, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Didech is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 71 amends the Eviction Article of the Code of Civil Procedure to fix a conflict that exists between the statute and the Instalment Sales Contract Act that was passed in 2017. The General Assembly decided in 2017 that, for an instalment sales contract where at least 20 percent of the principal has been paid, the remedy for the breach of the contract should not be an eviction action but rather a foreclosure action. However, there was an oversight when the law was enacted. So, currently the Eviction Article has an additional requirement that the instalment sales contract must exceed five years of length in order for the appropriate remedy of a breach to be foreclosure. This Bill simply harmonizes those conflicting statutes by eliminating the five-year requirement in the Eviction Article so there will be clarity across State Law that the requirements in the Instalment Sales Contract Act are the only standards to determine whether an eviction or a foreclosure is the appropriate remedy for a breach of an instalment sales contract. I'm happy to answer any questions."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 71 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say '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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Again, on page 2 of the Calendar, under Third Readings, we have Senate Bill 80, offered by Representative Costa Howard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 80, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Costa Howard is recognized."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 80 is a Bill that passed out of the House in 2019 unanimously. And it passed out of committee. It was House Bill 4307. It is a... makes technical changes to the Illinois Probate Act regarding guardian of the person, guardian in the estate, allowing the courts to appoint separate individuals to those two options for guardianship of a... an elderly individual. It allows people to become co-guardians in the event that the guardians work together for the best interest of the ward. It also provides that a limited guardian of the estate may be appointed. There are notice requirements regarding the respondent's rights. And it also allows for fees of the guardian to be first-class claims within... for the purposes of bankruptcy. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you. Is there any discussion?

 The Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Evans: "Sponsor indicates she will. You may proceed."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you. You mention that one of things that this statute is going to enshrine into the legal code is that all of a sudden all of the guardian's fees and expenses are going to become first-class claims. Since I don't think most Members actually know what that means, can you explain that, please?"
- Costa Howard: "Absolutely, Representative. When a guardian, who would be the one that would be required to file bankruptcy for the ward while they're alive, the fees that the guardian incurs in the process of doing that would become first-class claims, meaning that the bankruptcy courts who now has jurisdiction over the wards' assets, if there are any, would allow the guardians fees to be one of the first-class claims that as... if any fees are distributed would go to them."
- Mazzochi: "Okay. And right now first-class claims are usually only limited just to burial expenses, right?"
- Costa Howard: "First-class claims under Section 18-10 of the Probate Act have previously considered seventh-class claims in the past."
- Mazzochi: "Right. So, now you're basically allowing guardians to jump ahead in line, ahead of the United States Government, any money that's owed to the U.S. Government, right?"

Costa Howard: "Okay. Go ahead."

Mazzochi: "'Cause U.S. Government are second-class claims, true?" Costa Howard: "True."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- Mazzochi: "All right. You're also allowing a guardian to jump ahead of a parent, or a spouse, or a child because those are considered to be a third-class claims under the bankruptcy statute, right?"
- Costa Howard: "Representative, I think you need to make sure that you understand that in bankruptcy the United States Bankruptcy Court has jurisdiction. The Illinois courts do not have jurisdiction..."

Mazzochi: "I'm sorry. Probate."

Costa Howard: "...over bankruptcy."

Mazzochi: "Probate."

- Costa Howard: "In the Probate Court that is different. But we are not changing the Federal Law. We are only changing... this is an omnibus law... I shouldn't call it omnibus, I apologize. This is a Bill that addresses many issues in the Probate Act."
- Mazzochi: "All right. But true or false, with... by making it a first-class claim you're going to jump ahead of a spousal claim, any survivor benefit for a family, or a child survivorship claim?"
- Costa Howard: "Representative, what this Bill does is that it actually makes sure that the individual who has been working on behalf of the ward and the wards best interest to be paid for the services..."

Mazzochi: "That's..."

Costa Howard: "...and it does not have to... Representative, please let me finish my answer. The ward... the guardian is not necessarily an attorney. As you know, the guardian could also be a member of that individual's family. And so, the work that is performed that a... and by the way, as you probably

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

know, but for the other Members of the Assembly, a court is the one who does the judgement. The guardian has to file a fee petition and the guard... and the court makes a finding on that judgement that fees are reasonable and necessary and for the best interest of the ward. So, the courts..."

Mazzochi: "I just want a simple yes or no."

Costa Howard: "Again, Representative..."

Mazzochi: "Are you jumping ahead of a spouse or a child."

Costa Howard: "Representative, if you don't mind, it would help if I answered your question before you interrupted."

Mazzochi: "It's a yes or no. I don't need a filibuster. I need a yes or no. Isn't it true you're jumping ahead in line, ahead of a spouse, ahead of a child?"

Costa Howard: "I'm going to say, again, Representative, if you would like me to finish the answer to the question, it is not a simple yes or no. Again, the court that... the Illinois courts are the ones who enter the judgement. They make a finding and the ward is alive. When the ward is alive and that bankruptcy is filed, the bankruptcy courts then have jurisdiction."

Mazzochi: "Are there any cost caps on the amount of fees that a guardian can recover?"

Costa Howard: "There are no cost caps in any fee petition."

Mazzochi: "All right. And is there any requirement that..."

Costa Howard: "Again, Representative, I respect the fact that you can ask a question. But I would also ask for the same respect for me to be allowed to fully answer your question so that all of the Members of the Assembly can hear the answer. This is not a court room."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Mazzochi: "All right. Well I'll... I'll go to the Bill because you're filibustering my time. And the fact of the matter is, is if you vote for this Bill, you're saying that a lawyer can get their fees paid at the expense of a surviving spouse or a child. If you are voting for this Bill you are also saying that a lawyer can drain an estate of someone who is disabled, whether the court agree... even though the court agrees with it. There's no caps. There's no time restrictions. There's nothing that's going to actual ... aside from hoping that the court gets it right and it is going to be fair, a hope and a wish, that people are... who may actually be deserving and people who may actually be entitled to a share of this estate or a share of what's remaining is left. So, if you want to put lawyers ahead of parents and kids of disabled people who had to use a guardian, vote 'yes'. If you're not into that, vote 'no'."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Mazzochi. Any further discussion? For further discussion Representative Halpin is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "Sponsor indicates she will. You may proceed."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I wanted to give you a chance to answer a couple questions as fully as possible. You're familiar with the Illinois Probate Act, correct?"

Costa Howard: "Correct."

Halpin: "And so, with a first-class claim under the Probate Act, where a person has been... is deceased."

Costa Howard: "Yes."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Halpin: "There is either a personal representative, like an executor or an administrator, if there's no will. Is that right?"

Costa Howard: "Correct."

Halpin: "And expenses of administration, including fees for that personal representative, are currently a first-class claim under the Probate Act, right?"

Costa Howard: "Yes."

Halpin: "When you have a person that's still alive, however, a personal representative is essentially the guardian of the person and they make health care decisions or they're guardian of the estate and they handle the ward's financial decisions.

Isn't that right?"

Costa Howard: "Yes it is."

Halpin: "And so, essentially the guardian is acting as the personal representative while someone is alive, just like an executor or an administrator is... is for that person after they've deceased?"

Costa Howard: "Yes."

Halpin: "And you could end up in a situation where a guardian has incurred an expense... and we're not necessarily talking attorneys... a guardian has incurred expense to take care of this person. They would still... they would be able to recover from a court while that ward is still alive, right?"

Costa Howard: "That... yes, Representative. Yes."

Halpin: "And under the current law, if they were to file a petition for fees a week before the person died, the court would grant them, as matter of court... well not as a matter of a course.

I'll get back to that... but the court would grant those..."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Costa Howard: "Yes."

Halpin: "...and allow the guardian to take those fees, correct?"

Costa Howard: "Absolutely."

Halpin: "Once the ward dies, however, any fees that had been accumulated by the guardian under current law get pushed to the very back of the line behind unsecured creditors even."

Costa Howard: "Yes."

- Halpin: "So... and on that issue of cost caps and everything, what is your understanding as to how those fees are awarded by a court?"
- Costa Howard: "The guardian would have to file a petition for fees with the court. And the judge would review those fees, they go line by line, and they make a judicial finding that the fees were necessary and reasonable for the care of the ward. Those fees are also determined by the court and by region."
- Halpin: "And so, for an example, maybe, if a court's looking at expenses, and a week before a ward passes away all of the sudden there's a lot of purchases for let's say clothing or restaurant's or something like that. In that situation, a court would look at that suspect and say these certainly weren't reasonable there's something going on here, right?"
- Costa Howard: "Absolutely, Representative. 'Cause I... I'm sorry.

 I failed to mention, as part of that fee petition, the individual, whether it's an attorney or just a simple individual, would also be required to include any receipts and essentially, as we say, prove up the fact that they... these fees were reasonable and necessary."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Halpin: "And so, although there's no absolute dollar cap, there
 is a limit on what a guardian can seek from the court?"
Costa Howard: "Yes."

Halpin: "All right. I'll go to the Bill. I had the honor and privilege of serving as public guardian for Rock Island County for several years before I joined the Assembly. And in my experience, the courts look on these claims with a healthy skepticism. And they make sure that any such claims are reasonable and necessary for the care of the guardian. And this Bill solves a fairness issue where a quardian has put in a lot of time, perhaps even put off a petition for fees to make sure that the quardian's... the ward's needs are taken care of during their lifetime, but then seek the reasonable compensation that they're entitled to under the statute. This puts the quardian in the same position as the executor or administrator of the ward after the ward passes away. It's an extremely reasonable Bill. And it... I would strongly urge a 'yes' vote just as a matter of fairness for the folks that take care of these disabled adults. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Halpin. For further discussion, Representative Bennett is recognized."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not a lawyer, and we just heard three of them talk about a number of things. And so, with that being said, let me share with you a couple things. For the past couple years I've been a commissioner with the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. And I know there are other Members on this House that are also part of that commission. In this time I've become more sensitized to the extent of labor and priorities that guardians, state,

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

public, and private, must place under a work with or on behalf of wards. This Bill is one of many that the... Illinois guardianship... I'm sorry... commissioner with the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission basically have worked with the Sponsor to ensure the state guardians and others concerns have been addressed. And so, with that experience, I think it makes sense. Now, if I may, there are seven levels of claims. Now... please as ... as I just mentioned, I'm not a lawyer. So, I'm learning as we go on this. But there are seven levels of basically classifications... and I see a couple of other Representatives standing up, and they speak on this too. But there's three I want to note. The first level of classification... please. Please. Thank you. The first level is claims of surviving spouse or childs of the ward. Okay? I'm sorry that's the second one. The first one is funeral and burial expenses, expenses of administration and statutory custodial claims. So expenses that they take, they're first. That's what it is today. The second, the surviving spouse or childs of the ward. That's number two. And the seventh one, go all the way down past three, past four, past five, past six, past... and up to seven. Basically seven is left over all other claims. And so, that's what we're talking about in this Bill today. Along with that, if this Bill does not pass, under current law here's what happens. If a ward passes away... and this is the point that I'm focused on... passes away during guardianship, the fee's that a guardian would receive while they were alive as first-class claims, which is today, then it gets pushed all the way down to seventh-class claim. All the work of the guardian, state, public, or private, which

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

can include family members, I repeat, can include family members, is then often unpaid. So, the quardian that's been working on this, and the person dies, they're all the way down at the bottom. There's nothing left. A guardian usually focuses on the care of the ward when they're alive using those... the few assets they typically have. The needs of the ward are the priority, and after a ward passes away a quardian should be able to have first claim status so that they can collect fees deemed reasonable by the court. Deemed reasonable by the court. All right. If this Bill passes, final fees and costs, that's final fees and costs, associated with quardianship will then be regarded as first-class claims. And those who have provided guardianship to a ward, which can then include family members, of course, will be able to file a petition and receive those costs subject, again, to court approval. Which is what our lawyer friends and... legislative folks here were trying to say. So, please, I'm not talking about this as a lawyer, I don't have that background. But in terms of what this is about, I think it ... it makes a lot of sense. I do have one question, if I may, Speaker of ... of the Representative Costa Howard, if I may?"

- Speaker Evans: "Representative Costa Howard indicates she yields.

 You may proceed."
- Bennett: "Thank you. Representative I need to ask you. I think I know the answer, but I... I'm not sure. Are you a guardian today? Civil, state, what..."
- Costa Howard: "Thank you, Representative. Yes. I am an attorney who practices law in the area of probate and guardianship. I

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

serve as a court-appointed guardian ad litem for wards and I also serve as a representative of wards."

Bennett: "So, you understand the process, you understand the wards, you understand the guardians and the needs involved?"

Costa Howard: "Absolutely."

Bennett: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you. For further discussion, Representative Davis is recognized."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have to give kudos to Representative Costa Howard who has worked tirelessly on getting this Bill done despite a lot of rhetoric saying that she doesn't know what she's talking about. You just heard her say that this is an area of expertise that she has. So, let's, again, support this piece of legislation. She has worked hard with the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, of which I am a commissioner along with Representative Bennett. And we know that that commission works very hard to support the people in care here in the State of Illinois that they work with and all of their sectors. So, I definitely want to make sure that we give credit to Representative Costa Howard on all of her hard work, and I would strongly encourage every Member of this chamber to vote 'yes' on this piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Davis. Being no further discussion, the Chair recognizes... further discussion, Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. As one of the former speakers noted, he was not an attorney, I, too, am not

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

an attorney. However, the Senate Sponsor, Senator Tracy, is my Senator, my dear friend, a Member... a former Member of this chamber before she moved over to the Senate. She is an attorney. Her specialty was also in family law. I'm very glad that she found an honorable person to help her carry that Bill because I know this is an issue that she has worked on for many, many years. And doing absolutely the right thing to get everything right. So, thank you, Representative."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Costa Howard to close."

Costa Howard: "I want to remind this Body that this Bill did pass last year unanimously off this House Floor by many of the Members who are still sitting here today. This is a Bill that helps people who don't have a voice. This isn't about being an attorney. This is about what our responsibility to be the voice of the voiceless. And this Bill does just that. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 80 pass?' All those in favor say (sic-vote) 'aye'; all those opposed say (sic-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 103 voting in 'favor', 12 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Again, on page 2 of the Calendar, under Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 64, offered by Leader Ammons. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 64, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 64 intends to encourage the use of restorative justice practices in the state. Some judges already have the privilege to assign people to restorative circles. However, what is shared in those circles are not privileged and not protected. So, this Bill simply provides a privilege protection for those who willfully participate in restorative justice circles as assigned by a judge and protects what is a shared in those circles. And I'm open to questions from any of our Members. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Is there any discussion? I see Representative Ugaste is recognized."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "Leader indicates she will. You may proceed."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Afternoon, Leader Ammons. How are you today?"

Ammons: "I'm well. Thank you, Representative."

Ugaste: "Good. Good. I have just a couple questions for you 'cause I'm always a little leery when we're creating a new privilege, where things said may not be used in court. Doesn't mean I'm opposed to it. I just want to make sure I'm clear on a few things, if I could."

Ammons: "Yes, Sir."

Ugaste: "So, I understand that the restorative justice practice is pretty well defined..."

Ammons: "Yes, Sir."

Ugaste: "...and what that entails. What I don't understand is who may be parties to that actual practice where the meetings occurring and... and how that's determined?"

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- Ammons: "So, currently the judges, whoever, in whatever jurisdictions utilizes restorative circles, can offer that to the victim and the perpetrator of whatever the incident is. And they currently do that, except that what is shared in those circles under this provision would allow it to be protected. Any other evidence associated with the case can still go through the regular judicial process. But, in this case, if people participate willfully in that circle, what they share will be privileged and protected."
- Ugaste: "And... and if I... and from what you're saying that I'm hearing today, you're saying it would just the victim and potentially the perpetrator. Is that correct?"
- Ammons: "It would be whomever is in relationship to that case.

 Yes, Sir."
- Ugaste: "Whoever's in relationship? So, I guess I'm trying to understand fully how that's determined because, if we have a whole group of people within the room and... and someone else admits to something that's not even part of what this meeting is set up for and admits to a crime or doing something, do they receive the same privilege? Because if they do, that seems somewhat problematic to me."
- Ammons: "This would be up to the judiciary, and they would determine what is covered under the privilege under this law. It would not change any other evidentiary proceedings whatsoever."
- Ugaste: "Okay. Well, actually... and I... I don't mean to correct you, but for everyone's understanding as to why I'm questioning it, we're actually determining who the privilege would apply to. And it would any person then who attends this

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

meeting, but the individual judge would decide then who's in attendance and the privilege would ultimately apply to. So..."

Ammons: "It will still... yes, Sir."

Ugaste: "...any chance you'd be willing to consider limiting it to the individual I... that's been harmed as well as the person who's caused the harm as far as the privilege is concerned? I just don't want this being a free-for-all where something may be said by others that's really tangential or maybe not even related and them receiving a privilege that we don't afford anyone else in the state. I mean, this is... our privileges for statements made outside of court not being used in court are extremely limited. And I just want to make sure we keep that practice."

Ammons: "This... this particular one, of course, this is not a new concept. The restorative justice circles are not new concepts in the State of Illinois. So, we're not creating that."

Ugaste: "Right."

Ammons: "What we're creating here, is to allow, in this case, that there's confidentiality in relationship to the circle. And that anything that is discussed in that restorative justice circle can't be used as evidence in the case. So, there may be other evidentiary purposes that are outside of that circle, but people have to willfully participate in the circle or they don't have to. But it would be still driven by the judge."

Ugaste: "Okay."

Ammons: "The judge also can provide oversight to ensure the practice is legitimate. And if there are any concerns or questions, the judge still has authority to deal with the

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

process during the practice or through the process of the courts."

Ugaste: "Okay. Leader Ammons, I understand the goal of what you're trying to get at, and I'm supportive of it. And if we could limit the confidentiality to just the individual as... as well as the person who... the individual who is harmed as well as the person who caused harm, I'd be very supportive of it. What I have a hard time supporting is..."

Ammons: "Yeah."

- Ugaste: "...extending a privilege from the judicial proceeding... a statement that could be used in a judicial proceeding to other people as well. So, thank you for answering my questions today. I greatly appreciate it. And again, while I'm supportive of the concept, the Bill itself as drafted, I... I just don't believe I can support. So, thank you."
- Ammons: "I appreciate you, Representative Ugaste. This is still in the hands of the judges, and they get to determine who will be in the circle."
- Speaker Evans: "For further discussion, Representative McCombie is recognized."
- McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield just for a couple of questions for clarification?"
- Speaker Evans: "Leader indicated she will. You may proceed."
- McCombie: "Okay. I just want to make sure that we do have protections in place and we do have safe guards in place. And I believe it is limited enough because of this language, if you could confirm? The Bill provides the privilege does not apply when disclosure is necessary to prevent death, great bodily harm, or the commission of a crime. Is that correct?

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Ammons: "That's correct."

McCombie: "It does not apply when it's necessary to comply with another law. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That is correct."

McCombie: "And lastly, it does not... the privilege does not apply when a court, a tribunal, or administrative body requires a report on a restorative justice practice. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That is correct."

McCombie: "Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I do believe that this is limited and that there are safe guards in place.

I understand a new practice can be concerning, but I do... you do have my support. Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a great practice. It's good legislation. And it is limited and keeps this in the hands of the judiciary, even though it is a restorative justice practice. And I ask for an 'aye' for its passage."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 64 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the question, there are 82 voting in 'favor', 32 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill, receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 2 of the Calendar, under Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 81, offered by Representative Mason. Clerk, please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 81, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Mason is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Chair. Senate Bill 81 creates a line item in the Illinois income tax form to support the Ronald McDonald House Charities. Ronald McDonald of Central Illinois covers counties throughout Illinois, including Champaign, Springfield, Decatur, Bloomington, Quincy, and almost to the Quad Cities. If you're not familiar with them, they have homes where families can stay, they have rooms in children's hospitals, and they have mobile health care units. All to provide care and comfort to children suffering from major illnesses and to their families to help them get through some of the most horrific times of their lives as they are trying to support their children facing horrible, horrible diseases. Many people think that McDonalds Corporation funds the Ronald McDonald Charities. However, they do not. There are no corporate contributions. Instead franchisees participate board members and do fundraisings through their stores. But individual donations are the bulk of their money. This is a very, very important charity, something that I think we can all understand the necessity for. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 81 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 2 of the Calendar, under Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 265, offered by Representative Hernandez. Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 265, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Hernandez is recognized."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 265 amends the Energy Efficient Act to increase participation of funding and... for the energy efficient program. It would also allow to expand priority to families regardless of immigration status, which... and who have children under the age of six."

Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you, Representative. Any discussion? Representative Wheeler for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will. You may proceed."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative Hernandez, great to see you.

We've talked about this Bill, just the two of us did. But I want to put some things on the record so that the Body understands a few different parameters that are a part of your Bill. This is a pretty substantial expansion in LIHEAP, would that be a fair assessment?"

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "And you want to expand it so that more people can be...

take advantage of the program that aren't taking advantage of

it today that probably are eligible."

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "So... but there are some things that this does that are... that people should be aware of. One element of this is that

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- it's going to... well, tell me how this is funded first. Walk me through that part, Barbara, if you would, about how the funding is going to happen to expand this program."
- Hernandez, B.: "So, currently the program is being funded by the utility charges of customers. So... yeah."
- Wheeler: "But... if my notes are right, these are doubling of the meter charge. Is that what your intention is?"
- Hernandez, B.: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that again?"
- Wheeler: "My notes say this is a doubling of the monthly mandatory meters charge assessed by Ameren, ComEd, Nicor, and Peoples Gas."
- Hernandez, B.: "So, the charges will only be tripled if... after 80 percent of the funds are dispersed."
- Wheeler: "So, there's a trigger later on that occurs that actually raises the monthly charge. Is that... am I getting that right?"
- Hernandez, B.: "It's in three years."
- Wheeler: "Could you repeat that for me?"
- Hernandez, B.: "Three years."
- Wheeler: "In three years it changes? Okay. And then there's an element of this Bill as well, I think you mentioned it in your opening, that this would apply to people of any immigration status. Is that correct?"
- Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."
- Wheeler: "And there's another part that says that if anybody is a recipient eligible for LIHEAP they also qualify for all other programs under the Energy Assistance Act. Is that also right?"
- Hernandez, B.: "We are not sure about that. We can follow up with you."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- Wheeler: "Well, I guess that's an important question. So, I guess my next question to you, Barbara, was just going to be, what other programs are there? 'Cause I'm not familiar with that program enough to know, but I would assume that there are other programs, probably some taxpayer funded programs, and that would be triggered for anybody who would be eligible under LIHEAP, which now would include anyone under any immigration status. And I just want to make sure I understand that before I vote."
- Hernandez, B.: "To my understanding, this is only for LIHEAP, as you've stated."
- Wheeler: "Right, but there's a part of the language that refers to if you're eligible... if a recipient is eligible for LIHEAP, they shall qualify for all of the programs under the Energy Assistance Act. I'm just not familiar with that Act enough to know. So, I was going to ask if you would... if you could elaborate on what those other programs might be."
- Hernandez, B.: "To my understanding it's only LIHEAP."
- Wheeler: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. There's some laudable goals that are outlined here in Senate Bill 265. However, Members need to be conscious of the fact that there's going to be a fee increase that's going to be mandatory at point and time in the future as well as the fact that this is now an expansion that now effects everyone regardless of current immigration status. So, I just want Members to be able to vote their own switch on this, their district, and be aware of what's in the Bill. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Manley: "Manley in the Chair. Representative Hernandez to close."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Hernandez, B.: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 265 pass?'
All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'nay'. 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 71 voting in 'favor', 46 voting 'against',

0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 267, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 267, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill may be familiar to us. We passed this a couple of weeks ago as House Bill 2878. Unfortunately, the Senate... well, fortunately or unfortunately, the Senate passed it just a few moments before we did. So, we're back here with the Senate version. This is a very simple Bill that asks the universities and community colleges to collect data about how many studentparents attend their institution, meaning students who themselves are also parents. This is agreed language. There's no opposition. The universities are on board with this language. It passed the Senate unanimously. In our last debate, the Gentleman from Plainfield suggested this was a bad Bill, vote no. I said it was a good Bill, vote 'yes'. We had a little bit of a difference of opinion there. But I hope we can all come around to this being a good Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go directly to the Bill. This is a bad Bill, vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "I'm sorry. I will repeat. This is a bad Bill, vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "This is a phenomenal Bill. It's only gotten better with time. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 267 pass?'
All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'nay'. 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', 45 voting 'opposed',
0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair
recognizes Leader Bennett. For what reason do you seek
recognition?"

Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege,
 if I may, for a moment?"

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm sharing these comments today for a lady by the name of Sharon Perzee, and she's watching from home right now. Sharon is a good friend and a good lady. I would like to share a few comments from House Resolution 66 on behalf of her and her husband, Marvin Perzee, who passed away July 17, 2019. This Resolution mourns the passing of Marvin E. Perzee and declares May 20, 2021, that is today, as 'Marvin Perzee County Fair Day'. Marvin and

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Sharon are married for 40 years folks. They were partners in so many things. Marvin and Sharon both grew up around agriculture, county fairs, and 4-H. Marvin was a volunteer for the Chargers for five decades. Wow. Forty-eight years on the Iroquois County Agricultural and 4-H Club Fair Board. Marvin held many other leadership roles in agriculture. He worked hard to make the Iroquois County Fairs one of the premiere county fairs in the state. He was a tireless advocacy or advocate for county fairs because, one, they were economic engines for local communities and, two, they also cultivated the next generation to have an interest in agriculture. And all the while, Sharon was right there beside him. What a team all these years. They both focused on work ethic, finding a way and taking pride in what they loved doing. What a love affair. Thank you, Marvin and Sharon, for your leadership, for caring about others, and for being great role models for many others to follow. And, Marvin, today is your day. Happy Marvin Perzee County Fair Day. God bless you both. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Marvin. Thank you, Representative.

Back on Third Reading, Senate Bill 340, Representative

LaPointe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. SB340 is about increasing the ability of Illinois families to save for college through an employer match program that already exists. This Bill extends the sunset on the current statute on the college

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

savings employer match from 2021 to 2024. The maximum annual tax credit provided to employers that match an employee's contributions to these qualified college savings and prepaid tuition remains at \$500 per employee. That's the nature of the Bill, and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 340 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 525, Representative Halpin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 525, a Bill for an Act concerning labor relations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 525 does three things. First, modifies the definition of confidential employee, managerial employee, and supervisor to make clear that whether or not an employee falls under those categories is not solely dependent on a written job description and actually includes and covers what the job duties of that individual are. Second, it clarifies that... the factors that are listed for a... an employee to bring a unit clarification petition and redefine the bargaining unit. And then, lastly, it extends, by six months, the maximum time that a collective bargaining agreement can continue into the following term of a constitutional officer to allow additional time to

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

negotiate on a good faith basis before potentially reaching impasse. This is a negotiated Bill with CMS... CMS, which is neutral. And I, as always, will grudgingly answer any questions and ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

Reick: "Representative Halpin, I will grudgingly ask you a few questions."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed, Sir."

Reick: "Representative, how many state employees are now represented by a labor union, be it AFSCME, SEIU, or any of the others? Do you know off the top of your head?"

Halpin: "Yeah, I believe, as we talked in committee, the number is 93 or 94 percent. Are in a unit."

Reick: "In a unit?"

Halpin: "Yeah. There are several different bargaining units..."

Reick: "Sure. Okay. Right. Right."

Halpin: "...that cover various standpoints. It's not all one unit."

Reick: "No, I understand that. So, we've got six or seven percent of Illinois workers who are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement or are represented by union, I mean to say."

Halpin: "That's correct."

Reick: "Okay. It's obvious that AFSCME wants to pick up those six or seven because of a draftsmanship error in the definition of certain job categories. Why is it that we can't change the definitions, instead of having the ability of... it's obvious that people who are in managerial positions sometimes wear many hats, you know what I mean? You're a partner in a law firm, you wear a lot of hats. So, the thing is, is that what

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

you're trying to do is give those people who maybe do a... a function that is, shall we say, incidental to their defined roll, it gives the union the opportunity to sweep them in under their representation agreement. Is that pretty much what we're looking at here?"

- Halpin: "No. So, what this Bill does is to make sure that an employee whose actual job duties are not the type of duties that would qualify them as strictly a manager or supervisor to make sure that they can, if they want to, appropriately join a bargaining unit and be under a collective bargaining agreement."
- Reick: "I guess, I'm confused then. If a person is in a position in State Government that is defined by one of these... one of these categories that we're trying to... now seem to effectively eliminate, what is to... you know, what we're looking at are... is there a... it looks like we're going to have the same people on both sides of the... of the table bargaining with one another. Even though they may be members of different unions, their bread is buttered on the same side."
- Halpin: "No, I... I don't think that's the case at all. For true...

 the reason we have those definitions for managerial employee
 is to differentiate who essentially is exempt from... from
 collective bargaining. This just makes sure that the
 employees that would appropriately be eligible for effective
 bargaining unit are able to actually be in that collective
 bargaining unit."
- Reick: "To the Bill. We end up with this situation because of a former Governor who spent seven years in jail, or however long he was there, because he treated management so badly

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

that they were forced to unionize because they were treated as second-class citizens. And now what we have is a workforce that, whether or not it belongs to one union or another, all fall into the same brella... umbrella of being represented by a... by a union. Management. Management in any organization is classically not unionized because, when the union employees go out on strike, management has to pick up the slack. Management has to show up and do the jobs that the laborers who are on strike. They have to cross picket lines. And if you have a situation where you have one bargaining unit that says, I don't want to go to work, are the managers who belong to a different bargaining unit going to cross that picket line to do the job that we demand of the people of the ... to provide the services here in the State of Illinois? I don't think so. So, I think that what we're looking at here is, an effort by the public sector unions, and we're getting a lot of that this term, to double down on their authority and their control of every single aspect of what goes on in this state. I can't strongly... strongly enough urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, thank you for your begrudging time, or whatever it was, that was good. I'm trying to keep my comments tight today. So, I just wanted to clarify something that I had heard. Ninety-three percent of workers are already unionized, but somehow that seven percent... seven percent

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

isn't management or they need to slide into the other area, but..."

Halpin: "It's... yeah. It's not... I mean, it's not all seven percent.

There are certainly employees in State Government that fall under confidential employee, managerial employee, and supervisor."

Batinick: "Okay. But... okay. But 93 percent is already?"

Halpin: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. That's all I wanted to clarify. Thank you."

Halpin: "Yep."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Halpin to close."

Halpin: "I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 525 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. 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', 39 voting 'against',
0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to
page 5, Bills on Second Reading. Senate Bill 153,
Representative Kifowit. Representative Kifowit. Out of the
record. On page 6, Senate Bill 336, Representative Stuart.
Out of the record. Senate Bill 685, Representative West. Out
of the record. Senate Bill 700, Representative Stuart. Mr.
Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 700, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments.

Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Stuart."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart on the Amendment."

38th Legislative Day

- Stuart: "Sorry. The Amendment is just simply some technical language that we got from folks in the insurance industry and the banking industry to clarify some definitions of terms."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. On page 7, Senate Bill 825, Representative Smith. Representative Smith. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1596, Representative Mah. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1596, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1646, Representative Marron. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1646, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted. No further Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please read... please hold the Bill on Second Reading. Senate Bill 1667, Representative Welter. Representative Welter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1673, Representative Stuart. Representative Stuart. Out of the record. Moving up to page 8. Senate Bill 1784, Representative Guzzardi. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1845, Representative Harper. Representative Harper. Out of the record. Senate Bill

38th Legislative Day

- 1846, Representative Lisa Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1847, Representative Harper. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1861, Representative Windhorst. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1861, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Windhorst."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Windhorst on the Amendment."
- Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment makes four changes to the Bill. It changes the name of Impact Incarceration Program to Impact Program. It changes the requirements of the program. It also extends the length of the Impact Program from four to six months to a year. And the final change is that the Department of Corrections will advocate for the Impact Program."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Windhorst moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1965, Representative Ford. Representative Ford. Out of the record. Senate Bill

38th Legislative Day

- 2066, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. On page 9, Senate Bill 2122, Representative Slaughter. Representative Slaughter. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2122, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2133, Representative Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2133, a Bill for an Act concerning demographic data. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Moving on to page 10, Senate Bill 2370, Representative Slaughter. Out of the record. Returning to Bills on Third Reading. Page 2, Senate Bill 573, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 573, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 573 is the Secretary of State's omnibus Bill. I'm free to answer any questions if anybody has any."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Ford: "So, Representative, did Secretary White approve of you passing this Bill?"
- D'Amico: "Yes. We sat down and had a personal conversation."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Ford: "Oh, that's good. Do you have any intentions on being a Secretary of State in the State of Illinois? Because you run lots of Bills to do this with the Vehicle Code."

D'Amico: "I would never rule anything out."

Ford: "Okay. You could..."

D'Amico: "Is that an endorsement?"

Speaker Manley: "Representative D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "I just appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate 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 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meier, do you... for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Meier: "The Republicans would like to let it be known that Representative McLaughlin is excused for the rest of the day. Can't even talk today."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2021: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 156; recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 156."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

- Speaker Manley: "Senate Bills on Third Reading. Senate Bill 626,
 Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 636,
 Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 636, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 636 simply allows for condominium associations to place a requirement in their bylaws that a majority of the board must be comprised of individuals occupying their condominium units. I want to stress this is a permissive only, not a mandate. And I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

- Batinick: "Representative... where are you these days? There you are. Thank you. Thank you very much. I am not going to do as eloquent of a job as the person who usually debates Jud Civ Bills. So, I apologize for that in advance. But I did have some concerns. We brought some up in caucus. Deconversions or condominium associations with a lot of investors, do you have any way of addressing that? I mean, it seems like you could have a tyranny of the minority if you go that route."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "So, it's my understanding that the Bill was brought to address the main concern, that members of a condominium boards do not reside on a condominium property and that that could result in unfair deconversions or decisions that could impact those who actually live in their

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

unit. The Illinois State Bar Association and associations representing condo associations did negotiate... come to agreement on this Bill language, which ensures that they... one, that it's permissive and, two, they included language that would not allow a board to adopt a rule that a majority of members... that more than a majority... I'm sorry... of members of a condo board live in their condo units. So, you can allow for a simple majority but not greater than a majority."

Batinick: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "Do you know how many votes it takes, once you do put something like this into a master declaration, to undo it?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm sorry. I... I would assume that that depends on the... the declaration inn the bylaws of a particular association. But I..."

Mazzochi: "No. And see this is one of the concerns that I have with the way in which the legislation is drafted. Is that, historically in Illinois, we have not taken it upon ourselves to discriminate amongst unit owners, whether you are a unit owner that lives within state, or you are a unit owner that lives outside of state, you are a unit owner who lives there, you are a unit owner who is renting it out. We normally don't allow our condo associations to discriminate based on your unit owner type. What this is... to the extent that you want to do something in the bylaws, it usually has to be reasonably related to particular differential of costs that you're actually going to generate as a consequence of someone living

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

in the unit and outside the unit, usually in the context of owner associated... homeowner run associations. However, when it comes to a master declaration, normally if you want to undo something that's in a master declaration, it is not just a majority vote. It is a massive super-majority vote, usually 80 percent, 90 percent, or even higher. So, the problem then becomes, if you are particularly in a small association where you have to have a president, secretary, treasurer, and you have several people who, for whatever reason, are either unit investors or maybe this is not their primary residence, they live in Florida, they live in another state, and then they are here. You are now setting up a situation where either your board may not be able to function, because you literally will not have enough people to make a majority. And to try to undo what you have here, you... it's not just a change of bylaws. It's a change of the declaration itself. Which is going to require a super-majority provision, which, course, you may not be able to obtain. So, to the Bill. What this Bill is basically doing is saying, we're going to privilege one group of unit owners to the exclusion of another group of unit owners. And while it is true that there are some situations where investor unit owners may not make the type of capital investment that you would like them to, there are also just as many situations where you can have investorowned units and the investors or the people who are not resident in the units, because they live in another state and this is a second home or this is... they will actually be upset because the people who are the primary residents are not doing what they should be to be taking care of their properties.

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

So, through this Bill, you're essentially saying, well, we only think there's going to be just one type of homeowner and not the other type of unit owner. And unfortunately, exactly the point when you're going to need to have your nonresident owners taking over control of the board, such as when you need a massive capital infusion when your homeowners are not actually taking care of units, when maybe you are in an area with a declining market and the only people who have a market are your investors, you're going to make it harder for people to actually retain value within your units. So, for that reason, I'm a 'no' vote."

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

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to address one thing that the previous Speaker noted and just... state for the record that this is permissive. The portion of this Bill is in the section relating to contents of the bylaws, not the declaration. I know of no opposition. And I'd ask for 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 636 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. There are 74 voting in 'favor', 32 voting 'opposed', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 730, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Didech: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 730 creates the Electronic Wills and Remote Witnesses Act. Its purpose is to provide for the valid execution and attestation of wills through audio/video communication and for the valid execution attestation and witnessing of documents other than wills through audio/video communication. This is an initiative of the Trust and Estate Section Council of the Illinois State Bar Association. Several other states are adopting similar laws. And this is a, I believe, a positive direction for Illinois to go as well. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "The reason... one of the reasons why I did not vote in 'favor' of this Bill is just, everyone needs to start thinking through the consequences of electronic witnessing. I understand that right now, in the time of COVID and with Zoom, it seems like it's a very simple thing. But unfortunately, the whole reason why we have a lot of these witness laws, philosophically, is because we want to make sure that when people are signing these critical documents that are going to really impact their lives, their assets that are significant in material that it's being done with full consent, with no coercion, with no risk that there's any confusion going on. And one of the things that we have here in the legislation, such as on pages 24 to 25, 'in the presence of' just means that you can be ... it means you can be in a different physical location but just be able to see or to hear, or to communicate, or know that the person is signing the document

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

in real time, but it doesn't give the added protections of ensuring that the person is free from coercion or other things that could actually a... you know, change the balance of power and equities when these are being signed. So, for that reason, I'm a 'no' vote. Because we just... we put these in-person presence provisions in State Law for a reason. And we should be really leery about tearing those out without making sure we've got solid... solid backup approaches behind them. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech to close."

Didech: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am glad the other speaker brought up the... the COVID-19 provisions of this Bill because one of the reasons why I'm confident this is such a good Bill is we had a forced pilot program for many of these provisions during the COVID-19 crisis through the Governor's Executive Order, and what we found is that they worked really well. And that there weren't unintended consequences. So, I think we should join the many other states moving in this direction. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 730 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 98 voting in 'favor', 16 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Leader Harris on the Motion."

38th Legislative Day

- Harris: "Speaker, I move the posting requirements be waived so the following Bill can be heard in the Judiciary Civil Committee, House Resolution 323."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Senate Bill 755, Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 755, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I'm presenting Senate Bill 755. What this does is, it's a very simple Bill. It just requires DCFS to maintain the... the name, the email, and the phone number for the guardian ad litem. And to provide that information to the minor, the foster parent, or the caseworker if it's requested. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 755 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'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 805, Representative Greenwood. Out of the record. Senate Bill 808, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 808, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill is substantively identical to House Bill 256 of the 101st General Assembly, which passed this Body with broad bipartisan support. It simply requires that for the exam for teacher licensure that videotaping not be part of that exam. It's agreed language from the Illinois State Board of Education. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "I'll be brief, but not as brief as last time, Representative. You know, I know... unanimous in committee but some opposition in the Senate. And my understanding is this was brought about because some student teachers couldn't get up and teach with the videotape because of COVID. But this makes that situation permanent. So, we're kind of deregulating teacher licenses a little bit here, is essentially what's going on, right?"

Guzzardi: "Well, if... if it makes you more comfortable with it, Leader Batinick, then we can call it deregulation."

Batinick: "Okay. But that's what it's doing, right? They... because of COVID we stop doing the videotape to get your teacher's license..."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Guzzardi: "Exactly."

Batinick: "...and we're taking something that we did temporary for the situation and made it permanent, correct?"

Guzzardi: "So, it will still be the same edTPA test, it just won't have the video component. Exactly."

Batinick: "Got it. That's all I was looking for the clarification on. Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Bourne."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, is this similar to your Bill from the 101st General Assembly?"

Guzzardi: "It is. Yeah. House Bill 256, yes."

Bourne: "Thank you. And I know I requested in committee that this not go on the Consent Calendar because I know last time in the 101st General Assembly it passed 83 to 23. So, I would just encourage folks on our side of the aisle to check the way you voted last time. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, this is agreed language. There was a little bit of controversy around this subject when we brought it two years ago, but we've worked closely with the various stakeholders to come to agreement on this language. And I ask the Body for an 'aye' vote. I appreciate your time."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 808 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting in 'favor', 25 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 813, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 813, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill basically holds school districts harmless if they lost population due to the COVID... COVID epidemic through no fault of their own. There is no cost associated with this. We are just holding them harmless. This affects over 50 school districts within the State of Illinois. I'd be happy to read them all, if you'd like to know. But it's a good measure. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Bourne."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I know we had a good conversation in committee, and I was able to talk to ISBE for a while after committee as well. But I just have a few questions for clarification. Is there any way for us to know if enrollment was lost due to students being under the compulsory school age, or if they went to another institution, or if they moved out of state? Do we have any way of knowing that?"

Mayfield: "No. That data was not tracked to my knowledge. From the school districts that I talked to, a lot of it dealt with

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

parents who had work situations that prohibited their children from retaining, they had family members who were sick that had an effect on attendance. So, there are a myriad of reasons why the enrollment dropped."

"Thank you. I appreciate that. And I know that this is ... Bourne: it gets a little wonky as to why different data adjustments have to be made for the tier allocation of schools in the evidence-based model. But I would just contend... to the Bill, Madam Speaker... that this Bill should have gone through ... we have... we have a group called the Professional Review Panel that is charged with looking at any changes to the model. And while I'm sympathetic to the fact that there were many educational challenges for families and that I don't want school districts to be unnecessarily punished by moving up to a different tier than maybe what they deserve, I think that pushing this policy through, without going through that full process and without us knowing the full picture of where these dollars... or where the students go so that we can send the dollars accordingly, is rushing through this process. And for those in the Body, we have a hold harmless so that the enrollment from last year that stays at that same level for our funding for the next year. And so, I appreciate ISBE working with me and you on this Bill. And I appreciate your efforts. But I would encourage a 'no' vote. I think that this process should have gone through the Professional Review Panel. And I think we need more data to know exactly how this will impact our schools, your schools, and students across the state who chose educational opportunities that may have been in person. Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I'd just like to state, there is no opposition to this Bill. What this Bill does is it holds school districts harmless. A lot of our school districts, as you know, went through a lot of different transitions, a lot of our families went through a lot of transitions through COVID. Some of their children were absent due to no cause of that particular school district. School districts are open, students were not there. They should not be penalized because a parent decided to hold their child at home, or because there was a sick child within the house or a sick family member, and the entire family had to be quarantined, which then resulted in loss of school days. This Bill comes at no cost to the state. It does, in fact, hold everyone harmless and say we're going to understand that we had COVID and that there a lot of things that happened during this pandemic but that the school district should not be penalized. And again, there are 50 school districts throughout the state, the majority of them in the southern part of the state, that are going to be negatively impacted if we do not pass this Bill. Again, no opposition. ISBE is in support. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 813 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. 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 75 voting in 'favor', 39 voting 'opposed',

O voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 820, Leader Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 820, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 820 is the cleanup to our trailer Bill, House Bill 2170, that provides clarity on how students are going to be assigned to the next accelerated course. It makes an effective date, which is more technical, and it allows the agencies to implement the provisions in House Bill 2170. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House'... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 82'... I'm sorry, excuse me... 'Senate Bill 820 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'favor', 43 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1561, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1561, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1561 ensures that third-party loan modification service providers are subject to the same prohibitions against engaging unlawful discrimination that banks and other financial... financial institutions are already subject to under the Illinois Human Rights Act. The intent of the Bill is to put third-party loan modification service providers on the same

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

playing field as banks and others who are already subject to them... to those protections afforded by Article 3 of the Illinois Human Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination in real estate transactions. Third-party loan modification services are often predatory lenders who prey on those who are poor, lack financial resources and the sophistication necessary to engage on a level playing field. This is an initiative of the Attorney General and the Illinois Department of Human Rights. I know of no opposition. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Keicher."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Keicher: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for working on this with me. And I appreciate you helping clarify. And there's a couple of questions we want to go through for the purposes of legislative intent. As we talked about during committee and after committee, there's some very legitimate purposes that we want to make sure are not rolled up into this new piece of legislation. So, can you please describe for me the general situation where this is meant to play?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah. So, this is meant for a situation where you have a... you know, these are not your traditional banks, as we talked about. We have predatory lenders who often prey on people, like I said, who are poor, who lack financial resources and the sophistication to obtain a loan modification from a traditional bank. The bankers are actually in support of this. It puts these third-party players... loan modification providers, who are, like I said,

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

are often predatory, on the same playing field as the banks are already under. And so, this would just ensure that those protections apply to some of these bad actors."

Keicher: "So, we do reflect on our side that bankers are neutral.

Just for clarification for our people. And... and so, it's a
fair statement to say this is meant to apply to nefarious
actors that are third-party modifiers that are preying on the
poor and uneducated in the financial space?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's exactly right."

Keicher: "Okay. And this is not intended to apply to loan modifications for those that might be more financially savvy and are entering into agreements where the... the factors that are talked about may actually be relevant consideration, correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "That's correct. And I don't think they would be encompassed. You know, as we've talked about... you know, we want to make sure that we put these... these types of lenders under the same umbrella that other institutions are already required to play by."

Keicher: "I appreciate you working with me. We are probably going to have folks voting on either side of this question on our side. But thank you for your work on this."

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

Gong-Gershowitz: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1561 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this
question, there are 97 voting in 'favor', 19 voting 'opposed',

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

O voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1632, Representative LaPointe. Representative LaPointe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1730, Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1730, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1730 amends the Business Corporation Act of 18... of 1983 to add the self-reported sexual orientation and gender identity of members of a corporation's board of directors to the list of items required to be included on the corporation's annual report that is submitted to the Secretary of State. This demographic information will be in addition to what is currently required to be reported, which is the gender, race, and ethnicity of its directors. Right now only 25 of the 5,670 board seats in the Fortune 500 companies are occupied by openly LGBTQ individuals. For a population that makes up a significantly... significant component of the general public, this is a massive underrepresentation that negatively impacts the LGBTQ community. This Bill will help remedy this problem. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1730 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Collins, Conroy, DeLuca, Vella. Mr. Clerk,
please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting
in 'favor', 43 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill,

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes. I apologize. I meant to vote 'yes'. I wasn't included."

Speaker Manley: "The record will reflect your vote."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Senate Bill 1799, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rarely say this, but this is a very simple Bill. This is an initiative of the Metropolitan Township Association. And what it does is, it caps the amount of reserve that a township funds that are in the general assistant funds can be at only 2.5 times the annual revenue expenditure over the last couple years. We have already put into legislation on all other funds to be able to do it. And for some reason, the general assistant funds were not put with this limitation, and we are asking that they too can be done with that elimination. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1799 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 114 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1904, Representative Costa Howard. Out of the record.

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Senate Bill 1966, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill allows for an intergovernmental contract between states to allow for mental health services."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1966 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate... excuse me. Senate Bill 2007, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2007, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Senate Bill 2007 expands the sale of cottage foods in the State of Illinois. These are foods that are produced in home kitchens. Right now they're only available for sale at farmers' markets. This Bill will expand the venues at which they can be sold to fairs, festivals, public events, online, and by pickup and delivery. The Amendment before us today represents compromise after lengthy negotiations with public health stakeholders from across the state who had some initial concerns about making

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

sure that these foods are going to be safe. And we have reached consensus on those negotiations. This is a wonderful Bill, and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2007 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2129, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2150, Representative Niemerg. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2150, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2150, is a... amends the Municipality Code to allow firefighters quality... quantify a firefighters paid-on-call, part-time experienced firefighters over the age of 35 to take the examination to be full-time firefighters. And I ask for a 'favorable' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Carroll: "Is this your first Bill?"

Niemerg: "Yes, it is."

Carroll: "Okay, great. So, I have a few questions."

Niemerg: "Here it comes."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Carroll: "I have a few questions for you on that. How many... how many words are in your Bill? Since Representative... our fine Representative over here cannot answer the question, how many words do you... are specifically in there?"

Niemerg: "Several."

Carroll: "Okay. And how many... how many people does this affect?"

Niemerg: "Several."

Carroll: "Okay. Good. Well, congratulations on your first Bill. It's a great Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Keicher."

Keicher: "Representative, will the Representative yield, please?"

Speaker Manley: "The Representative will."

Keicher: "Thank you. Representative, can you please tell me what date this Bill came out of LRB?"

Niemerg: "Recently."

Keicher: "Can you tell me how the vote was in the Senate?"

Niemerg: "Favorably."

Keicher: "Can you tell me what date you picked this up on?"

Niemerg: "Recently."

Keicher: "Thank you, Sir. Congratulations."

Niemerg: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, this is about firefighters in your area, correct?"

Niemerg: "Yes."

Batinick: "Was the genesis of this Bill. Do they wear masks down by you?"

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Niemerg: "When fighting the fire, yes, they... yes."

Batinick: "No more questions."

Speaker Manley: "I love Mark Batinick. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2150 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed... pardon me... vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative. Moving on to Senate Bill 2153, Representative Zalewski. Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2179, Representative Ann Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2179, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill is an initiative of the Illinois State Bar Association. And it deals with an anomaly in the law which provides that, in order to bring a malpractice claim on a will, you have two years until after the death occurs. This doesn't matter, even if the will was prepared 20, 30, 40 years before. Obviously, this is impractical, as statutes of repose exist for a purpose to achieve finality, show litigation has relevant witnesses, documents, et cetera. So, the Bar Association is proposing to change that to make it consistent with other statutes of repose and provide for a six-year statute of repose after the

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

document is drafted. I'm happy to answer any questions. And I know of no..."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll just speak to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "So, since we've already decided we're going to feed the quardian ad items more money, why not feed the trust lawyers more money today too. This is a situation where the reason why we have statute of repose is because when it's... in the context of trusts and estates, you usually are not going to find out that your lawyer screwed up until someone dies. That's why, under our current law, we give someone a certain period of time after you die, you go through probate, you discover there's an error in the will to be able to raise a claim for attorney malpractice. What this Bill will essentially do is say, if you drafted a will, six years, even if you screwed up, you're free and clear even if at the point and time when someone actually dies they find out the mistake happened. In connection with this one of the ... I offered several pieces of compromise language, including something as simple as can you give notice to the person whose will you're drafting that they only have six years to discover the mistake. And that compromise was rejected. So, because this is something that, again, is not going to help the people who are actually going to suffer under the lawyer malpractice but is just going to work to the benefit of lawyers, I urge a 'no' vote."

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

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Ugaste: "Representative Williams, I believe Representative Mazzochi covered my main point during our discussion in committee. I would just ask... I'm the one who proposed the possible change to the statute that say that if you would indicate that there's some document letting this person know that there's a time a limit of six years so that, if they don't discover it and it's on them to come back and see an attorney, that then they're on the hook. Would you be willing to do that or... or you still opposed to that?"

Williams, A.: "I think I'd like to make two points in response to that. First of all, as we know, if you practice in the area of estates and wills you are having an ongoing relationship with you client and you will be continuing to advise them long after the will is drafted. Things change, people get remarried, divorces occur, deaths happen, tax laws change. a responsible attorney, if they're practicing So, responsibly, will be in contact with their client about changes that are necessary to their estate planning documents #1. And #2, to the idea of providing notice. If we're going to go down that road, I think that's a slippery slope. And I don't believe that we have philosophically decided, as a Body, to require notification of a statute of limitations or repose for every cause of action that exists. Because, of course, every cause of action has a statute of limitation or repose. So, I would say that would be a different direction then we have gone in the past as a General Assembly, and I haven't heard from colleagues that that's the direction we want to go now."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Ugaste: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Ugaste: "The Representative raises some good points. I understand the purpose of the Bill requiring someone to be legally liable for something someone maybe two generations removed may have done. And to cover that from malpractice is quite a burden. But without something letting the people know that if they don't have this will checked within a certain amount of time, and no one looks at it, and no one does anything... and as she indicated, responsible attorneys will continue to advise their clients and meet with them and let them know things such as this. But unfortunately, in my 30 some years of practice, I have to say as ... even though most ... almost all members of the bar are responsible and try and do well for their clients, I've seen far too many who are willing to take advantage of their clients, just do sloppy work, or... or otherwise. And by doing this, we're subjecting people... the general public, unknowingly, to not being able to pursue a malpractice action if something's wrong with their will. And as far as other areas of law not having it generally, you're absolutely right, statute of limitations are there. There's nothing saying there's a notice provision. I understand that. But this is subject... this is something that arises from legal advice being giving. And I've also seen courts impose statutes or notice provisions through statute of limitations, such as in workers' compensation. I won't go into details, but I raise the issue when we discussed in committee. So, while I'm generally in favor of the concept, without some sort of change

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

I'm going to be opposed. And I would ask that the… for a 'no' vote as well. Thanks."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams, A.: "Just a quick point. Health care providers, accountants, and lawyers already have a two-year statute of limitations, and a four-year statute of repose for health care providers, five years for accountants. So, I think this would just make it consistent with other professions, often who have documents that they prepare or other services they prepare for clients that might be subject to malpractice claims as well. So, this just makes it consistent, updates, and modernizes this provision of the law. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2179 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 78 voting in 'favor', 36 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2153. Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2153, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2153 is an initiative of Illinois Hospital Association to address issues related to nurse staffing. It issues a compliance mandate for what happens when a hospital falls behind on their staffing

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

plan. And it awards scholarships from the... from a specific fund to help with staffing violations. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2153 pass'...

pardon me... 'Senate Bill 2153 pass?' All those in favor vote
'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Moylan. Have all voted who
wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question,
there are 116 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'opposed', 0 voting
'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2183,
Representative Zalewski. Pardon me. Senate Bill 2193,
Representative Ortiz. Representative Ortiz. Out of the
record. Senate Bill 2201, Representative LaPointe. Out of the
record. Senate Bill 2240, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk,
please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2240, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2240 is identical to Senate Bill 2310 in the 101st General Assembly. In essence, Senate Bill 2240 amends the Government Severance Pay Act, expanding the definition of severance pay to include university presidents and chancellors who are transitioning to a new position within the University. It was found out that severance pay was getting paid to individuals that stayed within the university system but changed positions, and this Bill addresses that problem. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

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

Batinick: "It was pretty loud in here, Representative, but I'm just going to go off my notes 'cause I think you clarified it. We were a little bit surprised in committee, I believe, but... so, it was partisan. But we really support this Bill. So, it should've been unanimous in committee 'cause you're trying to clean up some messes that happened with some severance packages. Is that what we're doing here? This is a good government, save the taxpayers money, yee-haw Bill, right?"

Kifowit: "Absolutely."

Batinick: "Thank you. No further questions."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Brady."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Brady: "Along the same lines, Representative. In committee, when this Bill was brought forth, we did not have notice that it was going to be discussed that particular day in committee. And therefore, the problems in which we thought were a part of this and misunderstanding, quite frankly, were not there. So, we... I plan on supporting your Bill. Thank you."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2240 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

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 117 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', 0 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2265, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2265, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2265 amends the Nursing Home Act, and it adopts protocols specifying how informed consent for psychotropic medications can be obtained or refused. And for the purpose of this section, it will define licensed nurse to mean advanced practice registered nurse, a registered nurse, or a licensed practical nurse for this section only. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2265 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2290, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2290, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mayfield."

"Thank you so much. This Bill creates the Broadband Mayfield: Adoption Fund, which, as we noticed during COVID, a lot of families were suddenly found themselves stuck at home, working from home with one Internet connection, if they could afford that, and maybe two, three kids all on the same one. And when they went to... they found that their connectivity issues were just not there. And they basically could not afford to upgrade their broadband. Now this was just for basic working class families like those of us here. But for those individuals who are low income, they found themselves really scrambling. Children were having to utilize local McDonalds, Taco Bells, the Dunkin Donuts hot spots. Schools are using buses in low-income neighborhoods to provide Wi-Fi students who didn't have access to that at home. So, what this Bill does, it creates a voucher fund that will provide up to \$50 for low-income families so that we can address the digital divide. Families shouldn't have to choose between providing meals on the table and providing Internet so that they can do their work and their children can do their schooling or any other services that they may need. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2290 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Bill 2531, Representative DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2531, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 2531, this is the workaround of the State and Local Tax Deduction, SALT, the limit imposed by the Tax Cut and Jobs Act. The State and Local Tax, SALT, deduction allows families that pay local property taxes state and local sales taxes, and state income taxes to deduct those taxes from their federal income tax to avoid double taxation. The 2017 Tax Cut and Jobs Act capped the SALT deduction at 10 thousand, which negatively affected Illinois taxpayers as they could no longer claim the full deduction they were previously entitled SALT cap only applies to individuals, not corporations. Illinois will receive the amount of income tax receipts. It will not affect that. It's tax... it's revenue neutral, and the Illinois Department Revenue had input on this legislation. It passed the Senate unanimously, and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2531 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Bill 2664, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2664, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is the product of over two years of work on the Electronic Notary Task Force. As you recall, we passed that a couple years ago. So, Senate Bill 2664 amends the Illinois Notary Public Act and the Uniform Real Property Electronic Act by creating a class of notaries known as electric notaries public. These electric notaries must first be traditional notaries before they can apply to be an electronic notary. The Bill provides for all information regarding electronic notaries, including how they are appointed, how to apply, requirements for conducting an electronic notarization, and much more. It also allows for traditional notaries to perform remote notarizations with the main differences between remote notarizations and electronic notarizations being that remote notarizations may only be done when all individuals are present within Illinois, where as electronic notarization may be done for individuals residing outside Illinois. I ask for your support."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Rep... Representative. Can you confirm that, while a lot of work has been done to try to get to agreement, agreement, in fact, has not been reached?"

38th Legislative Day

- Kifowit: "There are some individuals that wanted two-factor authentication with regards to the remote notarization program only. The remote notarization program has been in effect because of COVID-19. It was deemed by the Secretary of State, who is in charge of the notaries, that a two-factor authorization for that measure was not necessary."
- Mazzochi: "Right. Well, and I... I appreciate that. But this isn't just a small organization. This is the Illinois Land and Title Association that is opposed to this aspect, right?"
- Kifowit: "They wanted two-factor notarization. The options for them to do two-factor notarization is... is available to them if they so choose. Mandated it in the Bill was not deemed necessary by the Secretary of State. But they are free to do that of their own accord."
- Mazzochi: "Right. But one of the concerns, of course, is that... in particular if your someone who is doing title insurance or something along those lines, is that once a document is out there the assumption... you know, you can't necessarily guarantee anymore that there's been two-factor authorization. You know, 2 years, 5 years, 10 years down the line someone's just going to see notary stamp, assume that maybe a procedure was complied with, but the only default rule they could assume is what's in the statute, right?"
- Kifowit: "The same process right now with a wet notary, such as the person stamps the paper and signs it, is the same in the remote notary. It's just that the person signs it and either overnights it to the notary and the notary still has to authenticate it. So, there is no difference with the current processes is now."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Mazzochi: "Sure. And again, this... we're not... changing this in statute permanently not just because of exigent circumstances. So, again, to the Bill. This will be yet another situation where the whole reason why we want to have notarization, usually you have to swear to someone in person and identify exactly who you are and you can confirm it, is because you are trying to cut down on fraud. In this particular situation, particularly when we're talking about land and title transfers, you want to make sure you have your title solid and clean. And because an important organization is not accepting of this, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Ammons."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, can you clarify that the process by which an electronic notary would register to become an electronic notary, the cost associated with that is aligned with a regular notary process? The fees associated?"

Kifowit: "I believe that was in House Amendment 1. I know in House Amendment 1 we removed the requirement of the underlying Bill for the notary to maintain an errors and omissions insurance policy in the minimum amount of \$25 thousand. In House Amendment 1 we create a fund to support the implementation of the electronic notary. I don't have that information in front of me at this point. We did not discuss fees with regards to this Bill."

Ammons: "I appreciate you clarifying that. I looked at the underlying portion of the Bill and in its concern that the actual fee schedule, which Secretary of State has lots and

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

lots of fees, but I think that they are a little bit of a disjointed and misalignment for people who want to be notary but the cost associated might be out of reach in relationship to that fee."

Kifowit: "In my notes... I apologize. In my notes, we increased the
 fee for standard notary public appointments from \$10 to \$15."
Ammons: "Okay."

Kifowit: "Ten dollars is to be deposited into the General Revenue Fund. Five dollars into the Electronic Notarization Fund. It adds a \$25 dollar fee for electronic notary appointments to be deposited into the Electronic Notarization Fund is what I have in my notes."

Ammons: "Okay. Thank you for clarifying that that is not beyond the capacity. Because one of the list of fees was beyond what I understood the regular notary fees to be. Thank you for the clarification on that."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Representative Kifowit, I'm just looking through this. And I might of missed part of the dialogue just a minute ago, and I apologize if I did. But walk me through the fee increases that are part of this. I just... I just see a small part of my notes here about 10 to 20... or 10 to 15 and a 15 to 25. What are the differences and what is the purpose of the increase?"

Kifowit: "So, as I just mentioned, Leader, it increases the fee for standard notary public appointments from \$10 to \$15. Ten dollars is to be deposited into the General Revenue Fund.

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Five dollars into the Electronic Notarization Fund. It adds a \$25 fee for electronic notary appointments to be deposited into the Electronic Notarization Fund."

Wheeler: "Is that Electronic Notarization Fund a new fund?"

Kifowit: "Correct."

Wheeler: "Is it a sweepable fund?"

Kifowit: "We do not have that parameter in the legislation as we have right now."

Wheeler: "Okay. I'm just... okay. Perfect. Thank you. To the Bill.

Just want folks to recognize, at least on this side of the
aisle, that there's a fee increase here. I think there's a
lot of good work done in this Bill, but a fee increase may be
concerning to some folks. So, thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Chesney: "Just confirming, Representative, there's a fee increase in this?"

Kifowit: "Representative, that is what has been repeated twice
 now on the House Floor."

Chesney: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Members. Again, this is the product of two and half years of the Electronic Notary Task Force. We had 14 members at the table, including the organization that was mentioned prior. We all worked together, and this is the final Bill. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2664 pass?'
All those in favor in vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

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 this question, there are 70 voting in 'favor', 42 voting 'opposed', 3 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of House Bills on Second Reading, we have House Bill 156, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 156, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time, previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Barbara Hernandez."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hernandez on the Amendment."

Hernandez, B.: "I believe I already amended the... in the House Committee."

Speaker Manley: "Floor Amendment #2, Representative."

Hernandez, B.: "Please amend... it's... the Amendment removes the language mandating menstrual hygiene in the... to be in each bathroom in every school building instead of the Amendment requires bathrooms to only be in... the products to only be in the bathrooms in grades 4 through 12 during regular school days."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Bourne, can we adopt the Amendment and debate this on Third? Representative Hernandez moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 156. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. But a state mandates note has been requested on the Bill as amended and has not yet been filed."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez, B.: "Motion to rule inapplicable."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Bourne is recognized."

Bourne: "Thank you. Can I ask why it is inapplicable that a new mandate on... your Bill is a new mandate, why the states mandate note would be inapplicable?"

Hernandez, B.: "The mandate is... originally the 2017 Bill already mandated the products to be in the school bathrooms. So, this is just changing the location from the nurse's office or wherever they have it to the actual bathroom."

Bourne: "Well, I would like to see that in a note from the agency because this is a broad expansion, I would contend."

Hernandez, B.: "I believe the agency responded by placing a fiscal note that stated that this is not going to cause any issues with ISBE."

Bourne: "Yes, but this is a state mandates note."

Hernandez, B.: "With our notes it says that it's not a... it's not applicable for it. There's no fiscal impact to this."

Bourne: "Okay. Well, I would just contend that a new mandate, we should see a mandates note. So, please vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Chesney: "Representative, if I'm reading the Bill correctly, it says each bathroom?"

Hernandez, B.: "I apologize. Can you repeat that again?"

38th Legislative Day

- Chesney: "My... I was reading the Bill, and it says each bathroom will have to provide these products. Does that include male bathrooms?"
- Hernandez, B.: "Fourth to twelfth grade, all bathrooms."
- Chesney: "So, this will include male bathrooms?"
- Hernandez, B.: "Fourth to twelfth grade, all bathrooms."
- Chesney: "Okay. I'm a little confused because how... how does that work? I know we're the body of science. Why are we providing these products in male bathrooms?"
- Hernandez, B.: "So, this will be available to those that menstruate, those that have their period, and..."
- Chesney: "I get the science, but how does that work with male bathrooms? Why would they be in a male bathroom?"
- Hernandez, B.: "Because there's some bathrooms that are able to...

 the individual is able to choose what bathroom they want to
 go to."
- Chesney: "Okay. But a male bathroom wouldn't have the ability to do some of the things. So... so, are you suggesting that a fourth grader can go into the opposite sexes bathroom?"
- Hernandez, B.: "That is up to them to decide."
- Chesney: "So, a kid can go in any bathroom they choose if that's how they identify?"
- Hernandez, B.: "In any emergency, especially if you are experiencing a period, at the end of the day, if you really need a bathroom and you really need the product, you will go to that bathroom."
- Chesney: "No, I'm not talking emergencies. I'm just talking..."
- Hernandez, B.: "This is an emergency though. It's a public health issue."

38th Legislative Day

- Chesney: "I understand, and I appreciate the underlying goal. I'm just curious why we're going to be putting menstrual products in male bathrooms. I'm still... I've been a male for been 39 years..."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Chesney, we're debating the note, not the Bill. So, can we go back to debating the note and then we'll get to the Bill..."
- Chesney: "Love to. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "...once we've settled that. Thank you.

 Representative Hernandez moves to rule the note inapplicable.

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 68 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And the note is ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No further note requests."

 Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Hernandez. Mr.

 Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 156, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hernandez."
- Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mrs. Speaker. Once again, HB156 will allow menstrual hygiene products to be included in all bathrooms from 4th to 12th grade in regular school hours. This is really important for young menstruators who are not able to purchase products and they need this as an emergency situation. As many people have maybe experienced their period, it is tough, it is difficult to find the products, it

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

is expensive. And having it in the bathrooms in the schools without a cost to them will help... be helpful."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you. I'd first like to request a verification."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chesney has requested a verification vote. All Members will vote their own switches."

Chesney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She will... she intends... she indicates that she will."

Chesney: "Thank you. Representative, I'm... I'm trying to be respectful of your Bill, but I'm still trying to struggle why we would be putting menstrual products in bathrooms, male bathrooms from the grades of 6 through 12. How does that work? I mean, I know you're the party of science, but the science doesn't... those products are inapplicable in male bathrooms.

Hernandez, B.: "I don't think this is about science. This is about the body and the nature. It's Mother Nature. It's about our bodies. Trust me, if I could control not having a period, I would probably choose not to have a period."

I know it 'cause I'm a male. And that just... it doesn't work."

Chesney: "No, we're not talking... we're not talking about the actual process. We're talking about the bathroom in which that process is taken care of, and I'm curious why you feel it's appropriate to put menstrual products in a male bathroom. I'm saying as a male, they shouldn't be in our bathrooms. And I'm asking you why you feel it's appropriate to put them in my bathroom. I'm talking about my bathrooms. You're trying to make it about your bathrooms. I have no problem if they're in your bathrooms. I want to know why you think it's appropriate

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

to put them in my bathrooms. So, talk about my bathrooms. Why do you feel it's appropriate to put menstrual products in my bathrooms or children from grades 6-12 in male bathrooms?"

Hernandez, B.: "You know, women do have male friends and sometimes when an emergency is going on the male friends can bring a pad. I'm sure you've done it for your wife, for past girlfriends. They purchase a product and take it home for them."

Chesney: "I don't even know how to respond to that. To the Bill." Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Chesney: "Madam Speaker, we are getting way outside the logical lines of science. There's only two genders. There are males and females. There have been male and female bathrooms for a hundred years plus in this country and nobody has had a problem taking care of the sensitive nature of being of certain gender. But to perhaps put female products in male bathrooms is not only confusing to a sixth grader but completely inapplicable. So, as a male who did go to a public high school, as a male who went to bathrooms from 6th grade to 12th grade, I can promise you, not one of my male friends ever needed these. And I would really appreciate if the Sponsor would stay the hell out of my bathrooms. And I promise her, I will stay out of hers. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Bourne."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I know we've had several conversations about this in committee, and I appreciate you being willing to make some Amendments. But I just had a

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

question about those who still remain opposed. Are they still opposed with the Amendment?"

Hernandez, B.: "To my knowledge, only School Management Alliance is opposed."

Bourne: "Okay. On our analysis we also show the School Board Association, the Principal Association, South Cooperative Organization for Public Education, a few others. So, I just didn't know if any of them had reached out."

Hernandez, B.: "No, they have not."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

"This is something that we've discussed at length. We Bourne: talk a lot about mandates in this chamber. And I just want to say that there are school districts who, in situations where this needs to happen, they're already doing it. This Bill actually takes away all local control to serve students who need it and is a blanket mandate that will not only be expensive but that, I think, will reach beyond what even the Amendment intends to do. It says every school building... or every bathroom that serves students 4 through 12. And I think we know that for a lot of districts, particularly in our downstate area, we have buildings that serve fourth graders that also serve kindergarteners and preschoolers. And so, I think the Amendment may work in some districts to limit it, but it will not limit it in other areas. So, this is a place where I think local control works. We need to have faith in our local school districts. They're caring for students in the way that they need to be cared for. And I would ask this body to please vote 'no'."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mrs. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Evans: "I just got a clarifying question 'cause I used to be sixth grader. I wish I was still a sixth grader. And when I was at home I had my grandmother and my mom. When I went to the bathroom... when I went to the bathroom, I think, they had menstrual products in the cabinet. Do parents generally or sisters, do they generally have these products in the cabinets when little boys go home?"

Hernandez, B.: "If you're lucky, some parents do. Unfortunately, because of the price of the products, some of the families don't."

Evans: "Wow. And I know you got another Bill for that. To the Bill. I'm a little appalled by some of the opposition. These products need to be made available for our young ladies. Come to some of the schools in our community when this is an issue with young ladies. And I think Barbara... Representative Hernandez has educated me on some of the issues. And I've done a lot of reaching out to these schools. It is a serious issue. So, having these products available is very, very important. Again, appalled by some of the conversations going on on the other side. I request your support."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Guerrero-Cuellar."

Guerrero-Cuellar: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield for questions?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

38th Legislative Day

- Guerrero-Cuellar: "Representative Hernandez, has anybody ever, when you were working on this Bill... is it possible that a female student had an accident with her period and is sitting in her classroom and asked a classmate to go to the bathroom to get her a pad and that student might be a male student?"
- Hernandez, B.: "Yes."
- Guerrero-Cuellar: "So, that would mean that there would have to be feminine products in the male bathroom in order for the male student to help his fellow classmate, correct?"
- Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."
- Guerrero-Cuellar: "So, that means we would have to put pads and tampons and any other feminine products in the male bathroom, correct?"
- Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."
- Guerrero-Cuellar: "I strongly urge a 'yes' vote for students to help other classmates when these accidents do happen because they do happen. And if you are a sixth grade student sitting there in a chair bleeding, you're probably embarrassed and you might only have the courage to ask one person for help."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Stuart."
- Stuart: "Thank you. And thank you, Representative Hernandez. I find this Bill to be very important. But will the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"
- Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
- Stuart: "I'm just wondering when you... when you talk to the opposition and the claim about this unfunded mandate and how it's just going to kill the budgets of all of our schools.

 Does the School Management Alliance complain to you about the cost of toilet paper?"

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Hernandez, B.: "No, they didn't."

Stuart: "Do your schools have toilet paper in all of the bathrooms?"

Hernandez, B.: "I would hope so."

Stuart: "Is toilet paper something that is needed for a hygiene purpose?"

Hernandez, B.: "Definitely."

Stuart: "So, why are we questioning the need for a hygiene product that people need? Why are we debating whether it is worth the cost for a school district? I can't understand that, I don't know if you can understand that. I just... I think it's nonsensical. You and I have also worked a lot on issues like this, and we've learned a lot about the problems caused by menstrual shame. Is that correct?"

Hernandez, B.: "I apologize. Can you repeat that again?"

Stuart: "You and I have worked on... on topics like this together, and we've had conversations about the problems caused by menstrual shame."

Hernandez, B.: "Yes."

Stuart: "And when there are typically males who are taught to be uncomfortable, taught that it's icky, girls are taught that they should hide that this even happens to them. It leads to a lot of problems in the life of menstruators. When we make these products just normal course of everyday life, everyone sees them in every bathroom they go to, it is like toilet paper. There is a recognition that it is... menstruation is a normal biological function and everybody just needs to get over the uncomfortableness that makes them act out when they're... when they're a little bit uncomfortable talking

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

about the topic. So, I appreciate you working on this Bill. This is something that we actually passed and schools had not been implementing this properly. And that's why we need this Bill to actually get the products where there supposed to be. And that's in the bathrooms, not in some nurse's office, not in one bathroom on one floor, but all over the school building. So, thank you very much. And I hope this will finally make our schools comply with what we actually are tasking them to do. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Willis: "Thank you very much for bringing this Bill forward. I want to ask you a few questions regarding some concerns that the Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle had. In high school, do we recognize that there could be, or even younger than that, transgender youth?"

Hernandez, B.: "I don't think people recognize that."

Willis: "Well, we would hope that they would. And I think part of your Bill takes that into consideration. So, I'm going to go to the Bill. It is very possible to be biologically a female but identify as a male, therefore, wanting to go to a male restroom. And... but if you are biologically a female but are identifying as a male, you're going to menstruate and you're going to need these products. And if you are identifying as a male and that's where the bathroom you want to go 'cause you feel most comfortable, you may need these products. And this is the reason we need to have it in both genders bathrooms. Not only to help each other out if our friends

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

need it, but to be able to be comfortable in whatever bathroom you identify with and need to go to. Not only in emergencies, we've talked about all the other things, but this is to also protecting our students that identify with one... with one identification over another and being comfortable in whatever bathroom they want to go to. Thank you very much for bringing this Bill forward. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Carroll."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Carroll: "So, you do know that I am a father of a daughter, correct?"

Hernandez, B.: "Yes."

Carroll: "And very recently my daughter tried to have the very uncomfortable conversation with me about the first time that that's going to happen. And I will tell you... well, actually let me ask you the question differently. So, do you think that men should be educated on these things too?"

Hernandez, B.: "Definitely. Sure."

Carroll: "Okay. Because I'll be very clear, I haven't been. So, this is kind of a learning curve for me too. So, do you think by putting these maybe in a men's bathroom men may understand some of the challenges that our female friends have?"

Hernandez, B.: "Of course."

Carroll: "Great. Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. I sit here and I listen to this debate, and my friend on the other side, I consider him a friend, I'm going to disagree with him. I think this is important issue. I think this is something that... that is uncomfortable to talk about, necessary for us to do. So,

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

I really appreciate you bringing this Bill forward. I would like you to add my name to the Bill as a Sponsor 'cause this is a great piece of legislation. And it's about time we start having maybe a few more uncomfortable conversations and people like me become a little more uncomfortable to understand the challenges that my female colleagues have. So, thank you very much for this Bill. And... I'm hoping it passes. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Madam Speaker, I call the previous question."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hernandez to close."

Hernandez, B.: "This Bill will help hundreds of young menstruators in the State of Illinois. They will no longer be ashamed to go get a product that they desperately need, that they cannot afford. This is a good Bill. This is a Bill that I've been working on for a long time, and I had to fight for and ask. So, I would really appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Chesney has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 156 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', 43 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received... pardon me. Mr. Clerk, please read the names in the affirmative. Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Withdraw the Motion, please."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chesney has withdrawn his Motion for verification. On this question, 68 voting in the 'affirmative', 43 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Halbrook. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like the record to reflect that I wish to be recorded as a 'yes' vote on SB808, please."

Speaker Manley: "The record will reflect your request. Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

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

Demmer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise today to share a story from a constituent of mine. A family who's been positively impacted by one of the policies that we worked together in a bipartisan way to enact a few years ago. But has... which has come under some additional scrutiny recently. The Invest in Kids Scholarship Program is a remarkable tool that allows low-income families to have additional education choice. The Westhoff family in my district is a family of seven, five children. Kurt writes that he and his wife have been married for 25 years. They have 5 kids, age 19, 17, 14, 12, and 5. Kurt says, we both work in the public sector, and even with the financial aid that St. Mary's School is offering, they probably we're going to have to make some tough decisions. But Empower Illinois and the scholarships, the Invest in Kid's Scholarship Program came on the scene. He said it's been phenomenal. It's been a great burden off our

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

shoulders. It would not be possible to send our children to these schools that we would've like them to attend without these scholarships. He said it's been not just a blessing... it's been such a blessing, not just for us, but for many other families at St. Mary's and at schools around the State of Illinois. It has giving all of us an opportunity to send our kids to where they need to be. I've got a great photo here of a couple of the Westhoff kids. One in graduation attire. And, I think, as we celebrate so many graduations and kids moving on in their academic careers, it's important that we recognize the thousands of Illinois families and students who have been positively impacted by this great bipartisan effort that we achieved through the Invest in Kids Scholarship Program. And also, think about the tens of thousands of students who are on waiting lists, hoping to one day get access to these scholarships that provide them opportunities that financially their family would not otherwise be able to offer. I encourage Members of both sides of the aisle who came together to create this program to again come together to defend and extend and support and strengthen this program. The Westhoff family in my district and constituents in each of our districts have been positively impacted by this great program. And I look forward to working together again to make sure that these options remain in place for families just like the Westhoffs all around Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Welter for purposes of announcement."

Welter: "Madam Speaker, the Republicans will caucus in Room 114 immediately following Session."

38th Legislative Day

5/20/2021

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

Clerk Bolin: "The following committees scheduled for 3 p.m. will meet 30 minutes after adjournment. The Insurance Committee will meet in Virtual Room 3. Judiciary - Criminal Committee will meet in Virtual Room 1. And Public Utilities Committee will meet in Virtual Room 2. After conclusion of those committees, three committees will meet. Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools in Virtual Room 1. Health Care Licenses in Virtual Room 2. Mental Health & Addiction in Virtual Room 3."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 309, offered by Representative Guerrero-Cuellar. House Resolution 310, offered by Representative Mason. House Resolution 311, offered by Representative LaPointe. House Resolution 312, offered by Representative LaPointe. House Resolution 313, offered by Representative LaPointe. House Resolution 314, offered by Representative LaPointe. House Resolution 315, offered by Representative LaPointe. And House Resolution 317, offered by Representative Spain."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves the House stand adjourned until Friday, May 21, at the hour of 9:30 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."