47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Manley: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Remembering those who have fought for our freedom, those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, those who we owe a debt of gratitude. John 15:13, 'Greater love has no one than this, that lay down his life for his friends.' Most gracious and holy God in Heaven, God of all wisdom, God of all power, God of all presence, and God of all creation, invoke your blessings upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, its Leaders, its Members. May they be empowered with wisdom from above. May they lead of your precious spirit. May they find strength in you. May your grace, may your mercy, may your peace be with them throughout this day and forever more. This we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Manley: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Luft, who is a veteran. Thank you for your service."
- Luft et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Manley: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Greenwood is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record show that Representative Kifowit is excused today."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Leader Welter."

Welter: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect that all Republicans are present and ready to work."

Speaker Manley: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 117 present, a quorum... answering the roll, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports. Members, an announcement regarding House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear your face covering that covers the nose and mouth, except when necessary for eating or drinking. Members may remove their face covering when... Members may remove their face covering when speaking into the microphone at their desks. You guys hear that? Members may remove... don't let this be a motivational thing. Members may remove their face covering when speaking into the microphone at their desks. Thank you. The Chair recognizes Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning on this Memorial Day. The concept of Memorial Day can be traced back to Illinois where Illinois Congressman John A. Logan left the U.S. Capitol of Washington D.C. when the Civil War began and, in his civilian clothes, joined the Virginia regiment. Logan later volunteered with the Illinois volunteers, fought, and led troops in many major battles in the South. Logan became a general, grew up in Murphysboro, Illinois. In 1868, General Logan issued General Order #11, which stated the 30th day of May, 1868, is designated for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

died in defense of their country during the late rebellion, and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, and hamlet churchyard in the land. It was Logan who helped spearhead what is today recognized as Memorial Day. Memorial Day was originally called Decoration. It's a day of remembrance for those who have died in our nation's service. Memorial Day is about coming together to honor those who gave their all and decorate their grave in honor and respect. Serving in the Armed Forces of the United States has always been a noble calling. Since the shots at Lexington and Concord were fired and our Revolutionary War began, the American warrior has been the defender of liberty and democracy. Since their humbling beginnings in 1776, the American warriors have fought and died on battlefields, here and abroad, to defend our rights and our freedoms. Today, we do honor to those who offered their lives to protect our nation and our homes, for those whom the supreme sacrifice was accepted on the battlefield, and others who have since passed. This is the one day of the year that is set apart for our Soldier, Sailor, Airman, Marine, and members of the Coast Guard who have died. They offered their lives and made sacrifices for the sake of humanity. We cannot recount all their deeds, or valor, or bravery. These are recorded in the pages of our country's history and forever engraved upon the monuments of our land. Today, we remember their service, we honor their life, and we pay tribute to their memory. It is a day to remember those whose lives ended in the ultimate sacrifice for our country and for you and I. They died at places like Shiloh, Andersonville, and Gettysburg. They died in the mud and blood

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

and the trenches of World War I. They died at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, North Africa, Anzio, Salerno, Normandy, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. They died in the cold and misery of Pork Chop Hill and at Chosin Reservoir. They died in A Shau Valley in the jungle heat on the ambush trails of Vietnam. They died on the sands of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait in Desert Storm. They died in the cities, villages, and countrysides of Iraq and Afghanistan. They died on land, on ships, and submarines at sea, and in aircraft. In those distant places, in harrowing times, these ordinary people from the cities, towns, and villages of Illinois performed extraordinary deeds. Memories of their act and heroism must never fade away as has been said of old soldiers. It is our task to remember what they said and what they did. Always remember, never forget. We are blessed with many privileges. Do not forget those who died, who sacrificed to give us those privileges and freedom. President Kennedy once said, 'A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers.' Of course, today we equally honor service men and women, but the sentiment remains crystal clear. A key component of our nation's greatness lies in our ability to honor, appreciate, and cherish, through our actions and our memories, all those who died to ensure our freedom. We often hear that freedom has a price and that each generation pays its due. Today is our day to say thank you to those who, for generations, have foot the bill to those who have paid so dearly with their lives and to their families and friends whose lives are forever changed and to whom we owe an enormous debt. Lee Greenwood sings a particularly

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

sentimental song with the assurance that he would gladly stand up and defend America today, God Bless the USA. And today, as we should every day, we say God bless those who have given of their lives to make America strong and to those who remain prepared to fight for our country today. Nor should we forget the family members of our servicemen and women. They, too, made significant sacrifices and contributions by taking on the challenges of the day-to-day life that arise in our households that are missing an important component of their family. Also now, let us also remember those family members and those heroes that we lost at our veterans' homes. They didn't die in a battlefields, but succumbed in our veterans' home. Remember them and their family. In closing, God bless America. God bless Illinois. And thank you for honoring and remembering on this Memorial Day. Always remember, never forget. Thank you, Madam Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Representative. The Body will take a moment of silence remembering those who gave their lives for us. Thank you, Members. Chair recognizes Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Mah: "Thank you. I would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of Thomas Lee, a former constituent who passed away last year on February 27, 2020, just prior to the stayat-home order. It is especially fitting to honor him today because Mr. Lee, who was known to many as Tommy, was a veteran, having served in the U.S. Army at Fort Dix, New Jersey. In addition, he was a Chinese American veteran. And

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

it is especially appropriate to pay tribute to him today on the last day of Asian American Heritage Month. Tommy Lee was born in Chicago, Illinois on November 23, 1951 and was a kind, gentle person who loved to help people. He was a lifelong Chicagoan and spent most of his career as an employee of AT&T. He was a proud member of the Chicago Chinatown community who was generous with his time and talents, especially with three main organizations that he was especially devoted to. The American Legion Chinatown Post #1003 being at the top of that list. He was a former commander at that post, having been elected to a term in the 1990s. And every year during the Chinatown Summer Fair, he would be found volunteering at the post's beer tent. He was a longtime committed volunteer for the Chinese American Museum of Chicago and helped with their exhibitions, the maintenance of the facilities, and any tasks that needed to be completed around the museum. Every year during the annual Chinatown Lunar New Year's parade, he would be part of the color quard ceremony with the Chinese American veterans of the American Legion Chinatown Post. At the beginning of the parade, he would participate in the ceremony and then join the Chinese American Museum's float after performing his duties in the presentation of colors. He was also a dedicated member of the Chinese American Citizens Alliance, helping with events and anything the organization needed. In his free time, in addition to serving as a volunteer and handyman around the community, he loved and enjoyed eating in Chinatown restaurants. He is survived by his three siblings, Susan, Earl, and Mary, and numerous nieces and nephews. He'll be laid to final rest at a small ceremony

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

with family and close friends on June 17, 2021 at the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery in Elwood, Illinois. I ask for a moment of silence in memory of Tommy Lee. And I thank you all for your indulgence."

Speaker Manley: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Members. Leader Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Manley. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

"Thank you. I'd first like to thank Pastor Crawford for the wonderful prayer this morning. And I'd also like to thank Representative Swanson and the many Members who turned out this morning to Oakridge Cemetery for a nice little Memorial Day ceremony we had at the war memorials out there. And, Representative Swanson, I'd really like to thank you for talking about General Logan and his... the Illinoisan and the deep connection that this state has to Memorial Day. General Logan and General Grant, two of the people that kept this union together, stand sentry right outside this very Body as statues in the rotunda here. But one of the things I'm always amazed about Memorial Day, the day that we honor those who've given the sacrifice with their lives to defend this nation, is that we continue to have Americans step forward to serve. A lot of you in this chamber have done that. But we continue to see people, especially young people, step forward. And I'd just like to honor one young man, a constituent of the 87th District, JC Coonrod, a 2020 graduate of Athens who leaves tomorrow, June 1, for basic training at Lackland Air Force

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Base. Plans to go into security forces, eventually hopes to become a pilot. He'll be the fourth... at least the fourth generation of his family to serve our country in the military. So, I think it's a great thing on this Memorial Day that we realize that people continue to step up and serve our nation to defend our freedom. So, JC, Godspeed, good luck, and I know you're going to do us proud in defending this nation. Thank you, Madam Chair."

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

"Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Body. Happy Memorial Day to everyone, all here and listening. I heard President Biden, today, give a speech, and it was very touching. He lost his son Beau. But one of the things that he said during his speech, he said, 'Humanity is the fuel of our democracy.' That was good. I think ... it was very touching to me because I know that when we talk about people in our country, that soldiers and the men and women that died for our freedom, black people were enslaved. And today, I rise to say thank you for all the men and women that died in the Civil War for black people. Because of their fall, I'm here as a Member of the General Assembly, and I'm grateful. And so, we believe, as Americans, that we honor the work that they did and their lives that they lost for Americans. And so, today, I rise to say let's not forget that this country is about becoming more perfect. And let's not forget about the struggles of black people, that the men and women died so that we could be free, so that black people can enjoy the freedoms of America. If we truly believe that they died for

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

the freedom of Americans, then our conscious would tell us that black people are in trouble in America and that we have to work together to make sure that we further the emancipation of black people. Because yet, I still feel bondage in America. And I have to thank my colleagues here because we did go the extra mile during the Veto Sessions. So, thank you. But we have so much more to do if we want to free black people and honor the fallen men and women that fought for our freedom. Thank you, and happy Memorial Day to all my brothers and sisters in the House of Representatives."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Before things get too nutty in here today and we all say things that we may or may not regret, I just want to say thank you to Speaker Chris Welch for giving Illinoisans the confidence to have us be able to speak today and see our faces, and let the public see our faces, each other see our faces. So, I just want to say thank you to the Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Murphy, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Murphy: "Thank you. Yesterday, we were able to honor Clifford Dahl, one of Dave's sons. And I'd just like to mention a couple of things about Isaac, his other son. He's got a busy, busy couple of weeks coming up. On June 3, he will be in front of the board of review to become an Eagle Scout. June 5, he will have graduation. And on June 21, he will enter basic training to begin his career in the Illinois National Guard. So, I would just like to recognize another one of our

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- outstanding young men, and women, who have decided to continue to serve this great nation. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, to the Dahl family. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 for House Bill 806."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting this afternoon. At 12 noon is Higher Education in Virtual Room 1, Insurance in Virtual Room 2. Meeting at 12:30 is Ethics & Elections in Virtual Room 1, Executive in Virtual Room 2, Revenue & Finance in Virtual Room 3."
- Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Greenwood for an announcement."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Democrats would request a caucus meeting. We will be meeting virtually upon recess."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Leader Welter."
- Welter: "Madam Speaker, the Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 114."
- Speaker Manley: "Democrats will go to their virtual room. Republicans will caucus in Room 114. The House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair, which is expected to be around 3 p.m... pardon me, 1:30 p.m. Look at everybody look at me. Look at everybody... 1:30 p.m. or as soon as committees adjourn. The House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 5 to Senate Bill 508, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 539, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 825; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 3 to House Bill 645. Representative Stuart, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 4 to Senate Bill 815. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3308. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Ethics & Elections reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 825, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 828. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 166, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 521, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 2800. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2621."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Manley: "Senate Bills on Third Reading. We have Senate Bill 8... 825, Representative West. Leader Batinick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Batinick: "The Republicans request an immediate caucus."
- Speaker Manley: "That was a very subdued request. Can you get this done in an hour? Is that reasonable?"
- Batinick: "That's probably a reasonable time."
- Speaker Manley: "Okay. The House will stand in..."
- Batinick: "Welter was supposed to be here for this announcement, everybody. I'm..."
- Speaker Manley: "The House will be in recess to the call of the Chair, at approximately 4:53. The House will be in order. Returning to Senate Bill 825, Representative West. Mr. Clerk, will you move this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 825, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative West."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative West on Floor Amendment #1."
- West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #1 and adopt Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Floor Amendment #1, read Floor Amendment #2."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative West and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative West on the Amendment."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is technical in nature. I discussed most of it in committee, but for the whole Body, it fixes a drafting error that left off the word 'appointed'. It replaces the phrase 'must have the option to' with 'shall have the opportunity to'. It adds additional language to counties section clarifying that the statutory deadlines are being extended. It delays the effective date of the State Central Committee gender change to July of 2023. It adds clarifying language that expenses related to providing child care for a minor child or care for a dependent family member if the care is reasonably necessary for the public official or candidate to fulfill political or governmental duties. And it addresses gender language throughout the code. Those technical changes were included in House Bill 45, sponsored by Representative Stuart, and they passed in the House on the Consent Calendar. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Manley: "Representative West moves for 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 825, a Bill for an Act concerning

elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and every... esteemed colleagues in the General Assembly in the House of Representatives. As you can imagine, I had a very long speech that would most likely get me on C-SPAN. But it's 5:42 p.m., so let's keep it moving,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

shall we? I'm excited that, here in Illinois, I'm proud to present an election Bill that empowers voters and ensures everyone has the opportunity to vote no matter where they live, who they are, and who they plan to vote for. Some things that I'll share with you, and then we can go to discussion. It pushes back the 2022 General Primary from March 15 to June 28 and makes petitioning process changes. It requires every county to have at least one universal voting center for the 2022 Primary and General Election. It allows election authorities to create permanent opt-in vote by mail lists. It makes Election Day 2022 a state holiday for schools and universities. It requires high schools to permit voter registration on the premises and provide application information to students. It requires the State Board of Elections to propose... requires that the State Board of Elections propose legislation to us, the General Assembly, regarding procedures to enable a voter with a disability to independently and privately mark their own ballot. And it requires that they solicit public input and have at least two public hearings before they give this legislation to us. It clarifies that jails outside of Cook County may set up polling places in the facilities, if they choose to do so, for those who have not been convicted of a crime. And it's a technical change for curbside voting. In the times that we're living in, with states adhering to voter suppression, here in Illinois, we're doing voter empowerment. And I'm excited to talk to you guys about it. I'm entertaining any questions with excitement. Let's do this."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "Members, we're going to be using Standard Debate.

To refresh your memory, it's the Sponsor, two other Members in favor, and three, should anybody oppose anything that's being talked about today. And with that, I... the Chair will recognize Leader Spain. And we're using a five-minute timer."

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

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

"This Bill is many things, and I have great respect and appreciation for the Sponsor, but this Bill is not about empowering voters. It's not about trying out by coincidence some new schedule for how we run elections in the State of Illinois. I could talk to you about provisions of this Bill, issues with voting in jail, allowing corrupt campaign practices that have been declared illegal, we're making them now legal. But at the core, this Bill is a continuation of the Democrats redistricting plan. And we continue to see that the links to maintain and sustain power know no boundaries in the State of Illinois. We have watched for weeks while redistricting activities have taken place. And we were told that time is of the essence, that we had to act now in the cover of darkness, in the cloak of night to move forward with redistricting in the State of Illinois because certain deadlines were bearing down upon us. Now, we see here that time is not of the essence, that we have plenty of time. What do we say to the advocacy groups that testified for endless hours, asking for time to review the maps, data to look at the maps? They asked for waiting until the census was delivered. They asked for having public input. They asked to be included, and we told them no. We don't have time for your

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

voice. We don't have time for you to be included. I just can't believe what we're doing here. And the hypocrisy of these mixed messages is out... astounding. We have to pass the map now for the Legislature. It has to be now, ignoring the people of the State of Illinois who have called for a different way. Ignoring the 600 thousand people that declared we've got to have a better way forward. This place isn't working. Our State Government is broken. Let's do something differently. Their wishes have been discarded because we had to pass a map that we did just a few days ago. But unfortunately for our Congressional Delegation, we're going to wait. Because the Democratic Congressional Delegation in the State of Illinois has said, we want to wait until we get the census. Of course you do. We should be using the census. And we're going to move the primary now so that we have plenty of time to draw the congressional map when the census is delivered. And for counties, we don't know what to tell you. We're going to kick the date for counties as well, and I don't know if we should use the census or the American Community Survey that's included in this Bill. The mix of messages here unbelievable. And it is all connected back to redistricting. And redistricting drives everything that we do here and accounts for so much of why our state is not working. This is not a Bill about moving the primary. It's not a Bill about voter empowerment. This is protection for redistricting. And as we heard from staff, we're going to look later on down the road, when we do receive the census, and make other adjustments. I am so disappointed with the way this entire process has gone. And for decisions to be made and votes to

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

be pushed forward in contradiction to the so many people who had genuine and earnest interest about building a better State Government, that their wishes were discarded. And now, just a few days later, we're going to buy ourselves months more of time. Time that could've been spent working together and building a better State of Illinois. I can't believe it. This is such a disappointment. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick for five minutes."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't think I'll need that long to make my point. There's one little small provision in here I want to speak about. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "Political committee vehicle expenditures. This... this is so Illinois. We've had an auditor general that has been found in violation of campaign finance laws. So, we're literally changing the law so he, retroactively, was no longer in violation of those laws. The Supreme Court found him in violation. And in the other half of the case, the only reason he wasn't found in violation is 'cause he refused to provide his own financial records. So, for years we have had an auditor general... I think everybody knows what the definition of an auditor is... that's been under scrutiny for his finances, and we're changing the law to protect him. That's so Illinois. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Mazzochi for five minutes."

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

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Mazzochi: "First question, when it comes to independent candidates who are not affiliated with a particular party, are they going to need to actually submit any signatures for petition to get on the ballot?"

West: "That doesn't change. So, yes."

Mazzochi: "Well, where does that not change? Because you're... so, are you saying that the existing rules stay in place and are not going to be changed under these rules here for 2022? Because you're changing other things for independent candidates, but you did not specify whether or how many an independent candidate needs to... how many signatures they need in order to file."

West: "They have the same 83-day petition period as they did before."

Mazzochi: "Right. How many signatures do they need to submit?"

West: "The same amount that they had before."

Mazzochi: "Which is what? I mean, so for the House of Representatives, how many signatures is that going to be?"

West: "I'll have to look that up 'cause it was unchanged from this Bill, and I was focused on the language in this Bill."

Mazzochi: "All right. Well, be... I'm concerned. Because if you're going to say an established party candidate has to have fewer signatures than someone who's an independent party candidate, then I'm concerned about that because that's going to potentially lead to some equal protection issues. An additional issue is, for an independent or a new party candidate, while you've given provision that if they're crossing county lines they can file with the Illinois State Board of Elections, what about the filing dates when you have

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

offices where they're fully subsumed within a county? What are the filing dates for them to file for the county clerks?" West: "Can you elaborate? I don't know what you are referring to."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. I'm looking at the procedures that you've got in around pages four, five, and six in terms of where the petitions for nomination get filed. So, petitions for nomination for congressional, judicial office, for territorial division that's in more than one county or partly in one county, right? Those can be filed in the principal office of the State Board of Elections beginning March 28, 2022, but no later than April 4, 2022. So, that's pages five to six. But when you have a candidacy for an office that fully falls within a county, what are the filing dates?"

West: "That doesn't change based on what the language says."

Mazzochi: "Well, what's the filing location? Do they have... do they also file with the Illinois State Board of Ed... are they also going to be filing with the Illinois State Board of Elections? Or do they do... I mean, normally, if you've got an office, it's going to be up in November 2022. Normally you would file at your county clerk. If it's for any type of office, it's either, like, your county board or something along those lines. Where are those people supposed to file? And if so, what are the dates? Because you've changed them for people who cross counties but not if you are within a county."

West: "The timespan of filing for county board members, county officials, county executive doesn't change. Just the date.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

So, all candidates in the June primary would file where they normally would."

Mazzochi: "Okay."

West: "That doesn't change."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. I guess the problem is, is that you're making changes but... and you're saying that these are supposed... what you've said though, you've also got a superseding clause here in your language that says if there's any conflict, then your language shall control. And my concern is, is that you're changing the dates, and you've made provisions for where people file that's... and dates for filing, and date ranges for filing that's just fundamentally different for anybody if you cross a county, but not within a county, and that's going to lead to all kinds of confusion. Finally, when it comes to this permanent mail-in ballot list, how are you going to the dead people off the roll if you've got a permanent mailing list?"

West: "The clerks will take the dead people off the roll when they do... certify their death certificate."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. But the problem is, our current election law and our current clerks, it only say they may take people off the rolls, not that they must or they shall. So, we have no provision in Illinois law that actually does require our county clerks to actually take the dead people off the rolls. I've filed legislation on this. I've asked you for three years that you need to make this change so that we actually get the dead people off the rolls. At the very least, if you have to show up and request a mail-in ballot, that might be able to catch them. But if you're creating a permanent mail-in ballot

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

list, that's yet another invitation for fraud because the county clerks do not have to remove them. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi, can you wrap up your question?"

Mazzochi: "I'm done."

Speaker Manley: "That was the third and final speaker in opposition. Chair recognizes Representative Stuart for five minutes."

Stuart: "Thank you. I realize it's already almost 6:00 and we have a lot of work to do, but I really felt that I needed to speak on this a little bit."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Stuart: "To the Bill. The characterization that this is simply a power grab and ignoring all the voter empowerment and other things that myself and many Members of the House Women's Democratic Caucus studied and researched and worked on for months, multiple 8 a.m. Monday morning meetings, bright and early... our staff James Hartmann, Madeline McCune helping us pull in experts from across the country on election law, bring in county clerks, board of elections, and everybody else that we needed to talk to and dive down into these details. We want people to vote. We want people to vote. I think that's a big difference. We're seeing across the country areas where they're trying to stop people from voting. And our work was focused on how to make sure that people had access to the ballot because that's something, as Democrats, that we believe really strongly in. I just wanted to highlight a couple of the things, and I have to thank Representative West for carrying this Bill. I appreciate it. I know that there's

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

lots of good things in here that we've talked about, that we're excited about. Some of the things that we worked and discussed at length, the Election Day holiday. The Election Day holiday, practically, it makes those schools universities locations where voting can happen, and that's a good thing. But the other thing is, it speaks to the importance of voting, which is the most basic and fundamental tenet of our democracy. It's telling people that voting matters, voting is important, and voting is how your voice is heard. And we recognize that by making it our state holiday. Making sure that high school students... we made sure that we are increasing civics education. So, as we're educating them about civics, let's make sure they get that registration part of the piece. Let them see it happening in their high school so that when they turn 18, they know that they're going to be able to vote. I think I told this story before about when I was in high school, at West Orange High School, Miss Pomar's English class, League of Women Voters came in and they were registering people to vote, and I was going to be four days too young and miss the 1988 election. And ever since then, I have been an avid voter, and I know the importance of voting. So, making sure that high school principals superintendents know that we support them bringing nonpartisan groups to host registration drives, I think, is a really important step. The permanent vote by mail list. We have a lot of folks who like voting by mail. We have a lot of folks who, practically, it's the best way for them to vote. We have a lot of folks who just... they know that they're, in the winter time, snowbirds, or whatever you call it. They are

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

always out of their area but want to vote in their elections. Letting them choose to put themselves on a permanent list so that they can be... they're not going to miss the application and they're going to make sure that that ballot comes to them, is going to increase voter turnout and increase participation in our elections. And I'm really excited to see that as part of this legislation. Another thing that was really important to us was making sure that things were consistent so that voters across the state are having the same experience. So, the pieces that talk about election authority giving quidance, making sure that ballot tracking and the proper vernacular and terminology is the same across the board, to make things clearer, and... just clearer for voters is also a really important piece of this puzzle. So, I'll wrap up. Voting is fundamental. Voting is what we, as Democrats, want to do. And we want people to vote. We want people to get registered. And we are doing what we can to modernize and update our voting system. Thank you. I, please, encourage everyone to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative West to close."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will allow Representative Stuart's comments to be my closing remarks. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "On this question, 'Shall House Bill'... excuse me...
'Senate Bill 825 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 72 voting in
'favor', 46 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills-Second Reading on page 6. Senate Bill 2406, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2406, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time previously. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2, which I would ask that we just debate on Third Reading, would... would make a... reform the judicial system in our area by making St. Clair its own circuit, creates a new 24th Judicial Circuit that would include Randolph, Monroe, Washington, and Perry counties, and it would expand subcircuits in the 19th Circuit, which is Lake County. I ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Meier, can we debate the Bill on Third? Thank you, Sir. Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2406. 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments, but a fiscal note, judicial note, and state mandates note has been requested and not filed at this time."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I would ask that those notes be ruled inapplicable." Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Motion that the notes be held inapplicable. Once again, the request is completely unfounded because it's my understanding that there has been no response from the judiciary, in particular, in connection with the fiscal note as required. Is that correct?"

Speaker Manley: "I'm sorry, Leader. Could you repeat that?"

Mazzochi: "Yeah. Have we gotten any responses in connection with the judicial note? Have the notes been fulfilled at all?"

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "A fiscal note, judicial note, and state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Manley: "That's the information I have for you."

Mazzochi: "Right. So... so, in fact, we don't actually have a response on the fiscal note, the state mandates note, or the judicial note. So, I would like to... perhaps the Sponsor can address why we're actually in a condition to waive all of these requested notes when we don't actually have a response under any of them."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I believe that the notes are inapplicable."

Mazzochi: "Is there any basis for that?"

Hoffman: "The inapplicability of the notes."

Mazzochi: "Right. So, this, again, is a... to the request then. This, again, is a situation where we put provisions into our statute, in place, to try to protect the taxpayers, the bodies that we're trying to regulate so that we don't actually make rash decisions along these lines. What we are changing, judicial circuits and subcircuits, in a situation where the circuits have not... the people who would live in those

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

districts and the judges who run those districts haven't asked for this. The state's attorney who run those districts haven't asked for this. The county board that is responsible for funding this district hasn't asked for this. So, we're changing the judicial structure that governs a region without their consent, without even their input. Why? Once again, it appears that this is being done for crass, raw political power reasons. Not for policy reasons and certainly not for any good policy reasons that would actually render the substance of the judicial note inapplicable. So, I urge that a roll call for this... for the waiver of any of these notes. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman moves to rule the notes inapplicable. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, 71 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And the notes have been ruled inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2406, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House (sic-Senate) Bill 2406, as amended, would remove all counties, except for St. Clair. So, St. Clair would be its own judicial circuit. And it would create the 24th Judicial Circuit, which includes the counties of Monroe,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Randolph, Washington, and Perry. In addition, it would expand the subcircuits in the 19th... Lake County circuit from 6 to 10. This would follow other counties... other large counties in the state such as Lake, Kane, Will, DuPage, and McHenry County, as well as, obviously, Cook, in these larger counties being their own judicial circuit. Just a fact, St. Clair County has 262 thousand people. Sixty-four percent are white, thirty percent African American, yet they only have one African American judge. This is unacceptable. By changing the makeup of this circuit, we will make sure that minorities have a fair representation as circuit judges. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "A reminder, we're using Standard Debate and a five-minute timer. The Chair recognizes Representative Meier."

Meier: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Meier: "Well, Jay, I heard you saying how many counties have this, but there's larger counties that don't have their own circuit yet. Winnebago doesn't. Madison County doesn't. I just learned that you only have one African American judge. There's been Republican African American judges run in St. Clair County. They just didn't get elected. So, when you look at this... Champaign County tried this. It didn't pass there. Can you... what is your population of St. Clair County?"

Hoffman: "Two hundred and sixty-two thousand."

Meier: "Okay. What's going to be the population of the new district?"

Hoffman: "A hundred and one thousand."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Meier: "Okay. So, with this, are you setting a precedent that any county that has less than a... or has more than a 100 thousand people are going to have their own circuit?"
- Hoffman: "No, that's not the precedent I'm attempting to set. I'm just talking about this circuit and making St. Clair County its own circuit."
- Meier: "Well, by breaking this circuit, you're creating the smallest circuit in the State of Illinois. You're going to be putting extra cost, real estate taxes, on all these residents, including St. Clair because there's going to have to be extra administrative workers hired to administrate this. You're raising real estate taxes for a political reason, to have more Democrat judges in St. Clair County. You're afraid that what's happened in the other counties is going to start happening there, and you won't have them. So, how many associate judges do we have right now?"

Hoffman: "There are 13 associate judges."

- Meier: "Okay. So, if we split this by population, are you going to guarantee us that St. Clair County gets nine associates and this new district gets four associates? Or are you going to make a power grab to get more of those associates? 'Cause shouldn't they kind of be divided up according to the population? And can we have that written into this Bill?"
- Hoffman: "It isn't... it isn't with regard to population. It's regard to... what it really is, regard to caseload. St. Clair County, by far, has a much larger caseload than the other four counties. And the Bill indicates that the associate judges will serve where they reside."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Meier: "Jay, if you look at the cases done in the other counties, and you look at the cases done in St. Clair County, percentage-wise, these smaller counties are getting a larger percentage of cases through their court systems than St. Clair County. So, I'm just saying I don't think that when this split is done you should be able to have 13 associate judges from St. Clair County. I think nine would be sufficient, and I believe four in the other district would be sufficient. I hope that could be added into here. Otherwise, they'll be another cost. You'll be hiring in more... and judges are expensive."

Hoffman: "Well, the associate judges are based on the parameters of the Associate Judges Act. And then, it's my understanding that the courts then make the determinations, the Supreme Court, as to how many are in each area, based on that Act."

Meier: "Is the Supreme Court currently... what's the percentage, more Republican or more Democrat?"

Hoffman: "The Illinois Supreme Court?"

Meier: "Yes."

Hoffman: "There are four Democratic justices, and there are three Republican."

Meier: "So, they will probably vote to go along with this, and we will have to pay more taxes?"

Hoffman: "I don't believe it'll increase taxes because each of your counties that you're talking about, in those four counties as well as St. Clair, already have their own courthouses. They have their own administration. They have their own judges that reside there. So, there won't be an additional cost."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Meier: "I beg to differ. This is a very bad Bill. It sets a precedent to go across the state. Any county with more than 100 thousand people will be trying to do it. And we will have our taxes going up in all those counties, our real estate taxes, to help pay for this Bill. When I talked with a lot of different judges, including Supreme Court Judges, none of them knew this Bill was coming. Isn't the judiciary a separate branch of our government? Shouldn't they be allowed to decide what is necessary to run the State of Illinois? It should not be done by the House of Representatives or by the Senate, but come here at their recommendation instead of somebody sitting down in here going, let's do this to protect our seats? This has nothing to do with having a better judicial system in the State of Illinois. It is so that this court system in St. Clair County can be packed. I ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Bos for five minutes."

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

Manley: "To the Bill."

Bos: "To quote the House Resolution containing our new maps. This was done for, 'political purposes to assist with increasing political advantage'. The Lake County Board has been seeking, for some time now, to reduce their judicial budget due to decreasing caseloads. And they're currently looking to close branches. This is nothing more than attempted court packing. It's not needed. It will cost the taxpayers greatly. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman to close."

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

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2406 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ness. Tarver. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills on Second Reading. On page 4, Senate Bill 508, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 508, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski on the Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendments 2 and 5 both become the Bill, related to property taxes. I wish to adopt 2 and 5."
- Speaker Manley: "We're going to adopt those separately." Zalewski: "Okay."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 508. 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 Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5 has been offered by Representative Zalewski and has been approved for consideration."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Madam Speaker, do I have to wear my mask or not when I'm at..."

Speaker Manley: "Not when you're on the microphone."

Zalewski: "All right. Thank you. That's good to know. Amendment #5 becomes the Bill. It removes provisions that were in previous Amendments."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 508. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 508, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 508, it contains a number of provisions related to property taxes. First, Treasurer Maria Pappas, in Cook County, annually conducts a scavenger sale. We've reached agreement with the tax buyers whereby the date of the sale will begin, and then she'll be allowed to conduct the sale in which... in the place that she wants. There's also expansion of the single bidder rule. This is actually very good government. The single bidder rule prevents tax buyers from manipulating tax purchases. We expanded to several counties that have already indicated to us that they're doing this, and it codifies existing practice. There's a piece in the Bill that Representative Guerrero-

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Cuellar... Angie. Angie really likes this Bill related to the Southwest Home Equity Association. That piece is agreed to, and there's... forgive me for... there's one more piece. I'm just making sure I have it. Oh, Senator DeWitte, in the Senate, has an issue related to the extension law. We've reached agreement with the school boards, and that is included as well. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Reick for five minutes."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Questions for the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Reick: "There were some things in that Bill that were originally put in regarding property taxes in Cook County and the assessor. Those have been completely taken out?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Reick: "Those were, of course, the major reasons why we had objections to the Bill. Got some questions here dealing with the single bidder rule. I'm getting statements from other people that the counties that are in the shall portion of this Bill have not all weighed in on it. Can you expand on that just a little bit, please?"

Zalewski: "I can only tell you what I've been told by the stakeholders, that every county included in the Bill has at least indicated to them that they are either doing it, or could do it with a codification of law. That's what... we have specifically created the counties threshold so that counties that hadn't wanted to do the single bidder rule would be excluded. And we additionally... there's an affidavit that

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

comes along with this single bidder rule. We put a provision in there that counties can opt out. So, Steve, I can only tell you that the Bill is... this language was filed on Friday. I just found out about the opposition at 12:00 today, on Monday. And I'm committing to you that, if there's technical cleanup, we'll fix it in the fall."

Reick: "That... that appears to be fair. But if the county treasurer is determined to be the one to decide whether or not there is an actual conflict here, is there potential liability to a treasurer who makes that determination in error?"

Zalewski: "I don't have my staff with me. He's indicating we can get you an answer on that, Steve."

Reick: "Very good. As to the Representative Guerrero-Cuellar portion of the Bill, we, of course, have no objection to it as it went out unanimously in a previous Bill. And I don't know why it's here to begin with. And you're going to have to remind me. What's the third part of this Bill?"

Zalewski: "Don DeWitte... the Don DeWitte language."

Reick: "Oh, the Don DeWitte language. What we have here, folks, is a situation where we have an appeal that happened in the... in Senator DeWitte's district that resulted in a pretty remarkable change in the property tax levy for that company. And what we're looking at here is a request to maintain the levy for the local districts, at that level, for one year. It does spread the tax liability out among the various other entities in the... or taxpayers in these taxing district. It is... we would consider to be somewhat unfair, but this is the way you fix it for a one-year purpose. It snaps back if I... if I'm correct. Is that... if I'm correct. Is right?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Zalewski: "Correct. That's my understanding. Yes, Sir."

Reick: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick for five minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, real quick, you said there was some late opposition that you were unaware of coming into today.

I just wanted to clarify what you thought the nature of that was and what you think it might be."

Zalewski: "The county treasurers would say that we are offering a mandate on the single bidder rule. I disagree, but that's what they're offer."

Batinick: "Thank you for you answer."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I urge an 'aye' vote, for Angie."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 508 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? Collins, Ozinga, Tarver, Ammons, Halbrook. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3, Senate Bill 166, Representative Harper. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 166, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time previously.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Harper, has been approved for consideration."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harper on the Amendment."

Harper: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I am pleased to bring before you, for your consideration, House Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 166, on behalf of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus. This Amendment becomes the Bill and contains various provisions related to the Commission on Equity and Inclusion, which was created as part of the Black Caucus Economic Equity Pillar that seeks a more equitable system regarding minority participation in state contracts. The Amendment seeks to address technical and implementation concerns to further allow CMS to undergo this programing. And as promised during lame duck Session, we have worked all this Session, along with the administration, to clear up concerns brought forth by the department. I encourage the adoption of the Amendment and an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "As a reminder, we are on Standard Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler for five minutes."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Are we on the Amendment or are we on the actual Bill?"

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Thank you for watching this.

Representative Harper moves for the adoption of Floor

Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In

the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the

Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 166, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harper, would you like to go right to questions?"

Harper: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. We just heard this Bill in committee just a couple... about three hours ago maybe. So, it's still kind of percolating. This has to do with some technical changes regarding the Business Enterprise Council that affects for minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. Can you just walk me through the agencies that are affected by that and had requested that for this Bill?"

Harper: "So, the primary agency is CMS. And just so you know, the Commission on Equity and Inclusion is a new state agency that was created by law that consist of a commission of seven members that are tasked with oversight a variety issues concerning state procurement, hiring, and diversity."

Wheeler: "So, this is not creating anything really new. This is something that's more of a cleanup for legislation we passed.

Was that in lame duck? Was that... I can't remember when this came into being."

Harper: "That is correct, Representative."

Wheeler: "Okay. I think we talked about this on the floor at the BOS Center, but it... there's a lot of moving parts right now. So, in other words, this Bill we're doing today is really only a technical cleanup, as opposed to any kind of expansion or changing the parameters or the qualifications of the actual

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Bill you passed back then. This is just cleanup from CMS and IDOT. And what other agency? CBD maybe?"

Harper: "Yes, CBD... CDB and the CPOs."

Wheeler: "Okay. Thank you. That... again, this is in line with the spirit and the intent of the original legislation you passed back then?"

Harper: "Yes. This is definitely in line with the original intent..."

Wheeler: "Okay."

Harper: "...from lame duck Session. Simply just a technical cleanup
in order to make implantation more smoothly for the
departments involved."

Wheeler: "Okay. Thank you for answering the questions. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Wheeler: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... this is not any kind of expansion of what was worked on in past efforts on behalf of the Representative and her efforts from lame duck. This is simply, from my research and from the answers just given here on the floor and in committee, a cleanup Bill that will make government more efficient and more effective for the people that it's trying to help and serve. Thank you."

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: "Representative, I'm assuming that there's been a lot of discussions with the universities regarding this Bill?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Harper: "It's mostly been CMS involved in the negotiations of this particular Bill during this Session."

Brady: "So you, yourself, have had no discussion with the universities, procurement in particular?"

Harper: "No, I have not."

Brady: "Okay. And can this commission cancel contracts that you're describing here?"

Harper: "They can advise the CPO to cancel."

Brady: "Okay."

Harper: "But they can't cancel them themselves."

Brady: "So, they can't cancel? Okay. So, there's also a concern, a question that I had that, could a vendor have their contract canceled and barred for up to a year if there's some violation found with the council themselves?"

Harper: "That is correct."

Brady: "They can?"

Harper: "Yes."

Brady: "And who, again, would make that judgement?"

Harper: "The secretary of the BE Council makes that call."

Brady: "Okay. And then one final method. What method was used for the goal setting here?"

Harper: "We're going to tie goals to a disparity study."

Brady: "I'm sorry. One more time, I apologize."

Harper: "We are tying our goals to a disparity study."

Brady: "To a study? Okay. And so, if this Bill would pass, then this cleanup language, as referred to as Representative...

Leader Wheeler had discussed, that then becomes a part of the Bill itself. Is that correct?"

Harper: "Can you clarify what becomes part of the Bill itself?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Brady: "Sure. The vendor... the aspect of having the contract canceled for up to a year. And then, also, the language in the Bill that deals with the method of goal setting. Both those would be implemented if this Bill passes. Is that correct?"

Harper: "That is correct."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Harper: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair... Chair recognizes Leader Mazzochi for five minutes."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just... I was one of the individuals who spoke out against this Bill during the lame duck Session. And some of the things that I pointed out that were going to be unworkable, I'm glad you're trying to make an effort to fix them, but you're still creating all sorts of compulsive requirements that are going to be adding costs and expenses. One of the examples is on pages 76 to 77. You're mandating that everybody who's trying to do procurement contracts has to include a utilization plan. If you don't include a utilization plan, it's going to be considered to be a nonresponsive and not-curable bid offering. The only way in which you can try to ... even if you do submit a utilization plan, you still can be overruled and you're going to be forced to do contracting with the Business Enterprise Program in order to reach some level of compliance. You know, so... and when it comes to... I'll just say this for our community colleges because they're also listed here as well as our higher ed partners. You're requiring them, every single time they send a contract out, that they're going to... and they

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

don't ... and the contract offer bid that comes in with a blank utilization plan or a noncompliant utilization plan, that has to all get sent over to someone else so that you can start data. This is going to collecting be vet administrative burden. It's not going to lead to any appreciable... a better outcome. It's just going to raise the cost of procurement, which is exactly what we've been trying to get away from. And that was certainly the subject of our Higher Appropriations discussions. Because one of the complaints that we're always hearing is that the cost of procurement is too high. You're not able to get the lowest bid because of our procurement standards. This is only going to make things worse. So, while I appreciate the effort to clean it up, it doesn't solve the problem. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative... the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 166 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 73 voting in 'favor', 42 voting in 'opposition', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Second Reading, we find Senate Bill 24... 2294, excuse me. Senate Bill 2294, Leader Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2294, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time previously.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Harris."

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

Harris: "Could we adopt the Amendment and then debate the Bill on Third?"

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris 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 Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Harris and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris, same thing?"

Harris: "Yes. Floor Amendment 3 is page and line Amendment that correct Floor Amendment 2."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Harris moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2294. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2294, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2294 is the Medicaid omnibus Bill for this year. And this is a piece of legislation that the Medicaid Working Group has been putting together with Members on both

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

sides of the aisle in both chambers, the Governor's Office, and state departments for the last several months. I'd really like to commend and thank Leader Demmer and the Republican Members who served on this group in the House, moving this Bill forward. It has a number of components. You know, I'll just list some of them. It allows new federal funding for mental health services to be brought into Illinois. It removes some barriers to opioid treatment. It restores chiropractic services back to the Medicaid program. It adds new care models... community care models for seniors. It simplifies claims for persons with complex rehab technologies to basically allow repairs of their high-tech wheelchairs and other assisted living devices. It does some dental rate increases, some technical fixes for the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. And I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Thank you for that explanation, Leader Harris, and thank you for your leadership in the Medicaid work group. To all the House Democratic Members who participated as well, again, year after year, I think we see that as a really good model of how we can debate and work on some very complex issues together in a collaborative way. And so, I appreciate your leadership and participation on that. Also, want to say a special thank you to Emily Gibbons on our staff. I know Danny on your staff and many others who have been... worked very hard to juggle all of these various Bills that we consider. We

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

certainly owe them a debt of gratitude, and I want to say thank you for that. Just to clarify, there's kind of two components, there are two funding sources for this. One of the items that's included in here is a per diem increase for supportive living facilities. And is it true that that increase is fully federally funded and is a result of a temporary increase in the matching rate that the Federal Government pays for homing community base services?"

Harris: "Yes. This brings additional money to the people of the State of Illinois."

Demmer: "I appreciate that. And those federal funds, I think it's important to note too, are required to supplement and not supplant current funding. And so, the per diem increase that's laid out in this Bill adds additional funding for some of these providers, as required by Federal Law, and helps support them during a very challenging year."

Harris: "Yes."

Demmer: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Demmer: "I encourage folks to support this Bill. I think it really represents a number of key initiatives, many of which were laid out by Leader Harris. Also, some things that will expand, I think, access to care in rural parts of the state. We have additional support for veteran services for licensed clinical counselors in many parts of the state where there... they have difficulty finding access to behavioral and mental health providers. This is a result of a very good process, a deliberative process, and one that I think will support care

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- and delivery systems for people in every community in the State of Illinois. I urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Caulkins."
- Caulkins: "Madam Speaker, I have a conflict of interest in this Bill and will not be voting."
- Speaker Manley: "The record shall so reflect. Leader Harris to close."
- Harris: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House.

  I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2294 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 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills on Second Reading. On page 4, we find Senate Bill 667, Leader Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 667, a Bill for an Act concerning immigration. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 667, a Bill for an Act concerning immigration. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Hernandez."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly. Senate Bill 667, also known as the Illinois Way Forward Act and also the trailer to the Trust Act. It's

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

legislation that builds up the Illinois Trust Act and other offer further legislation to assurance to communities who want and need protection from local law enforcement. Immigrant families and communities continue to interactions with police, due to ongoing police cooperation with federal immigration enforcement. immigrants do not come forward to report crimes or work with police, if they fear being turned over to ICE, our entire community suffers. This Bill would draw a bright line between law enforcement and federal civil immigration enforcement. It would restrict police participation in ICE raids, sharing of information with ICE and transfers to ICE. It would also end the use of county jails for ICE detention, which the COVID pandemic has shown to be cruel unnecessary. More importantly, this Bill would reduce fear among immigrant communities that is caused by the harmful actions of ICE. I ask for your support."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Windhorst for five minutes."

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

Windhorst: "Thank you, Leader. We had some issues that were brought up in committee regarding some of the parts of the Bill that were seen from our side of the aisle. I want to hit on a couple of those here this evening. The first relates to the prohibition on law enforcement officers inquiring about or investigating the citizenship or immigration status or place of birth of any individual in the agency or the official's custody, or who has been stopped or detained by

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

the agency or the official. The scenario that I'm concerned about is where an individual is not a citizen of the United States who is driving a motor vehicle, they get stopped by a police officer, and the police officer... they were unable to produce identification, and the police officer inquires a simple question. Your name and where are you from. My concern is, the way this is drafted, those questions may result in, if there is some illegal activity, such as if the person has some evidence of a crime in their motor vehicle that's discovered later, that those questions, which are prohibited by law, may be... may lead to the evidence being thrown out as fruit of the poisonous tree. So, that is my concern. Do you... have you looked at this legislation from that point of view on that possibility?"

Hernandez, L.: "I would say, Representative, that the Bill does nothing to restrict the law enforcement officer, or agency for that matter, in investigating or cooperating in investigations of criminal activity. So, it's simply just not asking immigration information. That's it. Anything else, if they need to proceed by asking their name or if there's anything else, just as long as there is no questioning of immigration status. That's it."

Windhorst: "So, as long as the questions are limited only to... or prohibited from saying, 'Are you a citizen?', that question would be prohibited?"

Hernandez, L.: "Correct."

Windhorst: "But asking, 'Where are you from?', you do not believe would be a prohibited question?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Hernandez, L.: "They can't... the other is you can't ask place of birth. That would not be... that would also be prohibited."

Windhorst: "Well, and... of course, where you from has a... sometimes that answer may be the United States for me..."

Hernandez, L.: "Exactly."

Windhorst: "...sometimes it may be Illinois, sometimes it may be Metropolis, depending on who I am answering the question to."

Hernandez, L.: "I'm from Cicero, so..."

Windhorst: "Right. So, you understand that that question, in and of itself, isn't necessarily one related to citizenship or immigration, but it could be interpreted by a court as being that broad. Do you understand where the concern?"

Hernandez, L.: "Yeah. But the other... I would say the other is the... the individual doesn't have to answer as well."

Windhorst: "Immigration is largely governed by Federal Law. Is that correct?"

Hernandez, L.: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "And there's a provision in this Bill that relates to local units of government having facilities, ICE facilities, in their counties."

Hernandez, L.: "Correct."

Windhorst: "Is that correct?"

Hernandez, L.: "Yes."

Windhorst: "If this becomes law, that would no longer be allowed in Illinois."

Hernandez, L.: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "What would happen to those current detainees? Do you know?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Hernandez, L.: "So, interestingly, before the detention centers, ICE handled it very differently. They had programs that they were able to basically have these individuals enter and... and there were different kinds of... some that were at 99 percent, in terms of these individuals going to court. So, it worked. Right? So..."
- Windhorst: "I'm sorry to interrupt you. Just so I understand, the programs would've been outside a facility or inside a facility?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Correct. So, some of these programs like, for instance, it used to be they participated in what they call the Family Case Management Program, which showed up for 90 percent of their court dates. So, what I'm trying to get at is that there were... before the detention centers, there were other measures, other ways, alternative ways, to go about this. And so, the idea is that that's an option. But if these centers do close... currently, there's some detainees that are being moved elsewhere. But the idea is to go back and think about these programs that worked previously to the detention centers."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative, your time is expired, and I'm going to stick to the rules tonight. You can take the place of another speaker if you'd like to continue."
- Windhorst: "I believe... excuse me. I believe someone's willing to yield me time. I believe that's correct. May I proceed?"
- Speaker Manley: "It's... it's not so much the time. You'll get another five minutes, but during Standard Debate, there are three..."

Windhorst: "Yes."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "...opposed, three in favor. And so, you will take the place of a second Member."

Windhorst: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry I misstated that."

Speaker Manley: "Is that okay?"

Windhorst: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "All right. Continue, please."

Windhorst: "The information we received... I'm sorry. I forgot the new rule. The information we received in committee from one of the experts was that he believed that the detainees we have in state will be moved out of state if we do not have these facilities in Illinois. So, it would not be that they would necessarily be released, but they would just be moved out of state."

Hernandez, L.: "Yes. And that's currently being done right now as well."

Windhorst: "And so, we would then, as a state, lose the ability to have oversight on what's going on in those facilities, as it relates to detainees. They may go to another state that isn't as friendly, potentially."

Hernandez, L.: "Yeah. Well, frankly, it's the federal... on the federal and they should be overseeing this anyhow."

Windhorst: "And I agree with that. I agree with that. It's a federal issue, should be done federally. And we should not take action as a state that's going to hurt us as a state. And that's why I want to point out one thing, and I pointed this out in committee and we talked about it. There were three of these facilities in this state. I believe McHenry County, Kankakee County, and the also Pulaski County, Illinois. Pulaski County is in my Legislative... in Representative

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

District. And it is a... compared to the other two, it's a very small county. Has about 5 thousand population, about a 20 percent poverty rate, has a 30 percent minority population. If this were to become law... I've talked to the county board chairman and others in the county. If this were to become law, it would have very dramatic impacts on that county. I understand that there are a lot of interests at play and there are a lot of concerns we have. But given the fact that the only action we're going to take is to essentially move these detainees out of state with this provision, in doing that, we are going to be harming one of the poorest counties in our state. In fact, this county joins with another county, Alexander County, with Cairo, Illinois, which is also among the poorest, if those aren't among the two poorest counties in the state. And this will have a very detrimental impact on those counties. They're speaking of layoffs of 80 people. There's talk that there may be mortgages that will be defaulted upon, potentially. So, I understand where you're coming from and the interests that you're representing and the cause of this Bill's bringing forward, but I... from this county's standpoint, this provision will be very detrimental to the future of the county. And so, to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Windhorst: "Our federal immigration laws are, as I just said, federal. We should deal with them on the federal level. We should not be taking action here in the state that causes harm to a county or people in our state when we will not be essentially solving the problem we hope to solve by this legislation. We will essentially be removing it out of our

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

state and out of our control. So, I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mayfield for five minutes."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I'd like to read a letter from..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

"...yes, to the Bill. Thank you. From Sheriff John D. Mavfield: Idleburg, the top cop in Lake County, our Lake County Sheriff. It says, 'When I was elected Sheriff of Lake County, I promised to strengthen the trust between our communities and law enforcement. As the Chief Enforcement Officer of one the most populous and diverse counties in Illinois, it is vitally important that my department work to be able to serve all of county's residents. That includes our immigrant community. Nearly one in five Lake County residents is an immigrant. Many immigrants are reluctant to report criminal activity or otherwise work with police out of fear that they, themselves, might be reported or turned over to immigrant authorities. As a member of the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, a nationwide law enforcement organization, we are committed to protecting all residents in our respective communities, and supporting policies that promote our ability to do so. We understand that when we build trust with our immigrant communities, we have a better and safer community for all. For these reasons, I am endorsing the Illinois Way Forward Bill, Senate Bill 667, now pending in the Illinois General Assembly. This legislation is a key step to ensuring that immigrant families and communities will feel safer in working with all law enforcement agencies throughout the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

state. I'm asking the General Assembly to pass the Illinois Way Forward and Governor Pritzker to sign it.' As a State Representative in the Lake County area who has a high minority population, I am asking everyone in here to be open, to remember that we did process the... I'm sorry... that we did pass the Trust Act, and that we are a welcoming community here in Illinois. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Keicher for five minutes."

Keicher: "To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Keicher: "I rise before you today as a Republican who voted in 2019 for the VOICES Act and has supported many pro-immigration measures through this Body. I'd like the Assembly, if you can, to take a look at Sarah Powell, my cousin that you heard me refer to before, who was sexually abused by her stepfather from age 8 to 12. Her step-father, an Italian national, had no scruples dangling her out of a fourth floor balcony, threatening her with her life if she had ever spoken to her mother. Had he been detained here while an investigation was ongoing in Italy, and we hamstrung our law enforcement agencies here from asking additional questions while in custody, we have the distinct potential of allowing pedophiles on our streets by blocking our agencies from talking to other agencies that are investigating this measure. And I point you directly to Section 7(h) that says specifically, 'Unless presented with a federal criminal warrant, you may not participate or support in any capacity with an immigration agent's enforcement actions.' So,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

therefore, if there was an investigation with no charges yet filed in Italy, and we prohibited our law enforcement officers here from asking additional questions, we would have potential of sexual predators on our street based on the example, the sad example, of my cousin. I further refer you Section 5(e), where it says specifically, 'A enforcement agency or law enforcement official may not inquire or investigate the citizenship or immigration status or place of birth of any individual in the agency or official's custody who has otherwise been stopped... stopped or detained.' Imagine a scenario where we have an officer identify a car driving with Kansas license plates and a tattered bumper, and pulls it over because of a safety issue. There are four occupants. The officer walks up to the car and says, 'Where y'all from?' Later to find out that in the rear seat is a Hungarian national with a pound of fentanyl capable of killing 2800 individuals at the proper dosage. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have asked the Representative to work on tightening up these loopholes in this law. We should not rush in something so important. And I am empathetic and sympathetic with the issues that we have with ICE and our detention centers and the cooperation that's occurring. But I implore you... I implore you to not open this gate, because we will not be able to close it. And there is a better way to do it, and I offered to be a cosponsor on a tightened up version of this. But please think about our children. Please think about the danger that we may be putting them in, like my cousin Sarah. I urge you to vote 'no' on this and let's revisit it during Veto Session. Thank you."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Avelar."

Avelar: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Avelar: "I'd like to, first, thank the Sponsor of the Bill, Leader Hernandez, for her unwavering fight and advocacy for immigrant families who are part of the beauty and fabric of our state. This isn't something that I lead with too often, but today it is incredibly relevant. For 13 years of my life, I lived as an undocumented person in the Chicago suburbs. So, when I say that local law enforcement agencies working with federal immigration authorities breaks down the relationship between local police and their increasingly diverse communities, or when I say that I would fear that a traffic stop would lead to ICE knocking on my door, I know that because I lived it for over a decade. And I wasn't alone in feeling that way. Study by the University of Illinois in Chicago found that ICE collaboration severely undermines immigrant communities trusting law enforcement. Nearly half of all Latinx community members would be more reluctant to report being a crime victim because they feared that police officers will question their immigration status, or their family's status. Forty percent said they are less likely to report criminal activity out of fear that they will be caught up in immigration enforcement. But this issue goes beyond my personal experience. ICE collaboration with local police is a dangerous overreach that subjects people of color across Illinois the discriminatory racial profiling and harassment. This is a practice that separates families, diminishes public safety, wasted taxpayers' dollars, and damages Illinois'

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

economy. And for local governments, ICE detention and collaboration in Illinois ends up being costly. The Federal Government does not reimburse the costs of local resources used to collaborate in immigration enforcement. Additionally, ICE detention is dangerous and inhumane. The National Immigrant Justice Center and local leaders in McHenry County have shown, in great detail, the abuses of ICE happening in Kankakee and McHenry County detention centers here Illinois. Even the Federal Government has acknowledged that the Pulaski County detention center is abusive of immigrant detainees. For years, the case has been building in Illinois to close detention centers and end ICE collaboration in our state. And that Illinois Way Forward will enhance public safety by ending the practice of using local police to enforce immigration law. By passing SB667 and ending collaboration for civil immigration enforcement, we can start to rebuild trust between local police and all members of our communities, including our immigrant neighbors who are currently without status. And one final note. To clear up any misconceptions about the legislation, nothing in this Bill prevents ICE from arresting, detaining, or removing anyone convicted of a serious crime. This legislation is meant to end a connection between our local police department and civil immigration enforcement at ICE, not federal enforcement. And while some of my colleagues might mention that a loss of jobs brought on by the closing of detention centers might be the main worry, my response to that is that we absolutely cannot build a sustainable economy by jailing people. I urge an 'aye' vote."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Manley: "Leader Hernandez to close."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you. So, local law enforcement should focus on serving the community and leave immigration to the properly authorized federal authorities. Overall, this Bill is aimed at eliminating discrimination and restoring human rights. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 677 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', 47 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5, Senate Bill 828, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 828, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time previously.

  Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ford, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford on the Amendment."
- Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think we have some notes to...

  I'd like to remove the notes that's requested by Representative Ford."
- Speaker Manley: "We'll get to that."
- Ford: "Oh, we will? Okay. Let's move on. I'd like to adopt House Floor Amendment #2. House Floor Amendment #2 is a page and line Amendment that includes emergency rulemaking for the expedition and timely implementation of the changes made by

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

House Committee Amendment #1. It also deletes the reference in the Bill on... that not later than five days before the primary general election, it eliminates the drop box for voting in prison. It also makes clarification about post-convictions. And finally, it sets up a task force to implement voting in Illinois prisons. I move for the adoption of House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 828."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Mazzochi, we'll get to the notes and discuss the Bill on Third. Okay. Representative Ford moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 828. 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments, but a correctional and judicial notes have been requested by the Sponsor and not filed at this time."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford on the notes."

Ford: "I changed my mind. I don't want them. Please withdraw my Motion to have the notes."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Mazzochi on the notes."

Mazzochi: "Well, I... I would like to then file my Motion to have the notes on SB... on this Bill because I attempted to file them, and I was told that Representative Ford had already filed them. So, since he's withdrawn them, I'd like to have mine filed."

Speaker Manley: "You can't do that while we're... it's on the board, Leader."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Mazzochi: "Right. All right. Well then, see, this again goes to show the way in which the Majority Party will try to, again, avoid the actual consequence of statutory provisions that we have put in place to try to protect our taxpayers and to try to protect the public from ill-conceived laws that are not properly thought out. So, the Sponsor of the Bill filed notes knowing full well that he was going to withdraw them so that no one else would be able to file notes to actually get accountability for all of the ways in which this Bill is going to be disruptive to our existing system. One of the reasons why this Bill is a problem is because our Constitution expressly says you cannot have the very types of voting that he wants to now enshrine in this piece of legislation. If this was just yet another task force, we wouldn't have a problem with it. But since we all actually did swear an oath to uphold the Illinois Constitution, and this is proposing a methodology of going outside the Constitution to expand voting rights, I just find this absolutely baffling that the Majority Party tolerates all of this because this is not the rule of law. This is abuse of power. I urge that we reject the... this whole effort to get ... of procedural tricks to try to avoid actually having this substantive debate and responsible legislation."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Well, I think I beat her to filing those notes and she's very disappointed in that."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ford moves to rule the notes inapplicable. Mr. Clerk, move the Bill to Third Reading. Mr.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 815, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 815, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time previously.

  Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Ammons."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons on the Floor Amendment."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment 3 just adds Members to the commission. There are a couple of technical changes for the higher... the commission to study higher education equitable funding. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 815. 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 Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Ammons and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons on Floor Amendment 4."
- Ammons: "Thank you. Floor Amendment 4 does the same thing as 3.

  The only change is that it adds two seats for the House
  Minority Leader from the Higher Education Committee, as well
  as from the Senate."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 815. 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?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 815, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you. Senate Bill 815, it sets up a task force that will study higher education equitable funding. It puts the provisions for which the task force will fund when they report and the constitution of that task force. And I ask for its approval."

Speaker Manley: "We're on Standard Debate, as a reminder. And with that, Chair recognizes Leader Brady."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Brady: "Representative, first off, in the most recent Amendment, which was Amendment #4 if I'm not mistaken, you had indicated that we... that you and others had put on the Minority Spokesperson in the House and the Senate on the Higher Education Committee. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "Yes, Sir."

Brady: "And in addition to that, part of that, the Democratic Chair in the House and Senate Higher Education Committee was previously already on the Bill. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That is correct."

Brady: "And you and I had discussions in committee regarding, I guess you'd say, kind of, the balance of that. Did we not?"

Ammons: "Yes, we did."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Brady: "And I thank you for bringing this forward and for putting the Amendment on to try and bring what we agree on mutual respect when it comes to legislation and our protocols around here. So, thank you. I do, though, still have concerns of the fact that the purpose of this task force... and could you explain the difference between what a working group that you've been part of from its early stages, as well as myself and many others in this Body, what the real difference is going to be from this task force, which I now believe to be 38 Members possibly, 40 Members, something like that? What would the... what's the difference going to be?"

Ammons: "The higher education working group was primarily made up of House and Senate Members from both sides of the aisle. This task force will include researchers, representation from the universities. It also includes advocacy groups and other higher educational professionals onto this particular task force."

Brady: "Okay. And did... and that working group, which you and I are a part of, as I said, many others in Higher Education, House and Senate, and we did that on our own. We did that without a piece of legislation mandating us to create a task force. We did it because of our love and our concern for higher education within the State of Illinois and the direction in which it was headed in many aspects, in particular, a funding formula. And while we did a number of great things, I think, on that committee... and, yes, it's been a work in progress for over three years. One of those was increased funding for Map, the AIM HIGH Program, things we could really drill down for what we thought was best for the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

students... the students first and trying to keep those students in Illinois verse going elsewhere. And that's what really the charge was. And then, the last and maybe most difficult thing to tackle was going to be that funding formula. And in that process, do you remember, did we call in university representation? Did we extend invitations for experts in the field of higher education? And did we extend invitations for those who had previous experience in other states of what they have done in the way of funding formula, performance face funding, et cetera throughout... throughout our different discussions over those years?"

Ammons: "I do recall the Midwest Higher Education Committee of some sort spoke to the working group at one of our meetings and brought us some really great information. I do recall that. I don't recall us having any of the researchers, experts from the university level at the Higher Education Working Group. Perhaps it happened when I was not present."

Brady: "Well, I can certainly... and I trust you and I believe you trust me. And certainly let you know that we did have those... not only extend those invitations, but people that took us up and traveled great distances to be part of those discussions. So, to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Brady: "My appreciation for the Sponsor doing in what she did in the last Amendment, I greatly appreciate. I do have concerns though. The management of a almost, I guess, 40 now Member task force. I believe what was the focus of these... working group that we had was it was legislative driven. Which, sooner or later, it's going to be the Legislature that draws down to

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

a funding formula that's, I believe, so sorely needed in this state. We have a funding formula on the books, about 10 years ago in this state. Unfortunately, we just don't have anyone that's applying what's supposed to be done in higher education and making those difficult decisions right now. But I look forward in working on the groups in the future to be able to do that. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hammond for five minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Hammond: "I have been a member of the Higher Ed Working Group since its inception at the request of a number of Members of both the House and the Senate, and we have worked very well together for a number of years. And, Representative Stuart, I want to thank you for your leadership on that group, having taken the reins over, and you have done an incredible job. We have been able to accomplish a number of really good efforts for higher education. The AIM HIGH Program, when it was first adopted and the way it was put in place initially, was incredibly successful. Many of the universities still speak about how that is a tool that they are able to use to keep individuals that are residents of Illinois in Illinois to further their education. In addition, there's been a number of other opportunities for us to do our very best to keep our students here. We passed, as a General Assembly, a funding formula for K through 12 education after years and years of research and work. As a higher education group, we have had numerous experts come to our committee, or we met in other

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

places, to listen to them, to hear from them, to understand what other states do. How do other states fund higher education? And there was a whole myriad of ways that that is done. And it was incumbent upon us, as Members of that higher ed working group, to begin to peel back that onion and come up with a product for funding higher education that is fair, that is equitable, and is sustainable. I do not believe that by putting a 37 Member committee together... they're not even going to decide, by the end of all this, whether they all want cream in their coffee for God sakes. So, this is not the answer. This is not where this discussion belongs. This discussion belongs within our higher education work group. We just heard, from Leader Harris, about a Medicaid omnibus Bill. Our Medicaid work group worked on that product. We worked together. We were able to come up with a Bill that passed with absolutely no opposition. It can be done, Ladies and Gentlemen, and it should be done that way. So, I, for one, think that our higher education work group deserves to keep working on this until we can get a product that we will all be proud of and we will be proud of for our children and our grandchildren. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Stuart for five minutes."

Stuart: "Thank you, Speaker. I got..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill?"

Stuart: "I'll just straight to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Stuart: "I want to... I want to thank Representative Ammons for this. I'm a believer that you can't really ever have too much

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

information when you're looking to solve a problem. So, I'm happy to have this commission and the working group. Which it has been a real true joy to me, in my work here in the General Assembly, to have been an original part of that working group, and then to be asked to take over the helm was a great honor. And I hope that I am doing... doing right by our former Leader, Senator McGuire. I think that we can work in tandem. I know that you and I have had discussions that we don't intend to step on each other's toes or stop anybody from working towards it. I think we want to achieve the same goal of an equitable and sustainable funding formula to support higher education and to support our students and the diverse and different institutions that are all over our state. I do really want to thank you for recognizing the working group, making sure that representation is going to be on this commission for increasing the presence of Members of the General Assembly, understanding that it is important to have a legislative presence. So... and for fine-tuning the language to make sure that the commission we'll be studying a myriad number of studies and places of information. So, I really do want to thank you for making those changes that were really important to me. I hope that we can continue to, again, do this work collaboratively together. I think that's how we really get good things done, and I think this can lead to really good things for our institutes of higher education. So, I would encourage everyone to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let me just take back for a second. Senate Bill 815 is the trailer Bill to the higher

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

education pillar for the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus. We passed that education pillar. And part of the process that we did in the pillar was to determine how to address the inequities that exists currently in higher education among communities of color, black students' graduation rates, including Latino students, and other students of color that are not graduating at the rate that they should be. Cost is the number one factor that we saw when we talked to these student groups, and this task force will be looking at that and many other provisions that we need to do to address higher education, not only retention, but success for minority students. So, Senate Bill 815 is offered, at this point, to do that. And, yes, the commission is very large, but there are... Zoom helps us with that. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 815 pass?'
All if 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 70 voting in 'favor', 46 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to page 5, Senate Bill 6... Leader Batinick, do you have... are you ready for your point?"

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick for a point of personal privilege."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Incredibly brief, but it just struck me that today, of all days, my nephew Jack Batinick is literally, as a junior, signed up for the Indiana

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- National Guard, is on his way to Fort Benning as we speak right now. I had to give a shout out to little Jack Batinick, 17 year old. So, thank you, everybody."
- Speaker Manley: "Godspeed, Jack Batinick. Chair... moving to page 5. Senate Bill 1697, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1697, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman to explain Floor Amendment 1."
- Hoffman: "Yes, this... I believe that we would withdraw Floor
  Amendment #1 and would go to... we want to adopt House Floor
  Amendment #3."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hoffman and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman on Floor Amendment 3."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is... deals with the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act. And what it does, it indicates that Local Government Distributive Fund, Personal Property Tax Replacement Fund, the Motor Fuel Fund, and the Transportation Renewal Fund, which are distributed by the Department of Transportation to units of local government, would no longer be subject to the GATA requirements. These funds deal with revenue sharing and are basically driven... driven by statutory

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

amounts that are put into these funds and they are sent to departments of local governments. Secondly, it would exempt state grants to universities from the GATA oversight. And the reason for this is, there is already existing, not only substantial amounts of oversight at the university systems, but also the… where the grants are coming from. It does not remove federal grants, however. And then finally, it deals with the Downstate Transportation Act and the money that is statutorily collected, 330 seconds of the revenue generated by a share of sales tax would go to counties and municipalities with downstate public transportation systems. It would no longer be subject to GATA. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Wheeler, we're going to adopt the Amendment and debate on Third. Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1697. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1697, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman. Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I discussed what this does on Second Reading, and I would ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "Continuing on the pattern of Standard Debate, we have Representative Wheeler for five minutes."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

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

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Wheeler: "Great Bill. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Yes, I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1697 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 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we're going to move to Bills on Concurrence, page 7. We find House Bill 32, Representative Meyers-Martin. Representative Meyers-Martin is recognized."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am here to ask for concurrence on Senate Committee Amendment 1 and Senate Committee Amendment 2 for House Bill 32. Senate Amendment 1 just modifies the content of the informational factsheets contained within the home delivered meals to seniors. It's a factsheet that shall be written in a language that the client understands, if possible, and each... with each home delivered meal. Senate Committee Amendment 2 merely changes the amended language subject to appropriations. So, I ask for a concurrence and an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2'... inches from a clean getaway.

Leader Batinick."

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

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "My notes indicate that we voted on this unanimously. It went to the Senate, you amended it slightly, it got voted on unanimously. It came back over here. So, it's a double unanimous Bill. Maybe make it a triple unanimous Bill. Is that correct with your notes?"

Meyers-Martin: "Well, it..."

Batinick: "Yes, is a good answer."

Meyers-Martin: "Yes."

Batinick: "Yes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "Once again... do you feel the need to close, Representative, or can I go right to the vote? I feel like it might be unanimous."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to receive concurrence on Amendments 1 and 2 because it does not change the spirit of the Bill. It merely just clarifies the information contained."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 32?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; and those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Buckner. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 32. This Bill having... this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 68, Leader Flowers. Leader Flowers on the Concurrence."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 removes the provision that amends the Hospital Licensing Act but leaves the Hospital Report Card Amendment intact. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, our analysis shows that it came out of committee partisan, but then there was Amendment. We were unanimous in the House. Went to the Senate, got tweaked, unanimously coming back. Is that what your notes show as well?"

Flowers: "I concur."

Batinick: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Flowers, do you need to close?"

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 68?' This is final action. All those in favor say (sic-vote) 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harper. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 68. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 266, Leader Bennett. Leader Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I do concur on this one. This Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Guardianship and

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Advocacy Commission. The Bill, as originally drafted, ensures that the guardian substitutes, the wards stated wishes for the guardians' wishes, when making decisions for the ward. This requires the guardian to consider what the ward, if competent, would've done under those circumstances. So, the agreed Amendment requires the guardian to give previously expressed values and beliefs if it can be determined, 'substantial weight'. So, what this does is clarifies for the guardian, for lawyers and judges, on what the guardian does for the best interest of the ward. There are no other changes. This was previously passed unanimously in the House and passed the Senate unanimously as well. So, I'd like to move for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates he will."

Ford: "I needed to breathe. So, I figured I'll ask Bennett some questions. Representative Bennett..."

Bennett: "Yes, Sir?"

Ford: "...are you sure you want to agree with the Senate?"

Bennett: "Case-by-case, how about that?"

Ford: "Okay."

Bennett: "But this a good case to do that."

Ford: "This is a good case."

Bennett: "Yes, Sir."

Ford: "Could you tell me the year the Probate Act was initiated in Illinois?"

Bennett: "That's a great question, and I got a feeling you might have an idea."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Ford: "I do, and we talked about it over breakfast. I really appreciate you treating me to breakfast the other morning. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Not just because of the breakfast, but because you're a great man and you would only pass good legislation. Please, everyone, punch green."
- Bennett: "Oh, thank you. And I understand that's 1975, and I appreciate the help. Thank you, Sir. Greatly appreciated."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Bennett to close."
- Bennett: "Oh, please an 'aye' vote. Please. I'm still thinking about the bacon and eggs."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 266?' This is final action. All those voting in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Severin. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 266. House Bill 270, Representative Moeller. Representative Moeller."
- Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Make a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 270."
- Speaker Manley: "Could you give us a little bit?"
- Moeller: "Sure. This Amendment, it's a minor Amendment. It clarifies that the underlying Bill only applies to communities with a population of a thousand or more. And it also allows IDOT to apply for grant funding to pay for the construction of bike and walkways."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I voted for this Bill last time. It was nearly unanimous. Did the Senate Amendment address the concerns of Rep Miller, Davidsmeyer, Halbrook, and Niemerg who may have voted 'no' on this previously?"

Moeller: "I'm not aware of... I believe it addressed some of the concerns from the Department of Transportation."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moeller to close."

Moeller: "Would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 270?' This is final action. 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 115 voting in 'favor', 3 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 270. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 376, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 376. Senate Amendment 2 makes a small change to ensure that the intent is clear, that TEAACH is not limited to any one particular historical event or Asian American ethnic group. It is about all of us. Asian American history is

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

American history. Let's make history tonight by making Illinois the first state to require a unit of Asian American history be taught in our curriculum. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go directly to the Bill on this one."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "Give my Members a little bit of time to... I think we were at 98 to 13 on this last time. And I understand some people... I voted against a mandate for cursive writing, for example, and some people have a hard and fast thing about voting against cursive writing. But in this time, I have to give a shout out to my brother-in-law's dad and his brothers who were Japanese Americans, some that were interned, and actually two fought in World War II, two served, subsequently... all the brothers who were Japanese Americans that were interned actually fought. And I know that was taken out in the Senate, but I hope it's still in the spirit of the Bill. So, once again, a shout out to the Takada family. I like the Bill. I understand we're going both ways on this one. I appreciate you bringing the Bill forward. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 376?' This is final action. All those voting in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Bennett. Chesney. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

in 'favor', 10 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 2 on House Bill 376. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to page 8. House Bill 414, Leader Greenwood."

- Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on Concurrence. It makes some technical and clarifying changes to House Bill 414. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 414?' This is final action. All those 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 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 414. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 417, Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm moving to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 417, which is an initiative of the Chicago Park District pension fund to shore up their employee pension system. 2013, the park district advocated for, and we passed, a version... some pension changes, but that law was struck down in 2018, and the park district went back to the drawing board. The result is this Bill, which will strengthen the pension fund in several ways. Number one, it moves calculations for the employers' contributions from a multiplier to and an actuarially determined contributions so

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

that they can reach 100 percent funding. It also allows funds from any revenue source to make payment into the fund. The immediate results of this change would be that the park district will be able to make a supplemental payment of \$40 million in 2021. And the district has this money on hand to make the payment. They also create a tier 3 for district employees, where a new employee will pay 11 percent of their salaries, rather than the current 9 percent, into the pension fund. And the retirement age for these new employees will decrease from 65... I'm sorry... from 67 to 65. Finally, the Bill allows for issuance of pension obligation bonds to be used as supplemental contributions. There are guardrails on this, namely that there are maximum issuance caps, both annually and in total. I know of no opposition, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McLaughlin."

McLaughlin: "Madam Speaker, thank you. I will attempt... to the Bill... to be brief..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

McLaughlin: "...and perspicuous. As a person who's worked for 30 years managing pensions, both public and private, doing my best to help taxpayers and businesses meet their pension obligations, I was excited to see this pension issue on the agenda. Quickly realized this is a short-term fix for a single Chicago plan with pension obligation and other bond issuance items on the Bill. And that, my friends in this Assembly, is a shame and a missed opportunity. My constituents have been calling for weeks, asking us to address the looming pension crisis in this state. We've been ignoring them, and it's

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

pretty important. One out of every ten of the workers in this state are participants in public pension plans, relying on them to fund and be solvent in their retirements. Total liabilities now are estimated to be near 300 billion on these plans. The average of all state funds available to pay benefits on these plans is only 40 percent. For those in the General Assembly who plan on retiring off the General Assembly Fund, that is about half, 20 percent or less. So, you might want to pay attention to what we're not doing in this Body to solve the pension crisis. So, what we've done in this Session regarding pensions, other than this single issue? Really nothing. The impact on the increasing costs of these plans is crushing property tax owners, small businesses, working class families, and I don't understand how much longer we can ignore this. After a cursor review of the budget, which we received today, it looks like we're going to do what we always do here in the General Assembly and kick the can down the road just one more time. One more year. One more bandaid while the state pension plans are on life support. There appears to be no recognition in this Body on what this all means, how we got here, and, worse, what needs to be done to get us out. We need to improve the lives of our Illinois taxpayers, not make them worse. Numbers don't lie. Thirty years ago, our pension cost made up four percent of our budget. Now it makes up almost 30 percent of our budget. Why should this be incredibly important to my Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle? You are constantly proposing spending programs, social programs, health care programs, and many more. Many of these proposals are appropriated for and, in many instances, they

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

are not. As a mayor of a town for eight years, I know a little about budgets and appropriation. I was able to reduce the tax levy, the spending in my town 8 years in a row, down 28 percent. Doing more with less is why people sent me to this Body. And I certainly hope that some of you might join me in this quest as we move forward. I am looking for a few brave men and women in this chamber to address the state pension problems in the same passionate ways that I've watched you arque issues that are important to you. Unless the Members of this Body on both sides make the difficult decision to do what's necessary, to tackle the threat of our children's future earnings, and unfortunately, at this stage, their grandchildren and our grandchildren's future earnings, we're in serious trouble. With the historic change in Leadership in the 102nd, let's do what all Illinoisans are calling for. Let's make some history. Imagine, a word that's been tossed around quite a bit lately. Imagine if we were to solve the pension crisis in the 102nd Assembly together. Now, that would, my friends, be historic. Let's do it. Let's do it now before we run out of options, money, and time. So, I am going to agree that this Bill makes sense. I thank you for your indulgence. And I am going to back this Bill, but I plead with the House, the Senate, the Governor, and our good friends at the Supreme Court, no matter where their jurisdictioned in, to put the same care and attention to the rest of our state pension plans as we spent on this one. Thank you. And I appreciate the time."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 417?' This is final action.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

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 89 voting in 'favor', 25 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 417. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 452, Representative Mussman. Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Madam Chair and Members of the House. I would like to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #1, which adds a provision to the Bill that amends the Illinois Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service Act to transfer the commission from the Department of Public Health to the Department of Human Services. If you recall, the original Bill was an initiative of DHS to clean up a number of areas of outdated or superseded programs for individuals with disabilities. It passed unanimously out of both chambers. I ask for your support."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 452. This is final action. 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 House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 452. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

passed. House Bill 576, Representative LaPointe. Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Floor Amendment 1 to HB576. This is a Bill that allows our young people around this state to use mental health as a reason to miss up to five days of school. And this Amendment simply says that, after the second day, they may be referred to the appropriate support personnel in school."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 576?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 576. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 645, Leader Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 806, Representative Mah. Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to concur Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 806. The original... well, first, I'd like to note that there's no deception at all involved in this Bill. The original Bill was sunset... regulatory sunset language for the practice Act governing those who operate lie detector machines. And the Amendment includes language, agreed language, for 10 other regulatory sunsets. And it's all in an omnibus. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 806?' This is final action.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

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? Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 3 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 2 on House Bill 806. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1207, Representative Moeller. Representative Moeller."

- Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1207. This Amendment was an agreement between the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Shriver Center to ensure that the information being sought on invested equity and deferred compensation are not used in the decision making on hiring. Happy to answer any questions. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1207?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting '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 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to 1207. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 645, Leader Evans. Leader Evans."
- Evans: "Thank you. I'd like to concur with Amendment 1 and 3. We worked on this great task force to discuss the future of jobs as we incorporate technology. I'm looking at the... I'm trying

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

to pull up the specifics. We tried to get Legislators involved, but, most importantly, industry. With doing these task force, I'm not a huge fan of a whole lot of... it's only politicians, but we wanted to make sure that we got industry, we got labor. I think we got a great agreement in the Senate to have ample industry, labor, and elected officials to get a really broad task force. I request your support."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "How about that, huh? Same time. Leader, real quick. We had a unanimous Bill over here. We sent it to the Senate, and I see some Senators roaming around. What did they do to it to pull some 'no' votes? My notes say that the Senate Amendment just changed the reporting date a month. What else did the Amendment in the Senate do to change the substance of the underlying Bill?"

Evans: "The Senate Sponsor... oh, this is so much better. The Senate Sponsor, Ram Villivalam... I believe we added a couple of... there was some clarifications of labor. I think proper labor representation was important. And we added a couple more Members for our Speaker and Senate President. So, I... they may have had some issues. There could've been some Senate going back and forth, but it was nothing major. It's pretty much the same composition, little changes here or there."

Batinick: "Okay. But with the Amendment, the Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce supports, Illinois Chamber of Commerce is neutral, IMA and IRMA have no position. No opposition you know of?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Evans: "Yeah, no. Again, we went over to the Senate and said, look, let's make sure that we have proper representation on there. Of course, I'm a Democrat. I support labor. I support the representation of Democrats. And it was very heavy when it left from over here. But we took it over to the Senate and said we're going to put more industry on the Bill. We're going to put forth some different... with different voices, dissenting voices in certain categories, and I think we got what we need to produce a good work product."

Batinick: "Dissenting voices are good sometimes. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Manley. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Leader Evans, I see that this is the Future of Work Task Force. Wondering if you can give any inside of what our future of work was going to be this evening between 8 p.m. and 12 p.m. tonight?"

Evans: "Again, I can't speak to the future of today, but I know that technology is ever-evolving, and we have to be prepared for that. And today is ever-evolving, and I hope you all are prepared."

Butler: "So, if you could look into the future for the next four hours, what would our work be for the task force here of the 118 Members?"

Evans: "What I would say is that the Democrats are going to push hard for the people of the State of Illinois, the working class people of the State of Illinois, the women of the State of Illinois, the immigrants of the State of Illinois, the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

blacks, the tall, the short. I think we're going to do that on this side of the aisle."

Butler: "I have... I have another question for you. Yesterday, on the trailer fees, you said it was for Southern Illinois. I supported the trailer fees. Where do... where do I live? Do I live in Southern Illinois?

Evans: "You live in beautiful Central Illinois."

Butler: "Very good."

Evans: "But I would say that my friends in Chicago who ATV all over, they like trailers too. I got some good texts about that trailer Bill. I did not know I had neighbors that were into so many things that requires trailers, the boating. I mean, that was a great Bill. We helped the State of Illinois yesterday."

Butler: "Well, I'm looking forward to the Future of Work Task Force. I may not be looking forward to the future of our work this evening. So, thank you, Leader Evans."

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Evans to close."

Evans: "Thank you for your support."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 645?' This is final action. 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'. This Bill... the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 645. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

hereby declared passed. House Bill 1765, Representative Buckner. Representative Buckner."

Buckner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for concurrence to Amendment 2 on House Bill 1765. The Amendment tightens up some language that we talked about in committee before the deadline in the House. So, basically what it does is it protects municipalities from excessive claims when this law is broken. Happy to answer any questions. I deserve... I urge an 'aye' vote. I deserve it, too."

Speaker Manley: "That's a first. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, we passed this unanimously, sent it over to the Senate, and they amended it where basically every Senator on the Republican side of the aisle voted against it. And I believe it came straight to the floor. It did not go to committee here, correct?"

Buckner: "That is correct."

Batinick: "So, what was the massive change in the Bill? The Senate sometimes votes for everything. Right? So..."

Buckner: "They do. As I told you yesterday, we should be careful about following the Senate."

Batinick: "I agree."

Buckner: "But the change just was... I had talked to the City of Chicago and some other larger municipalities that wanted to make sure that, if this did becomes law, that the municipalities were absolved from excessive lawsuits. And

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

that's all it did. It protected... protects the municipalities from excessive lawsuits."

Batinick: "So, I'm looking at Senate Amendment 2, adds to the Bill... provides that the provision of the background prohibition does not apply whenever a person speaking at an open meeting... it looks like you're... okay, this is a background check and a prohibition for background checks, correct?"

Buckner: "Yes, and that... and that Amendment also... I'm sorry. The Amendment also brought some of the folks who were against it in the beginning, including the Illinois State Police, it brought them on the... either their neutral or the proponent side."

Batinick: "But you somehow managed 17 'no' votes in the Senate, right?"

Buckner: "I'm not sure how that worked."

Batinick: "Okay. I think I stalled... stalled long enough for everybody to make up their own mind. I appreciate the indulgement."

Buckner: "Absolutely. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Buckner to close."

Buckner: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1765?' This is final action. 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 73 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1765. And this Bill, having

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1879, Leader Spain. Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1879. This is one of those great Peoria Bills that is bipartisan. This is to designate penicillin as the State of Illinois microbe. And all penicillin that is still used today is descendant from a discovery that took place at a research laboratory in Peoria. I urge your support of the Concurrence, please."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1879?' This is final action. 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? Harper, Lewis, Tarver. Lewis. On this question... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1879. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1926, Representative Luft. Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This reinstates the provisions of the Bill, as passed on the House, that makes further repeals of statuses no longer in use. This repeals a contagious disease hospital division of the Illinois Municipal Code and repeals Article 2 Division 25 of the Municipal Code. This passed through the House the first time unanimous. It passed through the Senate unanimous. And as I've stated before, part of our job is to come here and put good things on the books that make quality

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

of life better for Illinois. But it's also our job to remove things from the book that stand in the way of quality of life. I ask for a 'yes' vote on this, please."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1926?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1926, as this Bill has received a Constitutional Majority, and is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2109, Representative Lewis. Representative Lewis."

Lewis: "Thank... thank you, Madam Speaker. I am here to ask for concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2109, the Bill known as Cal's Law, which helps to cure cancer for children. The Amendment was an agreed upon Amendment that took opposition to neutral, the Illinois Life and Health Insurance Council. And as you may recall, 2109 helps children who are afflicted with cancer receive the most advanced methods of testing available to them that will help doctors develop targeted drug treatment plans to minimize the pain, extend the life, and possibly even cure children who are afflicted with pediatric cancer. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2109?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Have all voted who wish? Mah. Robinson. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2109, as the Bill has received a Constitutional Majority, and is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2394, Leader Gabel. Leader Gabel."

- Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2394. The Amendment simply says that everywhere the word 'data' is, they change it to 'de-identified aggregate data'. This Bill requires the Department of Human Services and the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to collaborate on developing standardized format for collecting data. It came out unanimously in this House and in the Senate."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2394?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Vella. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2394. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Evans in the Chair."
- Speaker Evans: "Continuing on page 9, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 2553, Representative Williams. Ann Williams. Representative Williams. Out of the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- record. Continuing on page 9, we have House Bill 2589, Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. I move to adopt Amendment 1 to House Bill 2589."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Conroy moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Disregard the Motion. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill... yeah, sorry for the delay. Explain the Amendment. Explain the Amendment, Representative."
- Conroy: "Sure. Absolutely. So, this is the Substance Use Disorder Act and Overdose Prevention Program. It expands who can... who can do naloxone, the training, and treatment of it. And the Amendment basically is technical in nature and removed all opposition."
- Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you. Seeing no question, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2589?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Buckner. Harper. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2589. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 2621, Representative Guzzardi."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

"Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members. I'm Guzzardi: very pleased to be before you this evening with House Bill 2621. This Amendment becomes the Bill and... these Amendments, I should say ... and they constitute our affordable housing omnibus. The various pieces in this measure come from a variety of Members here. We've discussed many of these issues in the Housing Committee, in subject matter hearings and in presentation of Bills. So, I'll just go over them because there's a fair bit here. I'll go over some of the components of this omnibus package. The first is a grant program. It's the COVID-19 Affordable Housing Grant Program. This program will help the State of Illinois leverage additional federal investment as well as private investment for the construction of up to 3500 new units of affordable housing. We'll be using American Rescue Plan dollars. This is a measure that was introduced by Leader Ramirez that Leader Demmer has been a great champion of and we've worked closely together on this idea. The Bill will also raise the income eligibility for the homebuyer program run by the Illinois Housing Development Authority and will extend the sunset on the donation tax credits that support the construction of affordable housing. It will increase the bond authorization for the Illinois Housing Development Authority from 3.6 billion to 7.2 billion dollars. It will keep following a provision... oh, sorry. Those measures that Ι just mentioned were Chair himself, Leader Evans, who was the Sponsor of the House version of those measures. The Bill will also reassess Low-Income Housing Tax Credit properties in the county of Cook, and encourage other counties to do the same. These are rental

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

properties that have relatively low rents. And, therefore, we believe that they ought to be assessed, taking that rent and income into consideration. That's an idea championed by Leader Mah, who's here on our side of the aisle. And finally, there are two different modes by which affordable housing construction and rehabilitation may receive property tax discounts in this Bill. I'm happy to describe them in detail should Members desire. But the upshot is that we will be using the property taxes to incentivize new construction of affordable housing in areas that have very low affordability at present. We'll also be incentivizing new construction particularly, rehabilitation of affordable housing properties in existing areas. I'm so pleased that this evening we're joined by the three Senators, the triumvirate who put this package together, Senate Feigenholtz, Senator Gillespie, and Senator Hunter. They've done a wonderful job. The measure passed the Senate unanimously. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Any comments or questions? I see Leader Batinick for questions."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'm going to go to the Bill. This is a special day, Ladies and Gentlemen. There may be some Republican votes on a Guzzardi Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Demmer for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Representative Guzzardi, I appreciate the work that we've been able to do on a couple of different affordable housing initiatives. You may have mentioned this in your opening, I just want to clarify. The grant program that's being

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

established, I know in this Bill, substantive Bill, is subject to appropriation. What do we expect that appropriation might look like in this year and how is it funded?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah, thank you. I did mention it, and I mentioned you also, and grateful to your help on this area. We anticipate... we're hoping that over the life of the 4-year program here, we'll get \$300 million of American Rescue Plan money to be put into this area, where we'll be seeing more of that in the budget appropriations this evening."

Demmer: "Thank you. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a great step to promote the development and the access to affordable housing in all kinds of communities across the State of Illinois. This is a start. We're able to use some American Rescue Plan money to get this program kick-started. I had the privilege of supporting a Bill that Leader Ramirez worked on this year as well, and I think we should continue to find a way to make sure that this is a sustainable program that can live on many years in the future, bringing in private dollars to develop affordable housing in all kinds of communities. That's not exactly what we have here, but we do have a start. We're able to use money that's on the table today. And so, I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "For further discussion, we have Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

LaPointe: "Just a quick question for you, Rep Guzzardi. Am I right that this Bill is going to create more affordable housing across the State of Illinois?"

Guzzardi: "Vastly more."

LaPointe: "Excellent. Okay, I'm going to speak to the Bill. When we talk about affordable housing in this chamber, we talk about tax credits, we talk about percentages, but at the end of the day, this effects real people. Not that many years ago, I was a homeless street outreach worker, and I worked with a man named Fred. And I still know Fred today. And he's on disability, he gets \$700 a month, and he's been homeless for years. And he called me the other day, very excited, because he got his \$1400 stimulus check. And I am now his State Rep. He is still homeless. And he called me because he thought that would be enough to get an apartment. And I had to deliver the sad news to him that when you have an income of \$700 a month because you're on SSI, even when you get a \$1400 stimulus check, we don't have enough affordable housing in this state. So, I just thank you for this Bill because I know what we're doing here today means that in some years in the future Fred will have access to subsidized housing. Thank you, Rep."

Speaker Evans: "For further discussion, we have Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates that he will."

Reick: "Will, I've got a quick question for you. Okay, we're using ARPA money for this... for this affordable housing program.

That's fine. But we've had a lot of discussions in our

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

appropriation committees the fact that we want to be very circumspect about the issue of making sure that this one-time federal money does not become a full-time expectation on the part of all of us, that this money will someday run out. But where's the money going to come from if this is a permanent program? Can you just speak to that, please?"

- "Absolutely. Thank you for that question. And we Guzzardi: discussed briefly in committee today, but I'm happy to go into it further for the benefit of the Body. So, these are one-time grants. So, the way this works is that, affordable housing developers, they have some cash to put up front. They can borrow money from the bank. They can leverage federal tax credits. But often, it's not quite enough to be able to make the finances work for the project they're trying to build. And so, this is simply a one-time grant program that will give these developers that last extra bit of cash to enable them to draw down that private investment and that federal tax credit money and get this project off the ground. So, it's not an ongoing obligation of the state to those developers. It's a one-time payment to help with the construction cost, the upfront cost, for the building. So, we believe that this is an appropriate use of one-time dollars from the Federal Government in a one-time grant program."
- Reick: "So, what you're saying is that at the time... once this aspect of the program expires, we may go back to what we had before unless we have additional general revenue or some other nonfederal, not ARPA funding source to pay for it."
- Guzzardi: "That's right. And I think what you just heard from Leader Demmer and what you hear from myself and from Leader

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Ramirez and others is that we're interested, once these four years have expired, in making... in figuring out a revenue stream to make a long-term sustainable version of this program. But that's a conversation for down the road. Right now, we have a one-time money, we're going to do a one-time program."

Reick: "Will, I hope you're sitting down... you will sit down because I will vote for your Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. And our final speaker is Representative Mazzochi for comments."

Mazzochi: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Mazzochi: "One of the Bills that we had also supported in the housing related to HB3123, which was a more robust tax credit program that would allow us to be aligned with some of the federal programs to also try to bring more funds into the affordable housing mix. Why is that particular structural model not here in favor of the current one?"

Guzzardi: "Just a moment while I pull up the Bill you're referring to. 3123?"

Mazzochi: "Right. That was the one that was..."

Guzzardi: "Oh, gotcha."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Guzzardi: "So, this is exactly the sort of long-term sustainable version of this that I was just referring to."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Guzzardi: "But I think there's been some questions among our technical and legal staff about the... about creation of a new tax credit program while we're in receipt of the American

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Rescue Plan dollars. There's concern that that might violate the terms of those rescue plan dollars. So, instead, we're using ARP right now to fund this program. And, again, hoping that we might return to that program in the future."

- Mazzochi: "Right. And is there any reason, though, why we couldn't implement the 3123 protocol if we simply said it was conditional on the fact that it would not interrupt the introduction of federal dollars?"
- Guzzardi: "Yeah, it's... it's my understand from our legal team on our side that the implementation of any new tax credits could jeopardize those ARP dollars. And so, we've been advised to steer clear of it for the moment."
- Mazzochi: "All right. To the Bill. This is... finally, I'm very happy to say that, here in the House, we actually have a housing... affordable housing Bill that I think is actually sane. So, because of that, I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you. I think sane might be the strongest endorsement I'm going to get from Leader Mazzochi, and I appreciate it very much. I'll just say, very briefly, in conclusion, that we have a profound housing crisis in this state. There are hundreds of thousands of people who are unhoused or who are unstably housed. This Bill will not solve that entire crisis, but it is a step toward getting those people a roof over their heads and a home where they can stay. It's a really important step. It's a monumental step for the State of Illinois. I want to thank, again, the Senate Sponsors who were here. Leader Ramirez, Representative LaPointe who've been tremendous advocates. The entire Housing Committee. And

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

I know Leader Evans is in the Chair, I was hoping to speak in support of this Bill. But I'll just thank him for his great work on this issue. Representative Harper also. I mean, just a phenomenal team of folks. And to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle as well. It's been a pleasure working on this issue, and I appreciate everyone's support. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2621?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 116 voting 'yay', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2621. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9 in the Calendar, returning to Representative Conroy for House Bill 2595. Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2595. This is the medical necessity Bill that will allow patients who are struggling with their mental health to get the care they need before it becomes a crisis. The Amendments are simply technical in nature, and they removed all opposition in the Senate."
- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. The House does concur... on this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2595. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to the top of page 9, under the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2553, Representative Williams. Ann Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2553. If you recall, this is the Protecting Household Privacy Act, which places reasonable restrictions on law enforcement's collection of household electronic data from devices such as a Ring Doorbell, Alexa, et cetera. I'm happy to report that we were able to neutralize all the opposition in the Senate by clarifying some definitions, adding some exclusions. And, therefore, I know of no opposition. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2553?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2553. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2746, Representative Stuart."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Stuart: "Thank you. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 2746."
- Speaker Evans: "Please speak to it."
- Stuart: "The Amendment just... it provides language that was asked for by the Community Bankers Association and the income share agreement group to just recognize the uniqueness of their student loan operations."
- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no comments, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2746?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2746. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2776, Leader Greenwood."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment 1, which contains agreed language by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation in St. Clair County to clarify some language. I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no comments, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2776?'

  This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2776. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2806, Representative Halbrook."

- Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2806. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill passed out of the House unanimous and passed out of the Senate unanimous. I urge for a favorable roll call. Thank you."
- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no comments, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2806?' This is final action. All those voting in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2806. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2878, Representative Stuart."
- Stuart: "Thank you. I move to concur with Amendments 1 and 3. It is a gut and replace. The Bill becomes the Access for Consortium for Equity Act, which provides the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board, they'll be establishing a consortium to serve the needs of the incumbent early childhood workforce and the employers of

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

early childhood educators. Basically, we're creating pathways to get degrees and credentials for those that teach early childhood education. This will be a model that our community colleges and four-year colleges can also follow for future workforce needs. So, I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Any questions? I see Leader Batinick for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Representative, you had mentioned this was completely shell. Did this go through a House committee after it came back on Concurrence?"

Stuart: "Yes. It came through the Higher Education Committee."

Batinick: "Okay. And the vote there was? Do you know what the vote was by chance, Representative?"

Stuart: "I can look it up."

Batinick: "Okay. 'Cause I... it looks like it went out 6-4 and then came back... looks like unanimously. Can you... another 10 seconds on what the shell Bill does for us?"

Stuart: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear your last question."

Batinick: "I'm going to let one of my colleagues handle the rest of debate. Thank you."

Stuart: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Any questions? We have Representative Hammond for questions."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Representative Stuart, I just want to clarify. I think with the original Bill there was some issues with the universities and they were not all

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

on board. As I understand it, this is pretty much a gut and replace from the Senate that takes all the opposition off. Is that correct?"

Stuart: "Yes. You're correct. The Community College Board and all of our institutions are all proponents of this. They all worked together, really did the yeoman's work in a few months' time, and created this really great plan for our students. Thank you."

Hammond: "That's awesome, and I appreciate it. Thanks so much for your work."

Stuart: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Seeing no further question, the question is,
 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 3 to
 House Bill 2878?' This is final action. All those in favor
 signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting
 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who
 wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay',
 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment
 #1 and 3 to House Bill 2878. And this Bill, having received
 the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.
 Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 for Senate Bill 521, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 4 and 5 for House Bill 20... for House Bill 3443."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Evans: "On page 4, under the Orders of Senate Bills-Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 539, Chairman Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 539, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Burke."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Burke on the Amendment."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor
  Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 539. I'd love to adopt the
  Amendment and discuss it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Burke moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 539, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 539 is an omnibus ethics Bill that sets forth strong and forceful limitations on lobbying by elected officials, improves transparency, limits Legislators' fundraising during times the General Assembly is in Session, and strengthens the independence of the Legislative Inspector General while clarifying the inspector's jurisdiction. The Bill allows the City of Chicago to retain its established and detailed lobbying registration

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

ordinance. But for other cities, counties, and townships across Illinois, the Bill creates a new local lobbying registration requirement so that residents know who is lobbying their local officials. The Bill broadens the definition of lobbying to include those who solicit others to communicate with government officials and also creates a new category to be disclosed, that of the consultant. Defined as one who provides advisory services such as strategy, development, or quidance on who or when to lobby or influence. The Bill requires that the behind-the-scenes actors be disclosed by the lobbyists to ... to whom they consult ... or with whom they consult. The Bill reforms the annual Statement of Economic Interest that we all file, as well as many others, so that it's more easily understood by the thousands of elected officials, candidates, and government employees who fill them out. There are better definitions of what should be disclosed. The Bill bans fundraising anywhere on Session days and the day prior. It provides for General Assembly Members to be paid twice a month so that if a Member ... so that a Member is only paid for the part of the month for which they work. The Bill also includes several revolving door provisions. For state employees, for whom there is currently a revolving door, it expands the categories of people to whom the revolving door applies. And it also expands the prohibition to those who participated, personally and substantially, in the fiscal administration of a state contract or the making of regulatory or licensing decisions. It includes a revolving door for elected executive officials as well as General Assembly Members. And it prohibits those folks... those elected

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

executive officials and General Assembly Members from lobbying the state for six months after the termination of office or the conclusion of the GA term. In terms of the Legislative Inspector General, it allows the Legislative Inspector General to initiate investigations without the approval of the Legislative Ethics Commission and clarifies the jurisdiction and duties of the... of both the Executive and Legislative Inspector Generals, which was consistent with the original intent of the Ethics Act."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Burke. Please keep in mind, for this legislative measure, we'll be recognizing House Rule 52 of Standard Debate, three individuals in opposition and two supporting, including the principal Sponsor. Any questions on this legislative measure? We have Representative Bourne for questions."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Unlimited Debate.

We're not going to be here all night, but I think this is a really important Bill and we'd like to have more than three speakers."

Speaker Evans: "Please continue on Standard Debate, and we'll revisit your request."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates that she will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I first want to start with...
if you will go to... well, I don't have a page for this. You
spoke briefly about the revolving door provisions. Would it
be possible, under your Bill, for a Member of the General
Assembly to resign beginning of January... let's say the new

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

General Assembly starts January 6. If they retire on January 4, could they lobby on January 6?"

Burke: "If... if the Member... I think what you're suggesting, if the Member completes their term... completes the General Assembly. And so, if they've completed the General... that General Assembly then, yes, they would be allowed to register as a lobbyist the next day. But for anyone prior to that, the six months would apply."

Bourne: "But in the nature of our schedule, right, you could be done today, May 31. Six months from now is the beginning of January to begin with. So, it's... you could lobby your colleagues the next day either one way or you could go, say, retire today and you could still lobby January 1. Is that correct?"

Burke: "If you retire today, then it... you would be prohibited from lobbying for six months from today."

Bourne: "Well, I guess I should clarify. That actually doesn't take a place until 2023. So..."

Burke: "When I say today, I mean this time of year."

Bourne: "When it's effective, right. I think this is really a weak excuse for a revolving door. I'd like to move to the Legislative Inspector General portions..."

Burke: "Okay."

Bourne: "...starting on page 63, just to expedite it for you. On page 63, I see that to receive and investigate without advanced approval of the LEC, which we are changing. So, there would not have to be preapproval of the LEC. I'm reading this to say that the Legislative Inspector General may not initiate an investigation unless there is a complaint filed, which is

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

different than the current jurisdiction of the LIG. Is that your intention in this Bill?"

Burke: "So, Rep Bourne, are you... are you suggesting that, currently, the Legislative Inspector General can initiate a complaint on her own, without any complaints?"

Bourne: "No. I'm suggesting..."

Burke: "I'm starting investigation..."

Bourne: "...that the Legislative Inspector General could come to the LEC with public knowledge of potential wrongdoing and request an investigation. And under this legislation, she would not be able to."

Burke: "I don't know that that's a correct interpretation of the current law."

Bourne: "It's my understanding that if there's public knowledge, public reporting of something, the Legislative Inspector General currently could come to the Legislative Ethics Commission and request to investigate without someone initiating a complaint."

Burke: "I don't know that that's correct, Rep Bourne. I'm looking at the current language which allows the Legislative Inspector General, under subsection (1) currently, to receive and investigate allegations of violations of this Act, et cetera. So, the... to receive and investigate, to me, implies that she receives a complaint of some sort. I don't see that she has the authority to initiate something on her own."

Bourne: "So, it's my understanding that she does. And if she currently does, if we were able to get clarification on this, would you be intending to change that with this statute?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Burke: "Well, I don't think she does. So, I don't... I don't understand how you are making that interpretation. So, I'm going to..."

Bourne: "Have you... have you spoken..."

Burke: "No, I mean, we..."

Bourne: "...to the Legislative Inspector General on this change?"

Burke: "No, we have not. But it is something that she has advocated for many, many times over the past two years. So..."

Bourne: "So, I have..."

Burke: "...I mean, we could talk... if it turns out that you are correct, we could certainly talk about some clarifying language. But at this moment, I don't think your interpretation is correct."

Bourne: "So, I've spoken with the Legislative Inspector General, and that's her interpretation, that this would limit her ability. I'd also like to move to page 58. And it's your interpretation and your presentation of the Bill that this clarifies, I think was your word, the intention of the law when it was passed. It's my interpretation that you are limiting the jurisdiction of the Legislative Inspector General. Do you have anything from the passage of this initial legislation to show that this was, in fact, the intent when it was passed?"

Burke: "Sorry to delay that, Representative."

Bourne: "That's okay."

Burke: "There were... in the hearings that we had, there were differing interpretations, even amongst the three inspector generals that we have had as to what they thought their jurisdiction was. And so, I do believe that this does clarify

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

what the jurisdiction is. And it's also consistent with what the jurisdiction... the scope of the jurisdiction of the Executive Inspector General."

- Bourne: "I appreciate that. I think that it narrows it. So, under this, would a Legislative Inspector General be able to investigate a case like we saw with former Member Arroyo?"
- Burke: "Yes. But I guess what I'd ask you is, are you saying that you support a... the jurisdiction that, at least one of the inspector generals had discussed, that it's 24/7, your personal life as well as your professional and campaign life? Is that what you're suggesting should be the standard?"
- Bourne: "Yes. I believe that the checks and balances we have in place, with both the discretion of the Legislative Inspector General as well as with the check and balance on the back end with the Legislative Ethics Commission, would rein in a Legislative Inspector General from going beyond their bounds. Particularly since now we haven't changed the voting threshold to a supermajority to block a published report. I think there are well over enough checks and balances to make sure that a Legislative Inspector General would not go beyond their bounds."
- Burke: "Well, I would suggest that we just removed one of the checks and balances by allowing the inspector general to initiate an investigation based on complaints without the authorization... or, I'm sorry, not authorization... without the approval of the Legislative Ethics Commission. So, I think this is a good balance and one that, I think, balances her duties with the public's... I don't know, with the public's

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

confidence that she's able to look out for anything related to our public and official duty."

Bourne: "I appreciate that, but we've seen Members of this Body who have clearly acted outside of what the public's trust would entrust them to do. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. That have clearly acted outside of that in instances that are maybe illegal, maybe not. Maybe a state's attorney wouldn't be able to do anything about it, but it clearly goes beyond what we would expect a Lawmaker, who I do believe is set to a higher standard. I'm really disappointed with this piece of legislation. It's not in alignment with what Legislative Inspector Homer, former Legislative Inspector Porter, or the current Legislative Inspector General have asked for. We have seen, time after time after time, Members of this Body, elected officials in Illinois, who have gone against the public's trust and who are, in some cases, have gone to trial for it. If we are going to show the public that they can have a renewed sense of trust in State Government, we've got to do something a whole heck of a lot better than this watered down, diluted, and I think, in some instances, really deceptive ethics reform. We are looking at actually taking away some of the jurisdiction of the Legislative Inspector General. This Bill literally does not ban some Members of this Body from being lobbyists. This Bill claims to have a six-month revolving door, but you and I both know you could resign a day early and then go lobby your colleagues two days later. If we are going to have real anti-corruption safeholds... safequards in place in this Body, we've got to do a heck of a lot better than this. And that starts with really

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

empowering the Legislative Inspector General so there's not a protectionist racket called the LEC or LIG to make it look like we're policing ourselves. I'm going to vote for this 'cause we've got some tiny pieces of very small steps in the right direction, but the public in this Body should demand much better than this. I move for Unlimited Debate."

Speaker Evans: "Representative... Representative Hammond for questions."

Manley: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "She indicates that she will."

Hammond: "Representative Burke, as you know, I have been a Member of the Legislative Ethics Commission for a number of years. Over those years, many of the inspector generals that served during that time and certainly inspector general... or Legislative Inspector General Homer made a number of suggestions on how we could make this commission and the role of the inspector general more efficient and actually address a lot of the situations that, over the last years, we have been faced with, with our colleagues in the General Assembly. So, my question to you, Representative, have... when you drafted this legislation, did you take any of those suggestions into consideration? And if so, can you give me some specifics?"

Burke: "Well, I think the suggestion that I've heard the most from all three Legislative Inspector Generals would be to allow them to open... open cases without the authorization of the Legislative Ethics Commission, and that is done in this legislation. So, I think that's a huge step forward and that's actually been their number one asks. They perceive... you know, they do it as an independence to show that they're independent

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

from the Legislative Ethics Commission. And so, that is part of this package and I think it's a very important one."

Hammond: "And I would definitely agree with you that that is...
that has overwhelmingly been an ask, not just from the
Legislative Inspector General but also from a number of us
that serve on the commission. Can you give me an example or
a scenario under this Bill where the Legislative Inspector
General would not be able to act independently of the
commission in investigations?"

Burke: "I guess I'm a little confused on your question. Sorry, Rep Hammond."

Hammond: "Sure. So, under your legislation, where you are granting the Legislative Inspector General the ability to initiate an investigation without the approval of the majority of the commission members, can you give me an example of a situation where the Legislative Inspector General would not be allowed to initiate an investigation?"

Burke: "I can't think of one. Do you have something in mind?"

Hammond: "I don't have anything in mind. But I will tell you that after having conversations with the Legislative Inspector General, currently she is concerned that the way the legislation is drafted, while it would appear to give the Legislative Inspector General the authority to initiate an investigation on their own, she feels that there are caveats in... in the legislation, the way it is worded, that would not allow that to happen either for her or for future LIGs."

Burke: "Yeah. So, I've not heard from the Legislative Inspector General, but, of course, I would be happy to talk to her. And if she can provide some compelling rationale for why she

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

thinks that is, then, of course, we would listen to her and see if there's a way to clarify the language. But I don't... I don't see that, and I don't think that's the intent."

Hammond: "So, it is not your legislative intent to, in any way, preclude the Legislative Inspector General from initiating an investigation on their own."

Burke: "No, that's not what I said."

Hammond: "I'm sorry. Did you say that's not what you said?"

Burke: "I said what we would... because I think what the Bill does is to provide her, upon complaint... upon receipt of a complaint, which we've already discussed with the prior speaker is our interpretation of the current law. But if the Legislative Inspector General... I'd be happy to talk to her and see if we can sort through this difference because I think it's... I think it is comparable to current law. But from what you are saying, she has expressed to you that she feels it's different, and I'd be happy to talk to her."

Hammond: "And I would very much appreciate that. And I take you at your word, Representative. So, another..."

Speaker Evans: "Excuse me, Representative Hammond. Your time has expired. Would someone like to yield their time to you?"

Hammond: "...we have one more... wait, are we in on... are we on Unlimited Debate, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Evans: "We're not on Unlimited Debate. We are on Standard Debate. Are you in support or opposed?"

Hammond: "I am opposed, and I will end my questioning there. Thank
 you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Wilhour for questions."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Wilhour: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll just ... I'm going to go straight to the Bill. You know, there's something that I've noticed in my three or so odd years here in this General Assembly. We have a... we have a habit in this Body of kind of acting like we're dealing with the real pressing issues without really dealing with the real pressing issues in this state. You know, I call it legislating for press releases. You know, let's make the voters back home... let's let them believe we're doing something. But really what we're doing in a lot of ways is maintaining a status quo, a broken status quo. And that's what we got here because the truth, if we want to speak the truth here, the Majority Party really doesn't want to change the broken structure that we're suffering under here. It's a structure that's worked for them for a long time. It crushes taxpayers, especially in my part of the state, but all over the state. It drives out opportunity, but the structure is good for you. You know, something like six Members of this General Assembly have been indicted for corruption over the last couple of years. And we can't even do simple things like ... you know, the Legislator to lobby revolving door provisions in here, they're embarrassment. They're a complete joke. The Legislative Inspector General empowerment, there's no empowerment here for the watchdog that's supposed to be... that's supposed to have independence and watching corruption in this Body. It is a complete joke. It's an embarrassment to the people of Illinois. There's nothing in here on conflicts of interest. There's nothing on recusals in this thing. You know, there's nothing that prevents Lawmakers from using their public

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

position for personal profit. You know, this is simple stuff here. This is absolutely simple stuff. And it just makes... it makes me ask, on behalf of the taxpayers, the citizens in Illinois, is this the best that we can do? Is this the best that we can do? Restoring trust and credibility to this General Assembly should've been our number one priority on day one when we came back here. It should've been our priority a long time ago, but it's not. You know, right now, we have no trust. We have no credibility with the citizens in this state. The citizens don't trust the people in this Body. And they shouldn't. We don't deserve it. We haven't earned their trust on any of this stuff. You know, the corruption, the self-dealing, the influence peddling that's happened here under this dome for generations, it's been epic. It's epic. It's been a national disgrace. We are a national embarrassment when it comes to ... when it comes to corruption here. You know, the... there are some provisions in this Bill that are good. The economic disclosure is good, but it's not enough. It is not nearly enough. We need bold action. The taxpayers in this state are asking, they're begging for bold action. Not these half measures. We know what needs to be done. We know exactly what needs to be done. We talk about what needs to be done when we run for elections, and then we come here and we bring these half measures here. What we need, what the taxpayers are demanding in this state is that we institute the strongest anti-corruption safeguards in the country so we can ensure that corrupt politicians never gain this kind of power over the taxpayers of Illinois again. This does not go far enough. This is an embarrassment. Vote 'no'."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Representative Butler, do you rise in opposition or support?"

Butler: "I'm still making up my mind, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Thank you. Representative Burke, thank you for bringing this Bill forward. And I will say, just as I start off, there are some provisions in here that I think we like. But I think you're also hearing the frustration from our side that we need to go a lot farther. So, I have a few questions. First of all... let me look at my notes here. On page 34, we're changing the fundraising during Session days. And so, currently... well, the prohibition... could you explain what the prohibition would be on the fundraising during Session days?"

Burke: "So, the prohibition would ban... would prohibit fundraising during Session anywhere. You may not hold... and I'm going to clarify that, that you may not hold a political fundraising function during Session or the day immediately prior to such day."

Butler: "Day before..."

Burke: "There are some..."

Butler: "...day before and day after, correct?"

Burke: "No. Just the day before."

Butler: "Okay. Gotcha. And so, that... that applies to whom?"

Burke: "To Legislators and the executive."

Butler: "So, Executive Branch and Legislators..."

Burke: "And constitutional officers."

Butler: "...and any committees associated with those positions?"

Burke: "Yeah, any candidates for those."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Butler: "So, let me ask you a question, and I'm... you just happen to be the Sponsor of this Bill. There are several mayors in this... in these two Bodies who have campaign funds. So, it is my belief, reading this legislation, that any of the mayors in here, since they have separate campaign funds, could actually have a fundraiser in Springfield or anywhere in the state on a Session day and accept campaign contributions. And then, maybe the next day, transfer them over to their own state funds. Is that correct?"

Burke: "I don't believe so."

Butler: "What is... what are the offices that are spelled out in this section?"

Burke: "Where... where?"

Butler: "It's page 34."

Burke: "Any political committee on behalf of the foregoing. So, that would apply to anyone who holds another..."

Butler: "But any political committee on behalf of the foregoing of the person for that office."

Burke: "No, that's not what it says."

Butler: "Well, I guess we have a difference of interpretation here."

Burke: "On behalf of the foregoing. If you want clarification that it includes anyone who holds any other office that's elected, I think we could probably do that. I don't think the intent is to have the..."

Butler: "Okay. Okay."

Burke: "I believe this is clear..."

Butler: "I don't think that's exactly what it says but..."

Burke: "...but if you need..."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Butler: "So..."

Burke: "I believe it's clear, but if you need it for intent..."

Butler: "I've got two and a half minutes. So, let me... so, there's another... another point here about individuals who are compensated and require Senate confirmation. What about people who don't require Senate confirmation that still have campaign funds, like maybe former Members of the General Assembly that are working as Deputy Governors, who have hundreds of thousands of dollars in their campaign accounts and getting paid money on the side from East Jackson Street LLC, along with their state money as well?"

Burke: "Just one second."

Butler: "Just one second, Mr. Speaker."

Burke: "Yeah, I'm just pulling up the... the language. Just give us a sec."

Butler: "So, while you're looking that up, let me just... let me just say that, since I have a minute and a half, we have the Luis Arroyo loophole continues here in the General Assembly. Representative Arroyo, who sat on the Executive Committee, who advanced gaming interests and... and for sweepstakes as a Member of the General Assembly, he was a registered lobbyist in the City of Chicago as well. That will continue. We actually had the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee standing right back here earlier tonight. He is a registered lobbyist, right now, for the City of Chicago. Today. That won't change as a Member of the General Assembly. He was standing right back here earlier tonight before the debate on this Bill. So, how are we going to address that too? Couple questions for you."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Burke: "So, let's go back to your original inquiry, which I believe was..."
- Butler: "Deputy Governors who have campaign funds and other people who work for, I guess... people who are not Senate confirmed but still who have campaign funds."
- Burke: "So, are... I guess I'm just trying to wrap my head around what you're suggesting. Are you suggesting that anyone who works for the Legislative or Executive Branch, who also, somehow, has a campaign account, should not be allowed to have that campaign account? Or what... what's your suggestion?"

Butler: "I didn't... I didn't write this Bill. You wrote this Bill."

Burke: "But I'm asking you..."

- Butler: "You specifically... you specifically called out people who are Senate confirmed. There are people who make, literally, \$300 thousand working for the Governor who aren't Senate confirmed..."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Butler, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Butler: "...who are not Senate confirmed. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker.
  To..."
- Burke: "Rep... Rep Butler, we're not opposed to that, and it wasn't something that was flagged for us. But the Bill doesn't go into effect until January, and we do have some work to do in the not-for-profit space over the summer. So, that was not an issue that was flagged by your side but... originally, but I would be happy to work with you to address that."
- Butler: "I don't think we knew it was coming up. I don't know. Yeah. So, to... to the Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you, Representative..."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Butler: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Look, I'm going to vote for this. I think a lot of my friends are not going to vote for this. I'm going to vote for this. I don't like it, but it's one step in the right direction. You do have some of the things that we like. Representative Murphy has had a Bill. Representative Jimenez had it to make sure that Legislators who work one day of the month, which we have seen recently, only get paid for one day of the month. I think that's what's in this legislation. You have ... you have my Bill to rein in members of the State Board of Elections who tried to do nefarious things with their campaign funds when they get on the State Board of Elections. I appreciate that. There's a lot more work to do though. And I think that's what you hear in our frustration tonight, that there's a lot more. And you just acknowledged that, that there's a lot more work to do. So, I hope we continue in a bipartisan, collaborative fashion. Not with Bills dropped in the middle of the night, at the end of Session, with... I don't know, debating it with less than three hours to go, that we actually work as a team on this stuff. 'Cause I think we all want to get to the same place. So, let's work it as a team on this and let's get it done for the people of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Butler. We've had three Members speak in support, following the guidelines of Standard Debate. Representative Caulkins, do you rise in support or opposition?"

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

Speaker Evans: "You must... you must declare."

Caulkins: "I have some questions that want to just..."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Evans: "Do you rise in support or opposition? Or we move to a vote..."
- Caulkins: "Opposition, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Evans: "You're our final speaker. Representative Caulkins."
- Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Evans: "Indicates that he will."
- Caulkins: "Thank you. Representative, you said you have not talked to the IG, current IG folks?"
- Burke: "I have not talked to the IG today, but I certainly had numerous conversations with the IG over the course of the last several months, and she's appeared numerous times before the commission and before our committee."
- Caulkins: "And what was her opinion of this point about the initiate investigations? I mean, we've talked a lot about it."
- Burke: "Yeah. I was under the impression that this is what she wanted. But again, I'm happy to... if there is some better language that we can talk about, I'm happy to do that. But what is in this Bill is our impression of what the LIG was asking for."
- Caulkins: "How long have we been working on this so-called ethics reform?"
- Burke: "There was an ethics commission that was... that started meeting in 2020. We had numerous hearings. Many of your... some folks on your side were on there as well as some other appointees and folks from the Senate. So, we worked on that. And then we were unable to get things done because of COVID. And then, with the formation of this General Assembly, we

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

have an Election & Ethics Committee. And so, we've been working on Bills as they've come through."

Caulkins: "Any... and ideas, suggestions, implants from this side of the aisle incorporated in this?"

Burke: "Many suggestions..."

Caulkins: "What..."

Burke: "...and ideas from your side of the aisle have been incorporated."

Caulkins: "Why is the financial disclosure form for the courts not used? Why... why are we designing our own financial report?"

Burke: "Because that's also vague. And one thing you have to keep in mind with the statements of economic interest is it's not just the Members of the General Assembly who fill these out. It's candidates for office, for local offices, people who have never run for office before, and it's thousands and thousands and thousands of state employees. So, we have to keep in mind and balance what we're asking folks to disclose. And I think the new form is a good balance."

Caulkins: "Don't we have a separate financial disclosure form for the courts?"

Burke: "Are you asking me or telling me?"

Caulkins: "Yeah, I'm asking. Yes. I believe we did, but I'm not sure."

Burke: "Perhaps we do, but that's not the wanted issue and..."

Caulkins: "So, why... why can't we have a..."

Burke: "Because there is some..."

Caulkins: "...more stringent financial disclosure for the General Assembly?"

Burke: "What would you like disclosed?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Caulkins: "I beg your pardon?"

Burke: "What... what additional things would you like disclosed?"

Caulkins: "I think using the court's disclosure form, being more transparent would be a big deal."

Burke: "Well, I guess it'd be helpful to know specifically."

Caulkins: "Well, I'd be happy to give them to you later."

Burke: "Okay."

Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you, Representative Caulkins.

Are you done with your questions?"

Caulkins: "To the Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you."

Caulkins: "This Bill is... is not ready for prime time. It is, indeed, an attempt to appease the people of this state who have demanded ethics reforms. We have taken their charge. We've taken this subject that we've been promised in 2019 that we would come to an agreement, that we would have genuine ethics reforms in this state. This... this is exactly the example of why we don't have commissions or why our commissions don't work. We need to have stringent, very, very stringent ethics reforms. Illinois is the second most corrupt state in the nation. This Bill goes nowhere near what's needed to do in order to fix that. The people of Illinois demand better. We should demand better. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Chairman Burke to close."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for the robust debate. We have had some high profile situations where some former colleagues have been engaged in wrongdoing. And those folks were caught and appropriate action is moving along. Those things are already illegal and not... and just not

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

something that would be tolerated or accepted. So, this Bill... this Bill is the product of input of many, many people with varied opinions. I want to thank everyone who attended hearings and offered input to my House and Senate colleagues who have diligently vetted through the testimony and research. We have some additional work to do for the not-forprofit community, to finesse the lobbying definitions or the exceptions to ensure we aren't providing a barrier to grassroots lobbying. I've committed to continuing these talks over the summer to develop a trailer Bill, as necessary. And based on some of the discussion we had today, there'll probably be a couple more topics of things that need clarification or fleshing out. I ask for the support of the Body. This Bill is a big step forward for transparency and will allow us to work toward earning more public trust. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5'... excuse me...
'Senate Bill 539 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?
Mazzochi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question,
there are 113 voting in 'favor', 5 voting 'against', and 0
voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek
recognition?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Butler: "Thank you. I just want to follow up on a previous discussion and just let the Body know that, in the short time after I made my remarks, it just takes a quick search of the Illinois State Board of Elections to see that members of the Governor's administration... top level members of Governor's administration who maintain their accounts have literally give thousands of dollars within the last few months to Members of the General Assembly. There's one \$10 thousand donation to a certain Senator, recently. So, to my point, this is something we really need to take a look at as we move forward. Additionally, I've been told a Member that recently left this Body that got a job with the Department of Natural Resources continues to have her campaign fund open while as a member of the Department of Natural Resources. So, Representative Burke, I really hope we can take a hard look at this stuff as we move forward. We do a lot of work, a lot of talk about trailer Bills, but this is one that cries out for a semi-trailer worth of trailer Bills to get us where we need to go."

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

Carroll: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Carroll: "Well, I wanted to say I went to the back room and noticed that we had several pizzas delivered this... early this evening that are now all gone. So, assuming the Body enjoyed and want to thank our old friend Shaw Decremer for buying pizza for the chamber. So, if we can, let's give him a nice round of applause. Thank you."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Representative Halbrook, for what reason do you seek recognizes?"

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your inquiry."

Halbrook: "Yeah. So, I'd like to know, would you advise me and the Body the status of HJR18?"

Speaker Evans: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of HJR18?"

Clerk Bolin: "HJR18 has been assigned to the House Executive Committee."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just real quickly. A week and a half ago, the headline read, 'The state's top fiscal watchdog spent \$250 thousand in campaign funds, says the high court.' On February 18 of this year, I refiled HJR18 from the previous year. This is a Resolution calling for a vote to remove Auditor Frank Mautino. What has happened here is a microcosm of the ethical problems we have in Illinois. Maybe what he did was just a misunderstanding of the law and there was no intent to skirt the law. But Frank Mautino is not just a former State Legislator, he is the Auditor General of Illinois. It really doesn't matter if it was deliberate or not. However, if it was deliberate, he should be disqualified from serving as Auditor General. In light of the Illinois Supreme Court's recent decision, we need to move on this legislation, sooner than later. We need an Auditor General that understands the finance and who will hold the state agencies accountable, not a compromised former politician. I urge the Leaders in this House and in the Senate to do the right thing and remove Frank Mautino as Auditor General. Thank you."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Evans: "Returning to Order of Concurrences. On page 9, we have House Bill 3004, Leader Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #2. It tightens up the Bill. There was some conflicting language, but the underlying Bill stays the same. Essentially you can't be a member of a pension board and then, yeah, there's a 12-month moratorium on working for that particular pension system that you're on the board for. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3004?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3004. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 9, we have House Bill 3174, Chairman Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3174 retained the original language in the Bill and adds provisions allowing wind power facilities built to replace existing power generators to qualify for High Impact Business tax incentives. Permanent structures associated with the wind turbines are also eligible for these incentives. The underlying Bill passed the House on the Consent Calendar, and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3174?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3174. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wilhour, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Wilhour: "Yes. Thank you. On March 18 of this year, this House passed a Resolution to publicly condemn a sitting Member of this Body. This Resolution contains serious claims about violations of oath and the Constitution. In the months since this Resolution was adopted, the Legislative Inspector General has performed a full investigation into these allegations. And the result of that... the result of that investigation was a complete exoneration from the reckless irresponsible accusations that were levied into and condemnation Resolution. Words matter. Facts matter. We talk about this stuff a lot. And in light of this report from the Legislative Inspector General, I would ask that the Sponsor, Representative Morgan, do the right and respectful thing by a fellow Representative and remove this false and slanderous Resolution from the record. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Representative Morgan, for what reason do you seek recognizes?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Morgan: "I'm surprised that one of my colleagues would think that, on Memorial Day, when we think about those who protected our institutions, and we lost a member of law enforcement on that day in January 6, they thought on a day like today, he thinks that we should talk about apologies for calling out the impact of the words like traitor, the definitions, the ways that we talk about other people that led to an insurrection and a murder of a member of law enforcement trying to keep us safe. I think many of us were together earlier today at Oakridge Cemetery talking about those that defended us, kept us safe. And I think today, on Memorial Day, the only thing I will say is that what is in order today is to focus on those who kept us safe, keep in mind the lives of those lost, including Brian Sicknick. I just don't know what else to say. I think if this Body can't come together and think about that on Memorial Day, I'm not really sure what we're doing here. So, I think that we have to focus on a path forward, but we cannot forget what happened on January 6. And I think the only thing that we can do is focus on those lives lost, including a member of law enforcement keeping us safe on Memorial Day. And I think that is what I would've asked my colleague, Mr. Wilhour, to think about what patriotism means on a day like Memorial Day. So, that's all I'll say. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Evans: "Returning to the work on page 3, Senate Bills-Second Reading. We have Senate Bill 215, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Yes, I would ask that the Amendment be adopted and we could debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor vote... excuse me. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #2, which has been adopted to Senate Amendment (sic-Bill) 215 provides... is an initiative of the Attorney General. What it provides is the release certain opioid related claims by units of local government, if a certain number of counties agree to it, an intrastate settlement allocation agreement. What this allows is that if 60 percent of the population of the State of Illinois, including all counties of a population of over 250 thousand

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

agree to an intrastate settlement allocation agreement with the Attorney General, then the Attorney General can intervene and release all the other opioid claims against it. This allows for this national multistate opioid settlement to take place and gives the Attorney General the ability to negotiate on behalf of the local governments of the State of Illinois and allows them to have a settlement, which many believe could be considerably higher as a result of this provision. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Evans: "Any questions? We have Representative Windhorst for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, in committee there was some concern expressed about those municipalities and counties that have already filed suit and they may have those lawsuits pending against those opioid companies. Do you feel there's sufficient protection in this legislation for those who've already filed suit?"

Hoffman: "Yes. What this would... what this would allow for is, in order to do the settlement of the multistate litigation, it would allow for the Attorney General to do it. So, they would only be effected if a nationwide settlement is reached. And then, when... if a nationwide settlement is reached, this would allow for 60 percent of the population of this state, including all counties over 250 thousand would agree, and by having this ability the counties would actually, I believe, receive more money because there would be the ability to release all claims at the same time."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Windhorst: "And there has been an effort to reach out to the various state's attorneys of the state to get their opinion and interpretation as well?"
- Hoffman: "It's my understanding that the Attorney General's Office has worked with the various state's attorneys to help craft this legislation."
- Windhorst: "Thank you for answering my questions. I would encourage a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "Any additional questions? I see Representative Halpin for questions."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Evans: "Indicates that he will."
- Halpin: "Just briefly, Jay. I'm supporting the Bill, but I wanted to ask you, do you know whether it'll be the court, the Attorney General, or the Legislature that will determine how that settlement would be distributed at the end of the day?"
- Hoffman: "So, it would... it would be between the agreement of the Attorney General and the 60 percent of the populations for the counties, and counties over 250 thousand. So, that would set out how that would happen."
- Halpin: "And so, that would be part of the settlement agreement itself, how that gets distributed? Or is it in the Attorney General's discretion, or either?"
- Hoffman: "It's my understanding that there would be... there would be a settlement agreement, and then there would be this agreement. This... he could settle the cases now. The problem is, if you don't settle them and get rid of the liability, the values goes down considerably. This allows him to do that."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Halpin: "And so, anyone that has a current claim, any municipality or county has a current claim, it'll be their responsibility to work with the Attorney General to see what share they're entitled to under that situation?"

Hoffman: "I believe it'll be worked out in the agreement."

Halpin: "All right. Thank you so much, Jay. Appreciate it."

Speaker Evans: "Any further discussion? We have Representative Mazzochi for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Mazzochi: "Well, I'm thrilled that the prior Legislator asked some of the questions that I had. The follow-up one would be, is this going to preclude any future claims from being filed? And if so, what will be the distribution mechanism for any future claims?"

Hoffman: "Yes. On behalf on local governments, once this settlement is reached and distribution and they voted with 60 percent or signed up 60 percent of the population and counties over 250 thousand, after the effective date against opioid defendants, if a defendant has been subject to the national multistate opioid settlement and has been approved by the Attorney General, then that would be precluded."

Mazzochi: "Right. So, I guess that's just the one caveat that I would caution on and whether we need to instruct the Attorney General to set forth some additional criteria or standards, because there could very well be additional units of local government or school districts that could be affected by this settlement that might legitimately have a potential claim, either now or going forward, that would be subjected to this.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

We should just have some additional clarity on exactly how the Attorney General is going to distribute the funds or, at the very least, not allow him to distribute them all in one fell swoop so that we can ensure that everyone is going to be made whole in a way that's fair under the terms of the settlement agreement. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Evans: "Question is, 'Shall House'... excuse me... 'Senate Bill 215 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, on page 4, Leader Hoffman with Senate Bill 826. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 826, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman... Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 826, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has to do with the issues regarding

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Capital Township. Capital Township is a township that is located entirely in Springfield and is subject to what is called Article 90. What Article 90 does is it makes the county treasurer the supervisor... the county treasurer of Sangamon County the supervisor and collector of the township, and the county clerk, the assessor and the clerk, all as a matter of law. What this would do is it would say that, in the future, what would happen is Article 90 would be repealed and that the county treasurer would no longer serve as a supervisor or collector and the county clerk would no longer serve as the and clerk. And those positions independently elected within the township boundaries. Ιt makes sense to me that if you live ... you should have to live in the township boundaries, be elected by the members of Capital Township... the population of Capital Township in order to make sure that you serve in these positions. This gives the right to people and the right to one-person, one-vote under the Federal Voting Rights Act. And I would ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Evans: "Any questions from the... we see Representative Butler for questions."

Butler: "Question of the Sponsor please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will yield."

Butler: "Jay, are you a resident of Capital Township?"

Hoffman: "I am not."

Butler: "Did you vote to eliminate the Sangamon County collectors in 2016? I can answer. You did. To the Bill. Listen, so the Bill that I worked so hard on, that I had a fit on a month ago, this is the opposite of that Bill. The Senate Sponsor

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

decided to send it over. The original Sponsor of this Bill couldn't get it out of committee so she gave it ... we had it bottled up in counties and townships. It's as easy as that. I had at least 22 of you committed to voting for my legislation. Twenty-two. Many of you who are very good advocates for township consolidation. This Bill is the exact opposite that erases an over 100-year relationship that the county of Sangamon has with my township and Representative Murphy's township, and not anybody else in this chamber. Nobody else. We defer to locals all the time on their local issues. I am... I am stunned that the reprisal of a Bill that I tried to do, that is a good government Bill that would give the people of Capital Township the ability, by referendum, to determine their path forward, to determine a path forward that 75 percent of my friends and neighbors in this township voted to do. And if you guys vote for this Bill, those 32 thousand people plus in Capital Township, you're slapping them right in the face. Many of you have advocated for consolidation. The Sponsor of this Bill, I voted for his consolidation Belleville... Bill. Others have consolidations in their communities and their townships that they advocated for. But what you're doing here is going directly against the will of my constituents by the heavy hand of the State Legislature. And by the way... 'cause I know 'cause I've talked to you a lot about this. Talked to a lot of you about this. This comes directly from the senior center, U.S. Senator from Illinois. The Senate Majority Whip who was here today with his downstate director, who excoriated me, excoriated me in an op-ed in The State Journal-Register and

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

said tremendously untruthful things about my motivation behind consolidation that a lot of you support. Think about that. For some reason, the Senate Majority Leader of the United States Senate decides to show up at the Capitol today and this Bill gets called. The downstate director of that said Senator was walking out of the Speaker's Office just the other day, and I saw him. So, what's going on here, folks? I do my best to work my Bill. I get 22 of you to support it, which is the majority of this chamber, and what I get out of it, I get screwed. You know... so, let me tell you what this Bill does 'cause it's very difficult to understand. But what this does is sever a relationship that my... we have been at the vanguard of consolidation in Sangamon County. At the vanguard of consolidation. And what you are doing is going directly against what my constituents want. And I see the Senators in here as well. You're going against what exactly my constituents want. This is going to be... so, what you're going to do... the only four elected officials in Capital Township are the township trustees. That's all we have. Because of the relationship of Article 90 that the Sponsor of this Bill wants to eliminate, that's a 120-year-old law, means that that relationship where the county clerk is the assessor for Capital Township, the county treasurer is the supervisor, and we have an intergovernmental agreement with the township to carry out... from the township to the county to carry out the duties of the township. General assistance, assessment, things like that. It works pretty well. And so, let me tell you, folks, my tax rate in Capital Township is probably one of the lowest township tax rates in this state. I'm sure

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Representative Murphy is as well, 'cause I've got the numbers right here. The rate for 2020, .0552. My house, \$150 thousand, I paid \$27.60 a month in my property taxes. Or excuse me, a year, for my property taxes in Capital Township. And if you'd pass this Bill tonight, this is a sure fire tax increase for not only me and Representative Murphy, but everybody who lives in Capital Township. Everybody who lives in Capital Township because we're going to have to have an assessor, we're going to have to have a supervisor, we're going to have to have a clerk. You will be expanding government when this Body wants to contract government, the state which has the most governmental bodies in the country. And that's what you guys want to do. All of you... all of you that have passed legislation that I have voted for on consolidation, you're going against your word on that. So, let me tell you. Some of the other townships that come into Springfield... there's other townships that come into Springfield, other than Capital, which is wholly contained within Springfield. So, I paid 27 and 60 dollars a year. Woodside Township, okay, 'cause they're a full township, \$204.15. Rochester Township, \$282.55. Gardner Township, \$311.90. Springfield Township, \$364.30. I could very well go from paying \$27 a year to \$364 a year. We have a history here in Sangamon County..."

Speaker Evans: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Butler: "You know what? This is a personal issue for me, Mr. Speaker, as you guys know. We have a history of consolidation here in Sangamon County. Elections commission consolidated."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Would anyone wish to yield their time to Representative Butler?"

Butler: "Animal control consolidation. Parks and recreation consolidation. Public health consolidation."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Butler yields... Representative Butler... Representative Morrison yields you time. Continue, Representative Butler."

Butler: "Township collectors, which passed with 106 votes in this chamber, you guys voted on to get rid of township collectors. Which how do we do that? We did that by advisory referendum that told us what to do. Look, I won't belabor the point. I had 22 of you that were committed to voting for my piece of legislation, which would have died in the Senate, by the way. The Senate Sponsor of this legislation would've made sure made sure of that, but that's fine. So, if you want to blow up our township, if you want to blow up any semblance of bipartisanship in Sangamon County, go for it. If you want to be with me and continue the good things that we're doing in Sangamon Township... or excuse me, in Capital Township in Sangamon County, I'd appreciate a 'no' vote on this. And, Senator Turner, I'm happy to work with you to try to figure this out, and this ain't the way to do it. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Butler. Representative Murphy is recognized. Are you in support of opposition of this measure?"

Murphy: "Opposition."

Speaker Evans: "Please continue, Sir."

Murphy: "Will the speak... will the Sponsor yield?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Murphy: "As Sponsor of this Bill, I'm assuming you're familiar with the works of Capital Township and Sangamon County?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I am."

Murphy: "Okay. So, you're familiar with the Sangamon County Citizens' Efficiency Commission?"

Hoffman: "I've heard of them, yes."

Murphy: "Okay. I've not only heard of it, I spent six years on it. I was vice chair for four of those years and chairman for two of those years. You know, one thing we never talked about was making Capital Township... taking it away from the county. You know why? 'Cause it runs amazingly efficient. This... this Citizens' Efficiency Commission was bipartisan. We had a former Sangamon County Democratic chairman on this commission. They were not in favor of what's trying to be done today. It never was. We had a referendum, 74 percent of it wanted to be rolled into the county. All of our considerations for consolidation never, never talked about more government. And this will have more government. What all officials will be elected if this happens?"

Hoffman: "I apologize. Was that a question?"

Murphy: "Yes, it was. What... what officials will be elected if this happens?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that the supervisor will be elected, the assessor, and the clerk."

Murphy: "Just... so three positions?"

Hoffman: "That's my understanding. That... just like in every other township in the state."

Murphy: "What would be the cost of those?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Hoffman: "I believe that the board would then set the compensation."

Murphy: "Do you... do you know what the cost is in Peoria for something very similar to this?"

Hoffman: "I do not."

Murphy: "It's much more, much more. Dramatically more than what we pay. Representative Butler talked about how much he pays. I recently moved... well, not recently, coming up on five years... from Divernon Township in Sangamon County. The cost there was dramatically more. I mean dramatically, like 8 to 10 times more. Sangamon County is one of the most efficiently run governments in the State of Illinois. Please, please don't vote 'yes' for this Bill and destroy what's been going on, successfully, for a hundred years. It's been run... we don't have ethics problems with the administration of Capital Township. This would be such a travesty, and it would just destroy good government that we had in Sangamon County in Capital Township. And I'm speaking that as one of the two Members who know what we're talking about because we live it every day. Every day. One thing I'm consistent on in my twoplus years, when it's a local issue... when it's a local issue, follow the lead of the Members of the House Representatives. On TIFS, on port districts, I look up and see what the local people want and I deliver. Please help Representative Butler and myself maintain good government in Capital Township. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Evans: "Representative... Representative Scherer is recognized. Do you rise in support or opposition?"

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Please continue."

Scherer: "Thank you. And I get to take my mask off. That's nice. Okay. I would like to make a few statements about Capital Township, which is in my district. To my side of the aisle, the Democrats, I have spoken to many of you about this, and I want to put the record straight, and I wanted to go on the record of what the truth is. I've got my new Senator, Doris Turner, with me on this Bill because it's just that important to our district. Senator Turner, by the way, welcome to the House Floor. And she took Senator Andy Manar's place. So, the first and, to me, most significant point here is that the people of Capital Township do not want this. Let me repeat that. The people of Capital Township do not want to be moved to the county. They want this Bill. I need to be really clear. So, I'm going to say it a third time. The people of Capital Township want Leader Hoffman's SB826 to pass. They do not want to be part of the entire county. When the referendum was put out, it wasn't just put out to Capital Township. It was put out to the whole county. Well, of course the whole county wants to overtake Capital Township because then they get all their money. But not if you just ask Capital Township. Capital Township wants to be treated like every other township in the State of Illinois. Why shouldn't they be? Senator Turner has informed me, repeatedly, that she tried to work with the other side and it just never could get across the finish line. It's upsetting to me... it's extremely upsetting to me that another thing that happened is, I know for a fact, that some of my Members, when they said they would support the other Bill, were told, oh yeah, everybody in Capital Township wants this.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

They had a referendum. Everybody voted for it. Well, that's... that's true. But they just left out the part that it was everybody in the whole county, not just the people in Capital Township. So, the people out in a suburb like Rochester would say, yes, we want the money from Capital Township. And it's another fact that I'm very troubled by is that ... another fact that was... I don't know if it was intentional or not, but it was left out, is that the county treasurer and the county clerk, they're being paid an extra stipend right now to do this. So, to say this is going to be a brand new expense is simply not true. The stipend will no longer have to be paid to the county treasurer and to the county clerk. So, to so many of you who have spent so much of your time listening to me trying to explain this to you, I appreciate your open mind. I know it's hard that once you've been told something and to find out that you don't really know what the true score on this is, it makes it very difficult. I am very proud of the fact that U.S. Senator Majority Whip Dick Durbin was on this very floor, as well as his chief of staff Bill Houlihan, as well as Senator Doris Turner and myself. And all four of us are agreeing to the facts that I just now gave. And if you have the desire, you can look it up yourself. And God as my witness, everything I said this evening is the truth. So, I thank you for your pledge and promise, and I would appreciate you to strongly consider supporting Leader Hoffman's Senate Bill 826. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Buckner, do you rise in support or opposition?"

Buckner: "I rise in support, Mr. Speaker."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Speaker Evans: "Following the rules of Standard Debate,
  Representative Buckner will be our final speaker. Please
  continue, Representative."
- Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions for the Bill Sponsor."
- Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will yield."
- Buckner: "First of all, I just want to start off by saying I know that we respect local prerogative in this Body, but I think that we all have an obligation to protect fundamental rights when they come up, no matter what district they may be in. So, Leader Hoffman, couple quick questions for you. Am I correct in my analysis that, unlike any other township in Illinois, the voters of the entire county of Sangamon are the ones who elect the township officers for Capital Township?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. They elect the county treasurer and they also elect the county clerk, who then serve as a supervisor, collector, and clerk and assessor, respectively."
- Buckner: "Thank you. We've got about 1400 townships in the state.

  And just to be sure, this current... this set up that we're talking about doesn't occur anywhere else in any of those other townships, correct?"

Hoffman: "That's true."

Buckner: "So, I just want to say... I want to note that I've been in this Body for a few years now... a couple years now and one thing I've heard a lot from our friends on the other side of the aisle, specifically talking about things that happen in the district where I'm from, is that Chicago should not be treated differently than the rest of the state. So, I want to underline that here. So, Leader Hoffman, based on what you

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

just told me and based on the population of Capital Township in Sangamon County, what I have here is that each person that lives in the township only has three-fifths of a vote when it comes to electing the township officers. Is that correct?"

- Hoffman: "Yes. It's my understanding that the population of Capital Township only makes up three-fifths of the county. And so, therefore, when they're electing their township officials as county clerks and as treasurers, they're only getting three-fifths of the vote."
- "Thank you, Leader. And you spoke a little bit in your Buckner: opening about the federal principle of one-person, one-vote, and I think that that really is something that we talk about. It's at the heart of this legislation and really the real reason why need to move this in the right direction. Once again, I know that it probably is nerve-racking to some of my colleagues to have somebody from Chicago talking about a Sangamon County issue, but I think it's actually really proper for this debate because it's almost like having somebody who doesn't live in Capital Township vote for Capital Township leadership. Fundamentally, Leader Hoffman, this really is about giving Capital Township voters the exclusive right to elect their own township officers. So, I thank you for bringing that. Thank you, Representative Scherer, for your work. Thank you, Senator Turner. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Buckner. Leader Hoffman to close."
- Hoffman: "Yes, I would just reiterate the previous two speakers.

  This is unlike any situation anywhere else in the state. I

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

respect the comments of my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I understand your compassion. However, I'm carrying this Bill because I believe in one-person, one-vote. I believe that if you live in Capital Township, you should have the right to choose your leaders exclusively, not at the behest of people who live outside of Capital Township. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Evans: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 826 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? Cassidy, Andrade, D'Amico, DeLuca, LaPointe, Conroy. Cassidy. Andrade. Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Leader Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "I ask for Postponed Consideration."

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

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

Speaker Evans: "Yes, Sir, please speak your point."

Keicher: "I've been here for a little over three and a half years now. And each day that we all come to work, we have the distinct honor of walking past the doormen who keep us safe. Every day, I think each and every one of us says hi, we get a friendly smile in response. Many of these gentlemen are veterans and former public servants. They're stalwarts at keeping this chamber moving, keeping this chamber safe. They greet us with a smile and a handshake. And so, I want to personally thank Ken Downs, Charles Hernandez, Kevin Keen, Marvin Mizell, William Mike Nolan, and Jim Paul for being

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

true servants of the Illinois House of Representatives. Thank you, gentlemen, for your dedication to this Body."

Speaker Evans: "On Supplemental Calendar #2, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3443, Chairman Slaughter."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Slaughter: the House. On behalf of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, I'm once again humbled and honored to present and ask for concurrence on Amendment... Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 3443. This is the trailer Bill to our Black Caucus Criminal Justice Pillar, also known as the SAFE-T Act, Accountability, Fairness and Equity-Today. This absolutely, if you guys can recall the SAFE-T Act, a bold, momentous, transformational initiative that makes Illinois a national leader in criminal justice reform and a model for other states to follow. It adds for significant reforms on behalf of the black community to address police brutality, mass incarceration, and the prevalence of crime and violence. Let's listen up just for a second. On policing, the SAFE-T Act put forth a policy framework consisting of seven critical components. A framework that addresses crisis intervention, use of force, transparency, accountability, oversight and enforcement, detainment, and officer wellness. These efforts included industry-improving initiatives. Industry-improving initiatives. Initiatives like more frequent and better quality training, a statewide universal use of force policy, a statewide body camera program, a more robust and effective certification program for our officers, a best practices approach to getting our officers quality mental health treatment. All initiatives that we all should want in our

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

policing industry. On mass incarceration. We ended... and everybody knows this. We ended the unfair practice of cash bail. Once and for all, turning the page on a practice that criminalizes the poor and rewards those with wealth, or those that have access to bail. We also took aim at our overlypunitive sentencing policies. We provided more judicial discretion for mandatory minimums and offered alternatives to custody. You may also recall the SAFE-T Act put forth a host of prison reforms, most notably modernizing our sentencing credit program and ending prison gerrymandering. I say all this to say that it's important that we remind this Body of the great reforms we needed to do. But, more importantly, I wanted to remind this Body about our commitment, our commitment to work collaboratively on any trailer Bill as needed. This trailer Bill reflects that commitment. And, Mr. Speaker, before we get into the merits and details of the trailer Bill provisions, I wanted to drive home just two important points. First, Chairman Sims and I decided to take a multi-phase approach to these trailer Bills. In this first phase, in this Bill, we're only addressing initiatives that go live in July 1. Let me repeat that. We're only addressing initiatives that go live in July 1. As many of you recall, the SAFE-T Act is comprised of various staggered go-live dates. For that purpose, we will not address or deal with certification that goes live January 1, 2022. And we will not deal with the pretrial fairness provisions, which go live on January 1, 2023. Secondly, if you can, please take a look at your analysis and the positions of the stakeholders. Chairman Sims and I worked collaboratively with a wide range of

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

stakeholders that represent robust perspectives throughout the criminal justice and law enforcement spectrum. What you will see is a good Bill, a Bill that has no opposition on it. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill has no opposition on it. A Bill that reflects a lot of hard work to get these entities to either neutral or support. When we vote on this, please, I beg of you, respect the hard work of the stakeholders that came together on a product where there are no winners or no losers on a Bill where no one gets everything that they want. As a Sponsor of this Bill, I'm absolutely honored to work with all the stakeholders and proud of our efforts. Ladies and Gentlemen, law enforcement entities, state's attorneys, advocates, and state agencies all at the forefront of these negotiations. This trailer Bill provides several clarifying provisions. And the objective here is to address language is either ambiquous and/or impractical that implementation. The cleanup language for the following... the Bill provides cleanup language for the following initiatives: duty to intervene; restrictions to deadly force; chokeholds; crowd control; body cameras; law enforcement misconduct offenses; no knock warrants; training issues; electronic monitoring, but we moved back the effective date; resisting arrest; duty to render aide; pregnant prisoner rights; the reporting of deaths in custody; alternatives to custody, where, again, we moved back the effective date; residency, again, where we moved back the effective date; detainment rights and phone calls, here, again, we moved back the effective date; mental health crises; grenade launcher military equipment; and bail. All of these initiatives do

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

come along with legislative intent. I'm prepared to address those if need be. Mr. Speaker, thank you for your indulgence. I urge a 'yes' vote on this very important Bill and will absolutely yield for questions."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Slaughter. Representative Windhorst for questions. And please keep in mind that we'll still be honoring Standard Debate. Representative Windhorst."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Windhorst: "Representative Slaughter, hi. I just have a few questions on the Bill. Some things that we need to clarify and some of the issues that some on our side have seen, I'd like to, kind of, flesh out a little bit. First, some of the things that are not in this trailer Bill... and I think you've covered them because they have a later effective date in the original Bill. You know, it..."

Slaughter: "That's correct, Representative."

Windhorst: "...but I just want to go through some of those. But we are not addressing any modifications to the elimination of cash bail."

Slaughter: "That's correct. There is one piece that we are going to do. Just one piece, Representative. It extends the provision that gives clerks and police the authority to continue collecting bonds to January... to January 1, 2023. We changed that. The original effective date on that was actually July 1, 2021. We moved that one back to January 1, 2023."

Windhorst: "And there was another important provision to some law enforcement officers regarding anonymous complaints. There's

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

been no change to allowing anonymous complaints against a police officer?"

Slaughter: "There's been no change to anonymous complaints."

Windhorst: "And as it relates to the ability of a law enforcement officer to view body cameras, there have been changes to that provision that allow a law enforcement officer to view the body camera. There were a couple things I wanted to point out. Number one, it appears that in the new section, a law enforcement officer who… involved in the recording wearing the camera or his supervisor cannot duplicate the recording."

Slaughter: "That's correct. Cannot duplicate the recording."

Windhorst: "Right. Cannot prepare a duplicate of the recording."

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "So, my concern is for smaller departments that don't have a lot of personnel to give that duty to. You know, there are actually some jurisdictions that have just two officers. No one inside that department can actually duplicate the body cam footage to give to the prosecutor or give to the court. So, I understand the intention behind that. You don't want someone involved making... potentially, I guess, having issues with the duplication, but it may have the unintended consequence of causing problems for, understandably, very small departments. So, I wanted to point out that issue. It also says in the Bill that it's the law enforcement officer or his or her supervisor. Does that just mean the immediate supervisor or anyone who operates in a supervisory capacity?"

Slaughter: "Any officer that operates in a supervisory role to that particular officer."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Windhorst: "Again, that'll, of course, further limit the number of individuals who can be involved in the... in this case, in the duplication of those recordings and may add to some difficulty. You know, from the law enforcement perspective, of course, they're... I believe officers will be appreciative of this change to be able to view their body cam footage. But the issue is there are circumstances when they will not be able to view it, and that's when there is an officer involved shooting, a use of force, excessive force situation, or an investigator... investigation of a complaint against the officer. Is that right?"
- Slaughter: "Representative, you really do your due diligence on this. I can tell that you really read through the Bill. That's absolutely correct. Everything you said is correct."
- Windhorst: "Yeah. And my concern is they have to wait until after they've written their report, then they can watch the video, then they file an amended report. That sets them up for inconsistencies potentially, and maybe unintentional inconsistencies, but it does set up a potential for inconsistencies that will be the subject of impeachment in court."
- Slaughter: "Yeah, Representative, you can have a secondary report, an amended report, in those situations after... after the supervisor... after it's gone through that process of the supervisor being able to also view the video."
- Windhorst: "And I'm going to be running short on time. My concern is that there were... well limited circumstances where an officer has to issue a supplemental report, which means that first report then makes them subject to... him or her subject

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

to impeachment in court and could present difficulty for the officer. There are several times through the Bill where language is changed to say 'under the color of law', rather than 'acting on behalf of a law enforcement officer'. So, for a law enforcement misconduct, it applies to a law enforcement officer or a person acting under color of law, rather than on behalf of a law enforcement officer. My concern is, color of law is a term that has a very broad meaning. In federal... in the federal courts, it means more than just law enforcement. It means judges, it means prosecutors, it means people who even act without... outside of law enforcement altogether. Is it your intent that color of law applies as broadly as the Federal Government or is it only to apply to those assisting... directly assisting law enforcement officers?"

Slaughter: "If they are authorized by law enforcement to be acting in that public safety role, then, yes. If they're authorized by law enforcement."

Windhorst: "There are also several provisions in this Bill which have delayed... or we are delaying the effective date."

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "Is it your intention then, we're going to come back, potentially, with other trailer Bills in the coming months and years to deal with these issues as well?"

Slaughter: "Representative, in particular, I definitely plan on working with you and collaborating with you. The answer is, yes. Again, Chairman Sims and I are taking a multi-phased-in approach wanting to deal... because we have so many staggered go-live dates, wanted to prioritize what's coming up July 1. Absolutely, we will be working with everyone, stakeholders

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

and the General Assembly, as we push forward to address those future go-live dates."

Windhorst: "Well, I... I see my time is up. I appreciate you answering the questions that I've asked. There are some concerns that there were more changes that were needed to eliminate some of the concerns, not only that address this evening, but in the original Bill that we've talked about. And we need to make sure we are not creating, which I believe we have with the first Bill, many unintended consequences that are going to have a detrimental effect to public safety. My concern is that this Bill does not go far enough. But I appreciate your efforts in bringing this forward and your answers this evening. Thank you."

Slaughter: "Representative, you bring up..."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Representative Windhorst. Leader Durkin is recognized."

Slaughter: "You bring up a good point, Representative Windhorst."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Slaughter: "Of course I will."

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Durkin: "Representative Slaughter, we had a good dialogue a couple days ago on a Bill that dealt with the issue of deception for juvenile defendants."

Slaughter: "Sure."

Durkin: "And that was something that was important for me. But, more importantly, I stress to you as a practitioner, process to me is important. Agree?"

Slaughter: "I do agree."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Durkin: "Now, back in January, I was very bitterly disappointed with the fact that I was cut off from asking any questions.

And I want to revisit a few things right now that I was, I would say, unfairly denied that ability."

Slaughter: "This is your opportunity, Leader."

Durkin: "You got it."

Slaughter: "And... and just wanted to point out, we're presenting the trailer Bill. I'll invite questions on the original Bill as well."

Durkin: "Oh? I'm going to ask whether or not these have been addressed..."

Slaughter: "Okay."

Durkin: "...these particular sections have been addressed in the trailer Bill."

Slaughter: "Okay. Fair enough."

Durkin: "Now, I see a provision that, from the original Bill... and let me know whether or not this has been changed, 'cause I have great concerns. Let me start by this. Do you agree that victims of a crime, complaining witnesses, should be treated with care and compassion during the course of a criminal... a case within the criminal justice system?"

Slaughter: "Yes. Should they be... should they be treated with care..."

Durkin: "Treated with care..."

Slaughter: "...and compassion?"

Durkin: "Yes."

Slaughter: "To the extent that it's within the law, yes."

Durkin: "Precisely. So, in the Bill that passed in January, there was a provision that says, for the first time, it gives a

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

defendant the right to subpoena... ask for the presence, via a subpoena, of a complaining witness at a revocation hearing. What in the world would a complaining witness be able to add at a revocation hearing?"

Slaughter: "Okay. Leader, it's... that is not a part of the trailer Bill. I will... it's a part of the provisions that were codified in the Pretrial Fairness Act. We will be collaborating to address the January 1, 2023 go-live date on ending the cash bail provisions."

Durkin: "Well, here's what happened. Everybody on your side of the aisle, at least 60 of them, voted for that provision, which is completely contradictory to the Illinois Constitution on an issue that we voted on... the State of Illinois voted on back in 2014 called the Marsy's Law, which was supported by 78 percent of the voters, which states that, 'Crime victims have the right to be free from harassment, intimidation, and abuse throughout the court process.' I will just tell you from my practice, bringing a rape victim into a courtroom within days, or if not hours, for a revocation hearing for no other purpose other than from harassment from a defense attorney, to me, is completely... flies completely in the face of what our Constitution says what we should do with victims."

Slaughter: "Leader, you have my commitment that we'll be working on the Pretrial Fairness Act provisions..."

Durkin: "All right."

Slaughter: "...in the SAFE-T Act."

Durkin: "Have we made any changes to the process that says that, in this Bill, that anonymous complaints can be filed against

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

law enforcement officers for any allegation of abuse or anything which they say may have changed... anything which they feel is improper?"

Slaughter: "Just some context here. I mean, the simple answer is, no, we have not changed anything with anonymous complaints. Now, what I do want to explain for the Body is that several stakeholders at the table negotiating this, we didn't feel comfortable with what was put forward. We believe that it was changing the spirit of what we wanted to accomplish with that, and we didn't change anything in regards to anonymous complaints."

Durkin: "Do you believe that in the... under our Constitution that one has the right to be confronted by their accuser?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Durkin: "But in this particular case, nowhere else in our court systems or anywhere else in the United States are we allowing a law enforcement officer to have his property right, meaning his job, taken away from him from an anonymous complaint, correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct, Leader. And you still have to verify the anonymous complaint."

Durkin: "Here's the problem. Once the complaint is filed, it is now part of the system within a police department."

Slaughter: "Sure."

Durkin: "And here's what's going to happen... and you know that I have some background in this and I know how some clever attorneys are. I'm going to have my client submit, or somebody submit, an anonymous complaint against an arresting officer, because that... once that complaint is received by a police

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

department, it is subject to FOIA and it goes directly to the credibility of the law enforcement officer in a courtroom."

Slaughter: "Leader, I understand the scenario. When we talked to the stakeholders, specifically state's attorneys, for example..."

Durkin: "Which state's attorney?"

Slaughter: "...public defenders..."

Durkin: "Which state's attorney?"

Slaughter: "Will County, DuPage County, Kane County, Cook County, and Lake County."

Durkin: "I can guarantee you that other than Cook and Lake..."

Slaughter: "DuPage County."

Durkin: "...who I do not support anything they do, that no other state's attorney in the State of Illinois is going to say that allowing for an anonymous complaint to be used, and to be used, eventually, against an officer to impeach their integrity... yes, it has to be verified. But the problem is, that law enforcer's going to have to take a question, 'Has there been a complaint filed against you regarding abuse or some type of dereliction of duty?' You don't have to answer. It's more of a rhetorical question. So, you know what? If we do believe in that there is a system that still supports our Constitution that someone has a right to be confronted by our accuser, we still haven't made that change, and that's effective July 1. And I think that's wrong, not only just on a constitutional basis, but also it is going to give a ridiculously unfair, unfair advantage to sully the reputation of an officer when he's on the stand. I know this, and you know that I know this. So, folks, I know you're going to vote

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

for it 'cause everybody wants to say that we made these magnificent changes to a Bill that I did not like. It was rushed through in the most ridiculous of circumstances in my career. But, folks, you're not going to be able to put the toothpaste back in the tube on this one."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Durkin. Representative Tarver is recognized."

Tarver: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Tarver: "Thank you. I'll just start by saying I take a little bit of an offense with this being considered to be a Black Caucus Bill because I don't remember ever discussing this in the Black Caucus. So, I just wanted to start there. A few questions for you though. How long did you know there was going to be a trailer Bill to the criminal justice pillar?"

Slaughter: "Can you repeat that?"

Tarver: "How long did you know there would be a trailer Bill necessary for the criminal justice pillar?"

Slaughter: "What was the date that we passed it? The day after, or that morning."

Tarver: "Okay. So, you knew a while ago. Okay. And when did you all start meeting to get together and put together this trailer Bill?"

Slaughter: "Officially, I would say three, four weeks ago."

Tarver: "Okay. And when did you present this Bill to the Black Caucus?"

Slaughter: "When was... lame duck was in January."

Tarver: "The trailer Bill."

Slaughter: "We started to talk..."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Tarver: "When did you present the trailer Bill to the Black Caucus? You just said this is a Black Caucus Bill."
- Slaughter: "We presented... I presented this in caucus to the whole caucus."
- Tarver: "When did you present this to the Black Caucus? You said it's a Black Caucus Bill."
- Slaughter: "The Black Caucus is a part of our side of the aisle's caucus, Representative."

Tarver: "Okay. So, this is a Women's Caucus Bill too?"

Slaughter: "No."

Tarver: "Okay. Right. Because you didn't present this to the Black Caucus, you can't just say this is a Black Caucus Bill. Did we take a position on this Bill? No, we couldn't because you didn't present it to us."

Slaughter: "I don't think so."

Tarver: "I'll answer that for you. Okay. So, let's... let's just move on a little bit. The QI Task Force, what's going on with that? Has that been set up yet?"

Slaughter: "So, we missed the deadline on the Qualified Immunity Task Force report. We..."

Tarver: "Right, I know. Have you all set the task force up yet?

This is a yes or no question."

Slaughter: "No, it isn't."

Tarver: "Okay. So, it's not set up."

Slaughter: "Let me explain and give you some context. It's not set up yet."

Tarver: "I don't ... I don't need context."

Slaughter: "We're continue... we're continuing to set it up."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Tarver: "I don't need context. I don't have a lot of time. I don't
   have a lot of time. I don't want to hear about continue to do
   things."
- Speaker Evans: "Representatives. Representative. Representative, stop. Both stop."
- Tarver: "I don't want to hear about continue to do things. I have a question."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative. Representative, one moment. It is not my opinion, but it is a rule that we must utilize the quorum. I believe it is Rule 51. So, allow the answer to go and allow the speech, all right?"
- Slaughter: "My apologies, Mr. Speaker."
- Tarver: "But I only have so much time, Mr. Speaker. That's the whole point, it's a yes or no question."
- Speaker Evans: "We'll... we'll address the time. Please continue with your questions and allow him to ask. Thank you."
- Slaughter: "No. No. No, Representative. It has not been put together yet."
- Tarver: "Okay. All right. Okay. So, it hasn't met either, right?"
  Slaughter: "Yes."
- Tarver: "Okay. So, you knew back in January that was an issue. You haven't set up a task force. You haven't met. You haven't done anything on that. But somehow, miraculously, you have come together and put this together. So, the very people that you say that are now... there's no one opposing the Bill. Many of those people opposed the criminal justice pillar in the first place, right?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Tarver: "Right. People don't oppose when you start clawing back things and watering it down. They opposed the criminal justice pillar because of what it was and now they don't oppose it because you're watering it down. Let me ask you a quick question. You talk about... well, at least the Bill talks about expanding the use of body cameras, I think it's on page 63, for other state agencies with law enforcement. Is that right, not just ISP?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Tarver: "Okay. How much money's in the '22 budget for ISP for body cameras?"

Slaughter: "I know the Governor increased the budget..."

Tarver: "Yeah, it's \$2 million. It's \$2 million. That is a few more million dollars to grant out for the rest of the state. So, quick question. How many more people are going to need body cameras based on this Bill and what is that cost to the state?"

Slaughter: "I'm not sure. When we begin the body camera program, we'll have the money for it in January 1, 2022."

Tarver: "Right. Okay. So, the \$2 million that's been appropriated to ISP that's in the budget now is enough for, now, additional officers outside of ISP. That's enough for January 1, 2022? Is that what you're telling me?"

Slaughter: "Not enough for January 1, 2022."

Tarver: "Okay. So... okay. So, we expanded it. We don't have the money to fund those body cameras. I'm obviously in favor of body cameras. I'm just trying to find the logic between this Bill and what we can actually do. So, let's move to page 64, if my computer would allow me. Actually, let's skip that. Why

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

don't you just do me a favor? Define what material is. You can go to page 106. I think it's Section 33-9. You changed the standard to knowingly, intentionally, or something along those lines..."

Slaughter: "Facts that actually pertain to the relevance of the situation. Material facts."

Tarver: "Okay. And what was the… I'm sorry, I cut you off. I apologize. What was the thought process behind changing the standard there?"

Slaughter: "Well, it's... first of all, it's used throughout the Criminal Code. But then secondly, we wanted to clarify that these are facts that are relevant to the situation."

Tarver: "So, facts that are relevant to this situation."

Slaughter: "Yeah."

Tarver: "What makes them material?"

Slaughter: "Material facts."

Tarver: "No. I mean, there are many facts that are relevant to a situation. What makes them material, is what I'm trying to understand. You changed the standard in your Bill. I'm asking you what..."

Slaughter: "Facts that are pertinent to the... to the issue..."

Tarver: "Pertinent and relevant..."

Slaughter: "...to the incident."

Tarver: "Pertinent and relevant mean the same thing. What gets them to the level of material? I'm just trying to understand 'cause you changed the standard."

Slaughter: "Representative, I mean, you're not only a friend, but you're an attorney. You should know..."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Representative Tarver, please bring your remarks to a close."

Slaughter: "...what that means."

Speaker Evans: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Representative Tarver. The next speaker is Leader Hoffman, and he'll be using his time. Representative Tarver, please bring your remarks to a close."

Tarver: "Okay. That's interesting how that happens. You know what?

That's fine. I see what you're trying to do."

Slaughter: "Will someone yield him his time?"

Tarver: "No, it's fine. Don't... don't worry about it. We'll deal with it. But let me just say this again. This Bill is not a Illinois Black Caucus pillar Bill. It is not a Black Caucus Bill. We have not taken a position. It was never presented in caucus, that's number one. If that's the case, then every single Bill that goes to the entire caucus is a Black Caucus Bill, is a Mod Squad Bill. This is a Women's Caucus Bill. This is a Latinx Caucus Bill. It's not. So, that was unfair, first and foremost. Second of all, I don't have enough time to ask the many questions that are respective to this Bill, but it's clear you don't know what's in it anyway. It's a watered-down Bill. It's disrespectful to the pillar in the first place. It absolutely is. And the fact that you didn't have the common decency, since I'm a friend and an attorney, to discuss the Bill ahead of time, before seven minutes before you got up to present, is also disrespectful. The fact that you knew for six months... five months that this coming, and it never was presented, and you have ... and the QI Task Force was not set up as well."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Representative Tarver, you must close."

Tarver: "The fact that the QI Task Force was not set up at all.

You all have done absolutely nothing on that, while people
continue to get shot in the back and die. This is a piss-poor
Bill. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Tarver."

Slaughter: "I respect your..."

Speaker Evans: "Leader... Leader Hoffman for questions."

Hoffman: "For purposes of intent, Representative, if an officer's on the scene and is unaware that unauthorized force is being used, would that officer have a duty to intervene?"

Slaughter: "Well, no. The officer would have to be aware and have reasonable opportunity to intervene."

Hoffman: "And can you also clarify the intent of the residency requirement provisions?"

Slaughter: "Yeah. The intent section is to ensure that police come from the communities that they are to protect. It's also intended for police departments to cultivate and hire a diverse pool of applicants."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Brady for questions."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "Indicated he will."

Brady: "Representative, I, for one, appreciate your willingness to work on this legislation. I appreciate your willingness to hear the other side and concerns from when this Bill first became law. And I appreciate, as well as I think many in this Body appreciate, that continued offer of dialogue. Because I believe when you have dialogue going, communication going, at

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

least you've got something versus stalemate. And that leads to my question of you, if I understood correctly, and that was that you were trying to prioritize things that take effect July 1, if I understand that."

Slaughter: "That's correct, Leader."

Brady: "And one of those was the issue of the body camera for the officer and being able to review the body camera as it pertains to writing the report eventually. Is that correct?" Slaughter: "That's correct."

Brady: "Okay. And Representative Windhorst has done just an outstanding job, in my opinion, of trying to keep that dialogue open and going. And, obviously, those stakeholders have been at the table. So, there's a little progress. I wish there was more. There's things that I'd like to see go further than what I'm being... described to me tonight. And that brings me to my closing point, really my closing question. And that is that... what plan is there for the future to have more dialogue and potentially address more concerns and find some common... more common ground on both sides? What..."

Slaughter: "There's always..."

Brady: "...what wording do you have tonight for that?"

Slaughter: "...there's always been a commitment to be dedicated to ongoing dialogue and collaboration with all the stakeholders."

Brady: "And are you going to take some of those areas that have been articulated and address them as their effective date comes out?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. That's correct."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Brady: "And that would be the priority and criteria for future discussions?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Brady: "But you certainly intend, and have given your word, for future discussions?"

Slaughter: "Yes. Yes."

Brady: "Okay."

Slaughter: "To the best of my ability, yes."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Slaughter: "Thanks, Leader."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Brady. We have Leader Flowers for questions."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Flowers: "Representative Slaughter, I know you've been working very hard and diligent, and there's no such thing as a perfect Bill."

Slaughter: "Yeah. And I don't know what's in the Bill apparently, but..."

Flowers: "Right. But we all know the problems that..."

Slaughter: "Sure."

Flowers: "...brought us here."

Slaughter: "Sure."

Flowers: "And so, I have a few questions. Under the chokehold, it says you are exempting 'a headlock where the only pressure applied is to the head' from the definition of chokehold?"

Slaughter: "Yeah, this was negotiated amongst the stakeholders."

Flowers: "Can you explain the reason why?"

Slaughter: "Why was it negotiated?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Flowers: "No. You are exempting the headlock from being a part of the definition of a chokehold."
- Slaughter: "It's a tactic I've seen the police use to get people under control, but what we were clear about was that it cannot restrict the airflow of the individual. And this was, again, negotiated."
- Flowers: "So, by holding a person's head, you cannot..."
- Slaughter: "That's correct. There's no wrapping around the neck."
- Flowers: "Okay. My next concern, under law enforcement misconduct and offenses... misconduct offense, it says, remove the provision that punish officers for failing to comply with State Law or their department policy in requiring the use of officers-worn body cameras. Are you removing the punishment for officers who don't wear their body cameras?"
- Slaughter: "No. No, we're not. Yeah, we're still punishing if you violate for body cameras."
- Flowers: "Well, I'm just reading... can you clarify where it says remove the provision that punish officers for failing to comply with State Law, or their department policy requiring the use of the officer-worn body camera?"
- Slaughter: "Right. We wanted to hold officers accountable for State Law that's being violated. Not necessarily departmental policies."
- Flowers: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?"
- Slaughter: "We wanted to hold officers accountable, not for violating departmental policy, but for violating State Law."
- Flowers: "And so, what is the punishment for officer who fail to comply with State Law?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Slaughter: "Class 3 felony. It's a Class 3 felony. We didn't change the punishment."
- Flowers: "Okay. In regards to the training issue, it says, extend the implementation of the training requirements to January 1, of 2022. And then, it clarifies that mandated training will be provided at no cost."

Slaughter: "That's correct."

- Flowers: "Is warrior training a part of the training, and is warrior-style training used here in the State of Illinois?"
- Slaughter: "There's not an all-out ban of it, but we are phasing it out with guardian-style training. We moved the effective date... in another provision, we moved the effective date to January 1 because this current cache of trainings is going to end after July 1. So, we're giving the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards Board more time to get ready for the new era of training. This starts on July... January 1."
- Flowers: "So, the warrior-style training is what I'm asking you about."

Slaughter: "What about it? We're phasing it out."

Flowers: "That will be... that will be in effect until July 1?"

- Slaughter: "We're phasing it out, yes. Leader, we're phasing that out. We're phasing that out. I don't know... do you understand or... we're phasing it out."
- Flowers: "I understand what phasing out means. I just didn't know that warrior-style training was being actually used and that type of training on the citizens of the State of Illinois. What about the regular police training as opposed to warrior-style training?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Slaughter: "There's new training requirements regarding crisis intervention, conflict de-escalation, that it will be the new norm for training our officers."

Flowers: "But today, and up until such time, January 1 of 2022, warrior-style training will be the training of the day?"

Slaughter: "I don't... I'm not aware of the... that there will be warrior-style training beyond July 1. I'm not for certain."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Flowers, please bring your remarks to a close."

Flowers: "Thank you. And as far as residency is concerned?"

Slaughter: "We moved the effective date back to January 1."

Flowers: "Okay. And..."

Slaughter: "We're going to continue to discuss that."

Flowers: "Okay. And my other concern, not only as far as African American police officers, will there be... is it a mandate that there be more African American police officers in an African American community?"

Slaughter: "I wouldn't say a mandate, but that is the intent of the residential requirement that... that's in there."

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

Slaughter: "All right. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Flowers. The final speaker on this matter, Representative Willis for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicated that he will."

Willis: "Representative, I actually want to thank you very much for the hard work that you have put into this Bill. There were many of us, when we took the vote last January, it was very difficult for us to do, but we understood the essence of

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

what you were trying to accomplish. And as you told a previous speaker, a questioner, you knew right away that there was going to have to be some harder work to go through to clean that up. I actually... I'm going to be mostly to the Bill. And I'm just going to go straight to the Bill. I think this shows that, when you are willing to try to listen to all concerned parties, you can find a place where you can really make a difference. The pillar that got voted on in January was important to many Members on this House Floor. And there were many Members that recognize that we do need to do something. But there were things in there that just were put in a little bit too rashly, needed to be finessed, had unintended consequences when you actually got them put into action. The Bill Sponsor worked hard since January. He had many people from the law enforcement community, from other places that were being affected by this, and he listened to them. There were pages and pages of requests of changes. They all didn't get put into this Bill. The ones that were most important that came in that were going to go into effect in the most timely manner did, and they were looked at and they... there were compromises. I don't think there is anybody that is 100 percent happy with what this Bill does, but it does some things to make it a better Bill, to make things better as we go forward. The conversation is not ended. As you heard the Sponsor say earlier, he is going to continue to work on this. There is more work to be done. And I have pledged to work with him to make sure we do that. As many of you know, I have a daughter who's in law enforcement. I had a brother who was in law enforcement and an uncle who was in law enforcement.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Law enforcement is a lot in my household and my family. There is nothing that a police officer hates more than a bad cop. And that's what this is trying to do, make sure we don't have bad cops in there, but we also allow our law enforcement officers do the jobs they need to do in a safe environment. This is taking into consideration all of those things. There's still more work to be done, but this is a good step in a right direction. I urge everybody to look at this Bill seriously, realize that we're on the path, and please vote 'aye'. Thank you so much."

- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Willis. Before you close, Chairman Slaughter... Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 2800; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 4, and Senate Amendment(s) 1, 3, and 5 to House Bill 1739."
- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Slaughter, please close."
- Slaughter: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pull this Bill from the record."
- Speaker Evans: "Mr. Clerk, out of the record. Continuing on page 9, in the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3223, Chairman Moeller."
- Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body. House Bill 32... I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3223. I'll explain both Amendments together. The

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Amendments change the effective date of the entire Bill to 2025. They changed the Ensuring Success in School Task Force report date to 2024; removes and substitutes the word 'accommodations' to 'support' throughout the strengthens the confidentiality provisions for students receiving support or services; modifies provisions regarding how schools may contact alleged perpetrators in cases involving domestic or sexual violence to ensure the safety of the community and potential victim and ensuring that there is written notice before making contact. These changes were made with discussion with the School Management Alliance after passage in the House. There are still some outstanding issues that we are working through with the School Management Alliance. We have made assurances to those stakeholders that we will continue working on this issue, potentially bring a trailer Bill back in Veto Session or next Session. And would be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote." Speaker Evans: "Any questions? Representative Bourne for questions."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This passed our chamber last time with a split vote. So, I would encourage those on my side to look up how they voted last time. There were 27 'nays'. I will say, I appreciate that the Sponsor continues to work on this and that she has committed to continue working on it. I think it's bad form to pass something with a promise of a trailer Bill when we could maybe just get it right the first time. There are still mandates. There are still opposition. And I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Representative Moeller to close."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to highlight... and I appreciate the comments of my colleague on the other side of the aisle. This Bill has been a work in progress since 2007. This particular iteration has been negotiated and discussed for over two years. So, we feel that there's no more time to wait to ensure that schools are providing traumainformed care for victims of sexual assault, sexual violence, and pregnant students in our schools. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote. In closing, I want to thank Leader Lightford, who has worked on this issue for many years in the Senate. And also, Madeleine Behr at CAASE and all of the advocates who've worked tirelessly on this Bill. As I said, this legislation is the result of many years of negotiations and is truly important in ensuring that our students are protected, that they can stay in school, graduate, and go on to live healthy lives. So, thank you very much. And again, ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3223?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Vella, Tarver, Nichols. Nichols. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3223. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- passed. Continuing on the Order of Concurrences. We have House Bill 3277, on page 10, Representative Costa Howard."
- Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Body to concur...

  I concur with Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment 1 is a clarification that a CASA volunteer can review court documents that only relate to the child. I ask for a concurrence vote."
- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3277?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', O voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3277. And this Bill, having received the Majority, is Constitutional hereby declared passed. Continuing down on page 10, under Order of Concurrences, we Bill 3295, have House Representative Slaughter. Representative Slaughter. When you get to your seat, please speak to the Concurrence."
- Slaughter: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Amendment 1 to House Bill 3295. This is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. Amendment... Amendment #1 is a page and line Amendment that removes the provision that prohibits a victim's criminal history or felony status from automatically preventing compensation to that victim or the victim's family. This change comes because the provision was already included in the criminal justice reform omnibus Bill

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

that was passed during lame duck Session. This provision is already law. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Concurrence."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Slaughter. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3295?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. This House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3295. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3308, Chairman Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise today for... ask for a concur to Senate Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308. This is the telehealth Bill, which protects a continued access to physical and behavioral health. This is an agreed upon Bill. Before I begin my presentation, I would like to... the Body to join me and stand for a moment of silence for the nearly 25,113 people who have lost their lives to COVID. One of the reasons why we are discussing telehealth, again, 25,115 Illinoisans have lost their lives to COVID-19. I would ask this Body for a moment of silence."

Speaker Evans: "Moment of silence, please. Please continue."

Jones: "Would also like to thank Speaker Welch for allowing me to chair the Insurance Committee. And thank all the Members of the Insurance Committee for not only bringing this Bill to the board today, but also to the hard work of Senator Napoleon

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Harris. And I also want to thank Governor Pritzker for everything he did during the pandemic in implementing the Executive Orders that effectuated telehealth. Second, I want to recognize next to me, Ally Lopshire. Also the hard work of the committee, Michael Marks, Hank Strickler, Tyler Bohannon. And I would also like to thank my Vice Chairman Bob Morgan, Representative Deb Conroy, and also Leader Brady for their indulgence with this Bill. House Bill 3308 becomes the Telehealth Act. As we wind down the telehealth and wind down this pandemic, this Bill represents an agreement between 36 health care and patient advocacy organizations that comprise the coalition to protect telehealth and the insurance industry. As amended, House Bill 3308 will move Illinois into the 21st century by advancing reasonable provisions to improve health care outcomes, decrease health care costs, reduce health care disparities, and improve health equity in our state. And, more importantly, this Bill enhances and codifies coverage in payment parity for state regulated commercial insurance. And also ensures strong patient and provider protection. This legislation represents a fair compromise by statutorily setting payment parity as a baseline while explicitly allowing providers and plans to voluntarily negotiate alternative rates. This Bill also has mental health and substance abuse disorder telehealth services, which are excluded from the sunset. And, more importantly, to note with this legislation, it applies to commercial insurance where the Department of Healthcare will summer, to negotiate reimbursement continue, over the requirements for Medicaid fee services. The Department has

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

also agreed to meet with stakeholders over the summer. With the passage of this Bill and the Governor's signature, Illinois will finally become a telehealth leader, joining only a handful of states with a telehealth coverage and payment parity. This Bill received not only strong bipartisan support in the Senate, but many of you in the Insurance Committee received strong support for this Bill. So, I ask for your 'yes' vote to concur with Senate Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you so much, Chairman Jones. Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Under Concurrence, we're going to return to House Bill 3443, Chairman Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here we are, once again, moving for the concurrence on Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 3443. We thoroughly debated this Bill just a few minutes ago. It's something that we're proud of in terms of the collaboration and the discussions and the negotiations that we had with a myriad of different stakeholders, whether it was state agencies, state's attorneys, law enforcement

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

entities, and advocates. I'd like to move for its passage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Moving forward for a vote, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #4 and 5 on House Bill 3443?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 and 5 to House Bill 3443. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 10, continuing on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3355, Representative Meier."

Meier: "Yes. This is the opioid Bill. Just trying to cut down on the opioid deaths. When it went over to the Senate, they added the Amendment to it that hospital... controlled substances which are lawfully administered in hospitals and institutions licensed under the Hospital Licensing Act shall be exempt from the requirements of the provision concerning the risk of dependents on opioids, except that the prescription for the controlled substance shall be in writing to the patient's record. That's the only Amendment was added to it. It's still a good Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3355?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

wish? All voted who wish? Slaughter. Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3355. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3445, Representative Yang Rohr. Go ahead, continue on the Concurrence. Just speak on it."

Yang Rohr: "I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 3445. We talked about this Bill a few weeks ago. It was a Bill brought to us by one of our... one of my constituents who lost his son, Alex Green, to an overdose on Christmas Day. And because the person who was trying to help Alex was too afraid to call for help or to tell others he was overdosing, Alex died. Senate Amendment #2 merges elements of the Bill that was passed through this floor with current Illinois law of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act because there was some overlap. And we are maintaining the name of the Bill as Alex's Law to honor the family's loss. And the Bill makes sure that if someone who is seeking medical attention for someone who is overdosing, it makes sure that it won't effect their pretrial release or furlough if evidence is obtained as a result of seeking help. And I ask for your support in honoring the Green family and in honoring Alex with a 'yay' vote to honor the memory of Alex Green. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Any questions on this measure? Leader Batinick for questions."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "Indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, here's my understanding what happened with the Bill. We passed legislation that the House supported unanimously, but it turns out that was already, kind of, basically in law. And it went over to the Senate. And what they did over there is they amended it that you can't get in trouble for a pretrial release or furlough if you're in this situation that you referred to, which is kind of expanding what was already done. It was basically partisan in the Senate with the Amendment when it came back over. Is that basically the history of the Bill?"

Yang Rohr: "Yes, that's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Any further discussion? We have Representative Ugaste for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicated she will."

Ugaste: "Representative, quick question for you. And maybe I misunderstood. So, please clear it up for me if I'm off base with this. But wasn't the problem with those who opposed it in the Senate because they believed that if, in fact, it was the person, say, who gave the person the drugs that caused the overdose that is... the subject, or the victim here, that the person who might be the cause, the drug dealer or whoever it is, would have no recourse against them? Is that correct?"

Yang Rohr: "So, as I understand it... and I do so appreciate everyone taking the time to have many, many conversations with me on this. As I understand it, the reason why it went through

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

unanimously in our committees and our floor was because the original Bill was pretty narrowly focused..."

Ugaste: "Right."

Yang Rohr: "...on opioid overdoses. And I believe with the Senate Amendment, because it goes to the Illinois Controlled Substance Act, there might be, from the Senate side, those 'no' votes. I think there is, like, just on principle, a... basically they're against that Act, the existing law on principle. So, what we are looking at now, the Senate Amendment 2, it only adds a few lines. And I believe, in talking with a few Members on your side, I don't believe that they have any issues with those lines, in particular, but it's more of the Act itself that maybe there's some objection to."

Ugaste: "So, let me ask you then, as a point just for my own clarification. If, in fact, it is the drug dealer who gave the person the drugs that caused the overdose and they are to call in the overdose, do they, possibly, have no problem whatsoever if this Bill is passed because, in fact, they're reporting it... reporting the overdose?"

Yang Rohr: "If... so, the Illinois Controlled Substance Act, it does... it enumerates certain amounts. So, if it did go above those certain amounts. I think the amounts are amounts that would involve drug dealing, which I think you're concerned with, it would not fall under this immunity."

Ugaste: "So, only if it's over a certain amount. If they're under a certain amount, they're still okay then though, correct?"

Yang Rohr: "Correct. They would then have this limited immunity."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Ugaste: "Okay. I appreciate it, and I certainly voted for it on the way out. I just don't know that I can support it this time. Thank you."

Yang Rohr: "Thank you. Any further discussion? We have Representative Ford for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Ford: "Representative, I just want to congratulate you on this Bill. Because if this Bill doesn't pass and the Governor doesn't sign it, is it true that if two people are in the same room, one person is on probation or parole, and they're experiencing their friend or loved one dying of a drug overdose, they cannot call for help according to current law?"

Yang Rohr: "So, right now, they would be de-incentivized to because they would be punished for it with current law. And so, I just want to make clear what we're adding is those on..."

Ford: "So, to the..."

Yang Rohr: "Sorry. One..."

Ford: "That's fine. To the Bill. I just... I think that it's critical that we support legislation that actually allows people to call for help when someone is dying. To actually have a law in the book that a person has to sit and watch a person die and not have the ability to call for help because the fear that they may go to jail is not the type of state we should be. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Yang Rohr to close."

Yang Rohr: "I urge a 'aye' vote as well. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3445?' This is

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voting who wish? All voting who wish? Representative Moylan. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to 3445. And this Bill, having received the House Bill Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brady, for what do vou reason recognition?"

Brady: "Yes, point of personal privilege please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Brady: "Please let the record reflect that on House Bill 3433 I was recorded as a 'no' and intended to be 'yes'."

Speaker Evans: "Can you confirm that number again, Sir?"

Brady: "3443. I'm sorry, 3443."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. The record will reflect. Continuing on page 10, we have House Bill 3484, Representative Stoneback."

Stoneback: "I move to concur Senate Amendment 2 on House Bill 3484. The goal of House Bill 3484 is to remove barriers for domestic violence victims to leave abusive marriages despite lacking financial independents by making a possibility of obtaining good legal counsel more equitable. The statute of fee splitting in the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act needed further clarification so that both parties would be able to have commensurate counsel and, therefore, have equal footing at the beginning of a dissolution proceeding. This Bill allows either party to, in

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

divorce actions, to seek an allowance from the other party for a retainer fee to obtain an attorney. So, this Bill came out of committee with bipartisan support. It passed the House and the Senate unanimously. There's no known opposition, and the Illinois Bar Association is in support. When it came out of the Senate, there was some confusion about whether the fees awarded for the payment of the retainer fee were considered to be interim attorney fees, and this was fixed in the Senate. And, as amended, it would allow a petitioner in divorce proceedings to request these retain... the retainer fee as a form of interim fees. So, I appreciate your time. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3484?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3484. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, we have House Bill 3577, Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3577 is the initiative of the Secretary of State's Office to clean up the... and allow for the implementation of Illinois Worker Cooperatives. It sets the definitions of a worker co-op as well as the fee

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

schedule for the Secretary of State to implement the Bill. That's what the Amendment does. And I move for its passage."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Seeing no questions, the question is,
 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 3577?' This is final action. All those in favor signify
 by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'aye', 0 voting
 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 3577. And this Bill, having
 received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed. Continuing on page 10, under Order of Concurrences,
 we have House Bill 3587, Chairman Slaughter. When you get to
 your seat, please speak to the Concurrence and Amendment."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Bill (sic-Amendment) #5 to House Bill 3587. This is a Bill creating a task force to study and come up with recommendations for resentencing. Senate Amendment #5 removes provisions relating to the Illinois Department of Corrections as well as a requirement that a member of the task force be from a correctional labor union. In addition, the Amendment removes the administrative work of the task force from ICJIA to the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council. And lastly, it moves the due date for the task force report from January 1, 2022 to July 1, 2022. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Concurrence."

Speaker Evans: "Any questions or comments? We have Leader Batinick for questions."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, quick question. Did the Amendment in the Senate take... it looks like the underlying Bill is essentially the same, correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Do you know if that underlying... that Amendment in the Senate will change the 'no' votes of Halbrook, Chesney, Niemerg, or Wilhour? Did it fix... did it fix their issues?"

Slaughter: "I'm not sure."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 3587?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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. With 113 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #5 on House Bill 3587. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3598, Representative Avelar."

Avelar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment 1 to HB3598. This is a page and line Amendment that removes the language requiring the Department of Insurance to enforce the provision in the underlying Bill by rule. This Amendment was brought at the request of the Department of Insurance, who believes it has the requisite authority to

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

develop the rules and regulations necessary for implementation and argued the additional language in the underlying Bill requiring it to enforce the provision by rule was thus unnecessary. As a reminder, House Bill 3558 would require insurance companies to offer group accident and health insurance policies to local chambers of commerce to provide health benefits to their employees. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3598?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Tarver. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3598. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, we have House Bill 3739, Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Please speak to the Amendment on the Concurrence."

Robinson: "With the Amendment in the Senate, we removed IML to neutral and the Illinois section of the American Water Works Association to support. This remains a feasible approach to the utilities, and communities have told us this is a way that they can accomplish this great task of making sure that all Illinoisans have clean drinking water. We extended the timelines and provided greater assistance to grants in the

47th Legislative Day

to remove opposition?"

5/31/2021

Amendment. With the \$45 billion proposal, and the Biden infrastructure plan, and 50 million requested from the ARPA funding for this year, we are committed to finding funding for this program. There are also still resources available today for communities that can access through the state revolving funds. It is essential that communities plan and prepare for the replacement so they are shovel ready when funds come available. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Representative... Leader Batinick for questions."

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

Batinick: "Representative, we had 31 'no' votes here on our side of the aisle, I believe, last time, and I'm not going to read their names. But you changed this Bill quite a bit. I can see with Senate Amendment 1 you had the realtors opposed. What is the nature of the opposition that's left? And what did you do

Robinson: "Certainly. A lot of hard work, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Okay. That sounds like a Representative Moylan answer. What, specifically, did you do to remove opposition from the... and what opposition is left?"

Robinson: "So, the realtors have an opposition that is a very, very small issue within the Bill that we could not remove.

But it wasn't a major issue for the realtors. But unfortunately, the language was an issue. But again, we extended the timelines to provide greater assistance through

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

the grant's Amendment. That was the major issue that our friends at the IML had, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Okay. So, what... so, other than the realtors, who is left as opposed?"

Robinson: "Just the realtors, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "The realtors. Okay. Thank you for the answer to the questions. I appreciate it."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ugaste for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Ugaste: "Representative Robinson, we've had this discussion in committee. So, I don't want to drag this out, but I want other Members to understand just an issue or two that, while I agree that this is of the upmost importance and something we need to do and support you in your efforts to get this done, there's a problem with the Bill that, because of it, I just still can't support it. So, let's... let's just get to it. Have you identified a definite funding source within the language of the statute, itself, currently?"

Robinson: "No."

Ugaste: "Okay. I know we're hoping, and I hope too, that there's enough money that comes out of any federal infrastructure Bill to fully fund this and take care of it. Nothing would make me happier. But in the event that does not happen, what is the fallback position under this Bill because... well, let me start by asking this before you answer that. Is it a mandate on the municipalities by a certain time they will come up with a plan and fix the problems with the lead lines?"

Robinson: "Yes, Representative."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Ugaste: "Okay. So, what is the fallback position should the Federal Government not come up with the money?"

Robinson: "To your point that I've answered, the municipalities will have to cover that cost, to figure out ways to be able to pay for this."

Ugaste: "Okay. And thank you. I appreciate you answering the questions and being so straightforward about it. To the Bill. Representative, I'd be happy to vote for this. I'd, in fact, work with you to try and find state money to indicate in the future we have to allocate so much money every year to take care of this problem. That's how serious it is. But without finding a way to fund this project, just to tell our local governments again, you're going to have to fund this... I understand IML is no longer opposed, but I just don't think it's the right thing to do. I hope the federal money comes through if this passes. And thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Reick for questions."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will yield."

Reick: "Representative, we've talked about the wish for federal money, or the demand for local money in case federal money doesn't come through. Is there anything in this Bill that would turn everyone's eyes toward Springfield to find a funding mechanism for that... for this Bill?"

Robinson: "Representative Reick, can you repeat the question? I'm sorry."

Reick: "My question is, failing... you know, it's a very aspirational thing. And believe me, I, like previous speakers, I'm a 100 percent with you on the theory and the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

need for this. But my question is, is that if the federal funding does not come through, and the local funding becomes inadequate, is there anything in this Bill that will move... that will obligate the state, whether by appropriation or by mandate, to come up with funding on this project?"

Robinson: "Representative Reick, no. The answer is no."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Representative to close."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for making sure that all Illinoisans are able to go to their faucets and have clean drinking water. I would also like to make sure that I thank Governor Pritzker for also making sure that we start these projects with funding on the front end. So, I want to be on the record to thank the Governor for, again, putting resources forth to getting us to a point where we have clean drinking water all across the state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative Robinson. And the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3739?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 85 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'nay', and 2 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3739. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, we have House Bill 3849, Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment 1 to HB3849. This is a Bill that passed the House and the Senate unanimously. It is an initiative of the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. It creates a mechanism in law called the Supported Decision-Making Agreement that our neighbors with developmental and intellectual disabilities can use in lieu of guardianship. The Amendment clarifies what the responsibilities are of IGAC for conducting outreach training and education related to supported decision-making agreements."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Any questions? I see... one moment, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 3 for Senate Bill 521, Floor Amendment(s) 2 for Senate Bill 2017, and Floor Amendment(s) 3 for Senate Bill 2800."

Speaker Evans: "We'll continue the questions on House Bill 3849.

We have Representative Lewis for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "Representative, go ahead."

Lewis: "Representative LaPointe, I have great relationships with NADS, being the National Association of Down Syndrome. They are very, very supportive of your Bill, and I encourage all my colleagues for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative LaPointe to close."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- LaPointe: "I appreciate that, Representative. I will just close by saying adults with disabilities have a range of decision making capabilities and this Bill will help them enact that.

  Thanks."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3849?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3849. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 10, we have House Bill 3886, Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur House Bill 3886 to Senate Amendment 1, which is a gut and replace. This changes... the changes made in the Senate makes this an agreed Bill with DCFS. This Bill passed bipartisan in the House and unanimously in the Senate. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3886?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3886. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 11, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3895, Chairman Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to concur with SA1 to House Bill 3895. As promised, we've worked with the Senate to have a Bill that we all can agree upon. It does four things. One, it provides that the Department of Correction should implement a wellness program to provide employees and staff with support to address both professional and personal challenges as they relate to the correctional environment. Two, it provides the Department shall establish a response team to provide comprehensive support to employees and staff affected by events that are both duty related and not duty related, and to provide training to the response team and its members. Three, it provides that the wellness program shall be accessible to all Department employees, whether full-time, part-time, contractual, and temporary staff as well as volunteers. It adds a preamble that concerns... concerning the policy of the Department of Correction and Department of DJJ regarding employees seeking mental health care."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Lilly. Any questions? I see Leader Batinick for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

Batinick: "Representative, our analysis indicates that the Department of Corrections, CMS, and AFSCME were opposed to

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

the underlying Bill and maybe part of that was taken care of with the Amendment. Do you have an update on opposition?"

Lilly: "That is correct. There's no opposition to the Bill. The Department of Correction and DJJ are neutral."

Batinick: "Okay. So, other than that, it's pretty... what change did you make to the underlying Bill to change their opposition?"

Lilly: "We worked with them to make sure that it did not conflict with their employees work status. And again, AFSCME is a full... is a Sponsor of the Bill at this time."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Lilly: "You're welcome."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3895?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 99 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3895. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the one-hour waiting period for Bills to be heard immediately on the floor. Leader Manley on the Motion."

Manley: "Speaker, I move that the one-hour posting requirement be waived so the following Amendments can be heard immediately.

House Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2017. House Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2800."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Leader Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Can we have a roll call vote on this Motion, please?"

Speaker Evans: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the one-hour requirement. 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. With 72 voting 'yay', 45 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the one-hour requirement is waived. Going to move to Senate Bills on Second Reading, page 6 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 2800, Leader Harris. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Speaker Welch."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Amendment becomes the Bill. It is the state budget. Could we adopt the Amendment and then debate it on Third Reading?"

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Speaker Welch."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris."

Harris: "I would also like to adopt this Amendment and debate it on Third... on Third Reading."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?" Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Harris: House. Senate Bill 2800, as amended, is the state budget and the state capital plan. And what a difference it is a year later to be back in our own House, in our own chamber, all together after being at the Bank of Springfield Center during the height of the COVID pandemic. And we've accomplished a lot together in that year, working together with the House, the Senate, and Governor Pritzker to begin to restore the fiscal stability of our state. We've made great strides of this year. We've had a lot of accomplishments. The budget we passed last year helped our state through the most difficult and dark hours of a pandemic. It served the people of Illinois. It brought the resources to our communities. It provided the health care folks needed. And now, we're ready to move on and to continue to reopen, restart, and revitalize this state and continue to stabilize our fiscal condition. You know, not too many years ago, we had a \$17 billion bill backlog in this state. As of this morning, our bill backlog was about \$3.2 billion. Though... 3.2 billion, that is the lowest is has been in many a year. We are paying down \$3

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

billion... nearly \$3 billion of debt with this budget that we'll be voting on today. It includes 2.1 million in payment in full of the Municipal Liquidity Facility, which we borrowed to see our way through the pandemic. By doing so, we'll be saving the taxpayers of Illinois \$100 million in interest costs. And as well, in Fiscal Years '23 and '24, because of this and another action we will take in this budget, we'll actually have another 1 million... \$1 billion in GRF that can go to costs such as evidence-based model, child care, senior care, in both Fiscal Years '23 and '24 by... so, by the fiscally responsible actions we're taking today, not only do we pay down nearly \$3 billion in debt, we set ourselves up for successful years in FY23 and FY24 also. This proposal here contains no tax increases. We have about a billion dollars that will come into the state from ARPA for different capital projects. We will fully fund the evidence-based model. We make substantial additional contributions to the Guide House Study for the developmentally disabled. And I... I just want to thank my colleague, Representative Michelle Mussman, who has been such a strong advocate for those children and those folks who need it so much. In addition, we're disbursing some of the ARPA money in this budget. And I say some because we're trying to work as prudently as we can to be sure, one, that we get substantial amounts of money into our economy this summer, and also into the hands of our community-based organizations, our not-for-profits to serve people during the summer. Especially our young folks during the summer months when they're going to need some support. But also, we're not spending all the money at once. We're deciding to spend some

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

money to get cash into the economy and cash into the hands of serving organizations. But also, we're realizing that this is a... that this federal money was designated as a four-year pot of money. So, we're stewarding it out over time so that we don't run off of a cliff. And we're also taking the time to spend money and make decisions in the future so that we can recalibrate, we can be strategic, we can be planful, and we can prioritize how this money is spent. In the initial allocations, we are putting a tremendous amount of money where our priorities are. And I had a sheet that told you these things. So, there's \$46 million for improving educational outcomes; \$45 million to... for community support; \$106 million to support our families; \$578 million for businesses, small businesses, hospitality, tourism; \$475 million for public health response; \$183 million to violence prevention and addressing of social determinants of health. I forgot that word for a moment. And \$104 million for homelessness and affordable housing. So, this is a quick summary of what's in the budget. You have analysis in front of you. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Harris. This Bill is on Short Debate. Leader Demmer is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Leader Harris, thank you for that description. I would note this Amendment, Floor Amendment 1, was introduced at 12:15 this morning. Then Floor Amendment 2 came sometime late this evening. And Floor Amendment 3 was introduced just, I don't know, five or six minutes ago. These are not page and

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

line Amendments where we can simply see what the changes are. These are gut and replace Amendments. So, we really have no ability to analyze what's changed between one draft and the next. But I won't belabor that process point because we've been belaboring it for years and nothing changes. So, let me just ask you, in the Floor Amendment that's been adopted here, what is the total revenue projection for Fiscal Year '22?"

Harris: "That would be 42 billion, 315 million in GRF."

Demmer: "This morning... or earlier this afternoon in committee, you indicated that the GRF revenue was approximately \$41.3 billion. Has something changed or was that just a misstatement earlier?"

Harris: "Well, as I said this morning, the chart I had in front of me was dated..."

Demmer: "Okay. Sure."

Harris: "...a different day. So, this is the accurate information."

Demmer: "Thank you. And the overall spending number?"

Harris: "Forty two billion, two hundred and twenty million."

Demmer: "All right. Earlier this year, when the Governor proposed his budget, he proposed nearly a billion dollars' worth of tax increases of one kind or another. He called them loopholes. Certainly, a scholarship program for low-income children isn't a loophole, corporate loophole. Which of those tax increases did you decide to incorporate into this budget?"

Harris: "Those are not in this Bill."

Demmer: "The revenues from those are in this Bill."

Harris: "So, what the... what we're discussing are the net operating loss deduction, the accelerated depreciation, freezing the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Franchise Tax at its current level, and the foreign dividend advantage."

Demmer: "And together, is it fair to say that that's about 650 or 660 million dollars?"

Harris: "In that vicinity."

Demmer: "Is there \$660 million that would not have been owed in taxes by Illinois businesses that will now be owed in taxes by Illinois businesses as a result of these changes?"

Harris: "Well, in many of these cases, if the Federal Government had not changed their policies, we would've been collecting those taxes as a part of standard procedure."

"That's right. The Federal Government did change their policies though, and they did so a couple years ago, and Illinois businesses saw federal tax changes and saw what the state tax treatment was. And these changes tonight are going to result in an additional \$660 million in taxes for Illinois businesses. Another point that the elimination of the Franchise Tax was an initiative that had broad bipartisan support and was, indeed, signed into law by the Governor just about two years ago. Your proposal tonight, I believe, freezes the phase out of the Franchise Tax. Now, the ... eliminating the Franchise Tax was an item that Republicans brought to the table during bipartisan Capital Bill negotiations, and we secured an agreement to eliminate that. Our initial proposal, in fact, was to eliminate the Franchise Tax immediately. There was a request made by your side of the aisle that we phase it out over the course of a few years. And in order to be reasonable, we accepted that agreement. I was worried at the time that we might get to a point like this where that

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

agreement and our accommodation of a phase out schedule would be frozen. Freezing the Franchise Tax where it is today will mean that 6,206 businesses, who had it seen in state statute that the Franchise Tax was going to be eliminated, will now see that it's not going to be eliminated and that those over 6,200 businesses will be required to continue to pay a Franchise Tax in the future because our bipartisan agreement is being broken here tonight. So, after we look at what these hundreds of millions of dollars in new taxes that businesses will owe, we also have to think about the over \$5 billion of debt that exists in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. Which, if it's not addressed, will result in significant benefit reductions for unemployment recipients significant tax increases for employers. Does this budget allocate money to reduce the debt in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund?"

Harris: "We are putting 100 million in to pay interest to the trust fund."

Demmer: "We have a difference of opinion on... I wouldn't say opinion. There are two different narratives being talked about, about the use of that \$100 million. I know we've had a discussion about that earlier. I just... I thought I'd clarify... it's my understanding, most recently, that that \$100 million deposit in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund is not to pay interest but instead to cover the cost of the expansion of unemployment insurance to noninstructional education employees and to allow for the waiver of nonfraud related IDES overpayments in the last year."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Harris: "I'm corrected, my colleague, that you are correct and I
 was wrong in my explanation."

Demmer: "So, the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund debt is not being addressed?"

Harris: "You are correct. I was incorrect."

Demmer: "Okay. What is the... this year's budget... and one of the reasons we have paid even further attention to the ability to analyze this year's budget is that every state budget is complex, and we both know that. This year, though, is particularly complex because of the unique one-time treatment of the receipt of both... some remaining funds from the CARES Act as well as new funds from ARPA. What... and I know ARPA has multiple features, but much attention has been given to the approximately \$8.1 billion that the State Government will receive, over which we have a greater degree of control still within the federal rules. So, of that \$8.1 billion, what does this Bill appropriate from those funds?"

Harris: "Approximately 1.5 billion."

Demmer: "\$1.5 billion in ARPA related funds appropriated here. Is there an additional appropriation for capital funds?"

Harris: "If capital projects are funded and go out, there would be, hopefully, another billion dollars there."

Demmer: "Is that included in this Bill or is that in the capital appropriation Bill?"

Harris: "The capital is in this Bill. So, it would be 1.5 billion in general operating..."

Demmer: "Okay."

Harris: "...and a billion in capital."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Demmer: "And we... we then would remain with approximately five and a half billion dollars of ARPA state funds that have not yet been appropriated and could not be spent without further legislative action?"

Harris: "Yes."

Demmer: "Okay. We addressed this in committee, and I'd like to enlighten all Members of the House about this. When we talked about the capital appropriations..."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Demmer, please bring your remarks to a close. Standard Debate was announced. Short Debate was announced."

Demmer: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have contained in this Bill, as was discussed in committee this afternoon, a billion dollars in capital projects at the requests of Member initiatives from one side of the aisle. These are federal funds, funded by people who pay federal taxes. Each of us and every district in Illinois have constituents who pay federal taxes, whose tax dollars have been collected and sent back to the states for equitable use. My question would've been, when you were making those capital requests, and after you have revisited the redistricting map room, did those capital requests come for your new districts or your old districts? Another of the problems of a politician picking their own districts. You can now make that pleasant phone call to say, good news, mayor, I've drawn you into my district and I have a little cash to give you as well. I would also like to point out that, in the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, there are 46 new grants ranging between \$50 thousand and \$2.6 million. Forty-six new grants.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Were those Member initiatives as well? In the Department of Human Services, 76 new grants ranging between \$50 thousand and a million dollars."

- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Demmer. Please bring your remarks to a close."
- Demmer: "Mr. Speaker, we've talked many times in this chamber about it being a new day. The only new day is going to happen in five minutes when the clock strikes midnight. Because what we're seeing on this floor is the same dark, old days that we've struggled under for years. This is not appropriate. This is not the way things should be handled. We all know that. Let's give transparency a chance. The only change that happens here is change that we make happen. Vote 'no'."
- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2800 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 this question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving along to page 6, on Senate Bill 2017, Leader Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2017, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Harris."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris to explain the Amendment."
- Harris: "I'd like to adopt the Amendment and we can discuss it on Third."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2017, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris to the Bill."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the BIMP Bill for FY22. It contains numerous provisions that effectuate the budget in the Bill we debated previously. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. I'm announcing that it'll be Short Debate. Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to ask questions. I'm going to go right to the Senate Bill. We're close to midnight. Some of this stuff could've been done earlier. I know we have more things on the plate, Pembroke Township, energy. But we're not going to be able to get to them because we are going to go past midnight. Makes things a little more difficult. In that, I'm disappointed. But let me start by saying, every Session, I come in... I come in with a clear mind and a hopeful spirit. I hit the reset button every year, hope that we can start over again, do things in a better way. I have hoped that we could work together to solve the countless problems that this chamber has created. Because what the problems that this chamber has

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

created affects every person, every man, woman, and child in this state. Whether it's our soring pension cost, our out of control property taxes, our ever-expanding state budget, and, yes, our deteriorating business climate. These problems that have been created in this chamber have consequences. I think it's pretty obvious that people are not calling Illinois their home anymore. They are truly leaving our state, that's clear. And, once again, this budget, and frankly this Session, have stolen my optimism and the hope that so many Illinoisans had for a new day in Springfield. What we have here is the same old story. The same old song and dance. A last minute budget ... boy, is it last minute... that spends billions of additional dollars irresponsibly. Here's some of the highlights, or lowlights, of what you decided to prioritize despite your claims of a deficit. Get this. Congratulations. Members of the House and Senate get a pay raise. I'm sure we all earned it. Legislative district office allowances were doubled at the same time every employer in our state is trying to cut costs to stay afloat. Talk about priorities. And get this. In this BIMP budget, whatever you want to call it, over a billion dollars in new unvetted pork spending by the House Democrats, for Democrats. Every resident in Illinois has suffered over this past year. People lost their jobs. Families lost their homes. Employers lost their businesses. Illinoisans lost their dignity. And so many of us have also lost a loved one to COVID. However, the only people who didn't lose anything are the Illinois Democrats who are keeping the good times rolling with more pork and even a pay raise. Question I have is why we didn't fund the trust fund, the Unemployment Trust

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Fund. That may be the most important social safety net program that we have in this state. The Unemployment Trust Fund. Remember, we are \$5 billion, \$5 billion in the hole. The one program that kept so many afloat during the Governor's shutdown, during the hard times that so many faced, we're not putting a penny towards it. Nothing. Now, with your vote on this spending plan, you'll turn your back on this program and refuse to fill the hole that was meant so much to employers and workers across the state. You said that your salary and your special interests were more important than the working men and women and their employers in Illinois. We receive billions of federal money to spend, nothing goes to the trust fund. So, here's what's going to happen. It's pretty obvious. We've heard this before. The benefits people relied on will be cut or reduced. And employers, just as they are able to open their doors and start hiring again, which we see going on right now, will have to pay more to cover for your pay raises. As I said earlier, I had hope this year, hope for a new day in Springfield. I just couldn't have been more wrong based on what's happening tonight."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2017 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 this question, there are 73 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 10, under Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 3404, Representative Haas."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Haas: "Thank you. I move to concur Senate Amendment 1, which was adopted to address concerns of opponents and clarify language to this Bill. This Bill continues to give residents the choice if they want to connect to natural gas, they may. If they want to continue with their current utility choice, they may. This is a better Bill than when it came before you in April, when it passed out of this chamber with 88 'yes' votes, with bipartisan support. This Bill, with Senate Amendment, passed out of the Senate chamber with 45 'yes' votes. I strongly urge a 'yes' vote on the concurrence of this Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3404?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3404. And this Bill, having received... on this question, there are 81 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3404. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 11, under Order of Concurrence, with House Bill Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to move to concur for Senate Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 3911. It simply adds clarifying language for the recommendations of the First Responders Suicide Prevention Task Force. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Any debate? We have Representative Moeller for questions."

Moeller: "Not on this Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3911?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'yay'... voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3911. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 11, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3914, Leader Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It's a gut and replace Amendment that includes several provisions relating to diversity in state hiring. And it creates a new Act. It provides positive changes... I'm sorry... positive action toward addressing systemic racism and barriers to increase workforce diversity in the state employment. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Flowers. Representative Windhorst, do you have a comment on this Bill?"

Windhorst: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Windhorst: "Leader Flowers, hi. I noticed that in the House the vote was fairly partisan. It looked like it was unanimous in the Senate. What changed in the Senate with that Amendment?" "Well, the Amendment was a positive Amendment. It was a Flowers: better Amendment. And as a result, it provided... it would require that CMS rules that reject candidates for state employment who fail to meet certain requirements, that will be taken away. It would also require that each state agency to increase their civic... their diversity on their interview panel. And... and also, Senate Amendment #1 includes... oh, it also includes to increase counseling resources to employees that are behind on child support payments. And it also directs CMS to dedicate staff to determine what the best counseling and resources are for people who are behind in their child support."

Windhorst: "And that Amendment moved CMS from opposed to supporting? Is that correct?"

Flowers: "Yes. Absolutely."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Flowers to close."

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

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3914?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3914.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving along to page... moving along to page 11, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3928, Representative Bennett."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to concur with Senate Bennett: Amendment #1 for House Bill 3928. It is an initiative of the Pontiac High School environmental science class to identify strategies to conserve and protect 30 percent of Illinois by 2030. This Bill creates a Thirty-By-Thirty Conservation Task Force Act, which includes a task force of members from many departments and entities to create a comprehensive representation of our state, including a teacher and two environmental students. Which I believe may have been the first of its kind here. Senate Amendment 1 would add one seed producer appointed by the chairperson. And also representative of a statewide outdoor organization, also appointed by the chairperson. It was a unanimous vote in the House, and it came back from the Senate unanimous as well. I'd like to move for an 'aye' vote, please. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3928?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3928. And this Bill, having received a

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Under Supplemental Calendar #1, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 4, Chairman Mayfield. Speak to the Concurrence."

- Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I move to concur with House Bill 4...

  Amendment 2 to House Bill 4. It basically just added language
  to ensure that if a school district was selected as a polling
  place that the contractors would still be paid. I ask for an
  'ave' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill #4?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on Supplemental Calendar #1, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 1739, Representative Hirschauer."
- Hirschauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Floor Amendments 5 and 3 and Senate Committee Amendment 1 to HB1739. HB1739 was a Bill that passed unanimously through the House to ensure proper notification of the Illinois state sexual assault tracking system. Senate Floor Amendment #5 merges language from HB3443, which Representative Cassidy passed in this current General Assembly. The language of this

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Amendment comes from the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault and the Illinois Hospital Association. It's a gut and replace Amendment that also makes various changes to the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act. It also extends the implementation date for certain provisions of the Sexual Assault Survivors Emergency Treatment Act. Senate Floor Amendment #3 clarifies that, when the Illinois State Police sexual assault evidence collection kit is collected from a sexual assault survivor, a health care provider or law enforcement who collected the evidence must notify the victim about the tracking system. And this change comes from the Illinois Sheriffs' Association who wanted the language to be more specific. And finally, Senate Committee Amendment #1 reflects changes requested by the Attorney General's Office to move the language back to the Sexual Assault Survivors Emergency Treatment Act. I request concurrence."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1, 3, and 5 to House Bill 1739?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting '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 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, 3, and 5 to House Bill 1739. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Slaughter, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Slaughter: "Yeah, a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Slaughter: "Yeah, today, it was tough getting here. It was extremely sad coming into the building. The reason was is because it's Oluchi Ifebi's last day with us. Many of you, if not all of you, know she's been absolutely tremendous in Judiciary - Crim, and certainly keeps me organized, to say the least. We've already done it. Newly married, her and her husband are going to be moving to Texas. Let's give her a round of applause as we send her off. Thank you so much, Oluchi."

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

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Halbrook: "Yeah, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to put on the record a factual statement to a prior speaker from Highwood's comment. The Wall Street Journal, April 21, 2021, 'The Washington's medical examiner found out that this week that Capitol Police Officer Brian Sicknick died of a natural death on January 7.' Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to support our colleagues in the Texas General Assembly for yesterday, having to walk out of their General Assembly to make sure that their other colleagues understood that there is something called voter suppression that's happening all across our state. And so,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in solidarity with my colleagues, again, in the State of Texas. I want all of us to keep them in their prayers. Keep them in their prayers, and we should also keep them in our thoughts, because everyone should be able to have the right to vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Robinson. Representative Buckner, for what reason do you rise?"

Buckner: "Point of personal privilege please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Buckner: "Mr. Speaker, in much of the country, the years following World War I saw a spike in racial tensions, including the resurgence of supremacists groups like the Ku Klux Klan, numerous lynchings and other acts of racially motivated violence, as well as efforts by African Americans to prevent such attacks on their communities. By 1921, fueled by oil money, Tulsa, Oklahoma was a growing, prosperous city with a population with more than 100 thousand people. Tulsa was also a highly segregated city. Most of the city's 10 thousand black residents lived in the neighborhood called Greenwood, which included a thriving business district sometimes referred to as Black Wall Street. On May 30, 1921, a young black teenager named Dick Rowland entered an elevator at the Drexel Building. And at some point, the young white elevator operator, Sarah Page, screamed. Rowland fled the scene. The police were called, and the next morning they arrested him. As tensions flared in the racially segregated city, many small skirmishes between black and white residents occurred, including a standoff between a group of white men and a group of black men outside of the courthouse. After shots were fired and

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

more chaos broke out, the outnumbered group of black men retreated to Greenwood. Over the next several hours, groups of white Tulsans, some of whom were deputized and given weapons by city officials, committed numerous acts violence against black Tulsans, including shooting an unarmed man in a movie theater. Hysteria grew, and throughout the night of May 31, a hundred years ago today. As dawn broke on June 1, thousands of citizens poured into the Greenwood district looting and burning homes and businesses over an area of 35 city blocks. Firefighters who arrived to help put out the fires later testified the rioters threatened them with guns and forced them to leave. Some 1,256 houses were burned, 215 others were looted but not torched. newspapers, a school, a library, a hospital, churches, hotels, stores, and many other black-owned businesses were among the buildings destroyed or damaged by fire. By the time the National Guard arrived and Governor Robertson had declared martial law shortly before noon, they had not effectively ended. Though Guardsmen helped put out fires, they also imprisoned many black Tulsans. And by June 2, some 6 thousand people were under armed guard at the local fairgrounds. In the hours after the Tulsa Race Massacre, all charges against Dick Rowland were dropped. The police concluded that Rowland had most likely stumbled into the elevator operator or accidently stepped on her foot. In the aftermath of the massacre, the Oklahoma Bureau of Vital Statistics officially recorded 36 dead. However, historians estimate the death toll may have been as high as 300. Even by low estimates, the Tulsa Race Massacre stands as one of the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

deadliest riots in U.S. history. In the years to come, as black Tulsans would try to rebuild their ruined homes and businesses, segregation in the city only increased and Oklahoma's newly established branch of the KKK grew in strength. And, therefore, rebuilding was unsuccessful. For decades, there were no public ceremonies, memorials for the dead, or any efforts to commemorate the efforts of May 31 through June 1, 1921. Instead, there was a deliberate effort to try to cover them up. The Tulsa Tribune removed the front page story on May 31 that sparked the chaos from its bound of volumes. Today, on the 100 year anniversary, the House Legislative Black Caucus commemorates this dark day in our country's history. And we implore all of our colleagues and every citizen of the State of Illinois to remember the importance of this legacy by working together to commit to policy that uplifts and strengthens all of us. Because our history makes it clear that we are not a perfect nation, but thereby learning from the tensions of the past, that we can be perfected. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence to commemorate the Tulsa Race Massacre and those who lost their lives 100 years ago today."

Speaker Evans: "Please rise for a moment of silence. Thank you,

Representative Buckner. Leader Flowers is recognized for a

point of personal privilege."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this moment to do two things. I don't know if you guys saw this little girl that was sitting with me earlier today, but that was my granddaughter, Madison. And about... almost 30 years ago, Steve Brown had to give up his car because I had this little girl's

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

mother down here in Springfield. I did 22 hours of labor and had a C-section, and the Speaker then made me come back to work 4 days later. But I just wanted to take this opportunity, since this is Steve Brown's last day, I want to say thank you, Steve, because you have been... the 36 years that I've been here, you've made my life very difficult and you've made my life very easy. But you will be missed, your little sour jokes, your little smart remarks, all in fun and love. But I will never ever forget your kindness. And I would like to say to you, and this will never be repeated, and it will be between you and I, I love you, man, and I'm going to miss you. Thank you."

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

- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 1, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 4 to Senate Bill 521; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment(s) 1, 2, 4, 5 to House Bill 2620."
- Speaker Evans: "On Supplemental Calendar #2, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2620, Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2620 is on Concurrence. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4, and 5. This is a liquor Bill related to creating a new type of class 3 license for craft brewers. It would... they have the ability to self-distribute small amounts of beer to retailers less than 6200 gallons of beer per location. If they have more than three locations, they can self-distribute 18,600.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

It also creates a beer showcase license. And, for small groups of retail licensees, creates a discount rate. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? We have Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicated he will."

Batinick: "All right. Representative, thanks for the quick chat on this previously. It was 50 to 6 in the Senate. Do you have any idea of the nature of who was against it in the Senate?"

Zalewski: "My guess is, given the agreement among the stakeholders, there are some of your colleagues that would just not love the idea of increased drinking in Illinois. So..."

Batinick: "Okay. With my indulgence real quick, the six that voted against it in the Senate were Bailey, Bryant... looks like..."

Zalewski: "I'm going to stop you right there."

Batinick: "...Rezin, Plummer, Sally Turner. And Fowler. Those were the six. Sally Turner... I should've saved that for last. Rezin, Plummer, Fowler. So, there you go. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Leader Batinick. Further discussion, Representative Carroll."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicated he will."

Carroll: "Representative Zalewski, where are the beer distributors on this Bill?"

Zalewski: "Neutral. I'm told they're neutral."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Carroll: "So, they came... they went from opposed to neutral. Is that correct?"

Zalewski: "That's my understanding."

Carroll: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. We'll move to a vote. The question is,

'Shall the house concur with Senate Amendment'... sorry.

Representative Meier, do you have a question?"

Meier: "Yeah, question to the Sponsor."

Speaker Evans: "Indicated he will yield."

Meier: "This Bill allows... if I remember right, this Bill will allow a tavern or a restaurant that's run out of alcohol to go ahead and restock without being penalized the first time or second time?"

Zalewski: "There's a way in which they're allowed to go restock under this new showcase license, Charlie."

Meier: "Okay. You know, throughout my district, we had many, many restaurants and bars that couldn't get certain product delivered. Meanwhile, you would walk through a Sam's or a Walmart and you would see cases of it piled up, but you couldn't take that back to your business and sell it. So, people who wanted to drink that just quit going to these places. They kept getting told from the distributors they could not get it. So, it's a great Bill for your small businesses like that. I've worked with them. They were having problems before the pandemic and it made it worse."

Zalewski: "A jobs Bill."

Meier: "Thank... thank you for running this Bill."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Charlie."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Chairman Zalewski for a quick close."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Zalewski: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, 2, 4, and 5 to House Bill 2620?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4, 5 to House Bill 2620. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to the Calendar, on page 4 and Senate Bills-Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 521, Chairman Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 3, and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Rita."

Speaker Evans: "Chairman Rita on the Amendment."

Rita: "What I'd like to do is adopt Amendment #1 and then we'll discuss... we've got a series of Amendments that we're going to adopt, and I'll discuss all these on Third Reading, if that's all right?"

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. We'll do them one at a time. Chairman Rita moves to adopt the Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rita." Speaker Evans: "Chairman Rita on the Amendment."
- Rita: "I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #3, and we'll talk about the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Evans: "Chairman Rita moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Rita." Speaker Evans: "Chairman Rita on the Amendment."
- Rita: "Again, I'd ask for its adoption. And we'll discuss all these different Amendments and how it intertwines into this Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Chairman Rita moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #4. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Chairman Rita is recognized."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 521, with all the different Amendments, does a number of things. It addresses a gaming package that we have put together this year. I could go through each one of them very briefly and then go to questions. It allows for

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

firefighter raffles... for organizations to do raffles. It includes the Chicago Sky Women's Basketball to be eligible for a sports betting license that was left out when we did the 2019 gaming Bill. It fixes the horse breeders fix. It allows betting on Illinois colleges with a number... with a couple of provisions. Only betting on teams and not on individual performances, and you have to make them bets in person on a brick and mortar facility with... not over the Internet. And it puts a two-year sunset on that. There's a COVID fix for the Casino Queen. When we originally did it, they had some credits and they had to make employment metrics. And due to COVID, with the casinos being shutdown, we've adjusted that so that they didn't have to have that number of employees from... due to COVID. Has a couple of racing board technical fixes with surety bond, and it also allows the south suburban racino license to allow the board to consider an amended application. We have a couple of provisions for the VGTs that we're going to license sales agents and brokers to create a new license for that. And then, also, harmonizes the license for the various license that they need. This is a request at the gaming board. It eliminates a push tax that's been put on local governments. And it allows a grandfather for two towns, particularly Oak Lawn, who started the push tax. They are grandfathered in at the tax they're at, but they will not be able to raise that tax. And it preempts any other Home Rule community from putting that tax on. It raises non-Home Rule fees from \$25 to \$250. And it doesn't ... with all these Amendments, it doesn't allow for any elimination of any other fees. I believe that's everything in this. Back at you."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "All right. Thank you, Chairman Rita. Any discussion? We have Representative Butler for questions."

Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Evans. And a couple of questions to the Sponsor, if you don't mind."

Speaker Evans: "Indicates that he will."

Butler: "Representative Rita, thank you for bringing this forward. I appreciate the thought that we've put into this this spring to come up with gaming Bills that aren't giant gaming Bills and try to make some fixes as we move forward through the process and everything. So, I appreciate you bringing this forward. I think you did a good job of laying out most of those items that we discussed in our caucus earlier tonight. I do want to point out a couple things. I have not been a fan of betting on Illinois college teams. I'm not completely okay with what we've got in here, but I think it's a halfway step forward when we've had discussions with Representative Zalewski. And I think this actually is as good of ... kind of happy medium where you're just able to bet on teams and not individuals and you have to do it in person. And I think that addresses some of the concerns that have been raised by the universities, as well as having a two-year sunset on it. I think Representative Spain's got some legislative intent on the video gaming. I think... I think Representative Wheeler's going to have some questions as well on the labor piece. And I appreciate the fact that you included Representative Hammond's horse semen cleanup Bill because we've had a lot of discussions about that over the last couple of years. So, thank you very much."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Speaker Evans: "Any further discussion? We have Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicated he will."

Hammond: "Representative Rita, I want to thank you for including...
as you are well aware, I had legislation a couple of years
ago to address the transportation of horse semen within the
State of Illinois and outside the State of Illinois. And
within this Bill, I believe that it completes the repeal of
the ban of the Illinois standard bred horse semen. Is that
correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Hammond: "And also, eligible horse semen will continue to be shipped out of state after January 1 of 2022. Is that correct?"

Rita: "You're exactly correct."

Hammond: "I appreciate your accommodation, Representative, and would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Wheeler for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Chairman Rita, there was an element of this Bill in its original... I guess it'd be Amendment 1 that referred to labor peace agreements that we've talked about in the chamber the last couple of days, and we were trying to work out a way to approach that. What was the final solution for this particular Bill with respect to labor peace agreements?"

Rita: "Well, as I stated in committee, in the original underlying, we had a labor peace agreement and it was to work with our

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

skilled labor and our labor unions. As it became a... is a newer provision that I agreed to take this out, work with all the unions to try to come up with a plan that works for everyone. It was bringing on a lot of different opposition. The intent is to work with them unions to come up with the right way to implement a labor peace agreement into the race tracks and casinos."

Wheeler: "So, just to be abundantly clear ... "

Rita: "So, I did remove that."

Wheeler: "Yeah. For... yeah, for my side of the aisle when we discussed this in caucus, this wasn't all flushed out all the way. There is no language regarding labor peace agreements in the Bill we're moving tonight. I make a commitment to my friend, the Chairman, to work with him on that over the summer on other gaming issues we talked about that are not part of this Bill that has been brought up by other Members. Chairman Rita, I appreciate your efforts on this. I think we found a happy medium on a lot of different parts of gaming that are nice, small, incremental changes so we're not waiting for that giant Bill that is so difficult to pass every few years. Thank you for your efforts. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Spain for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates he will."

Spain: "Chairman Rita, I would extend the same compliments that you've received, which are so deserving, both through your leadership of the Executive Committee and your leadership on gaming issues and the fact that we continue to work on this great topic and an opportunity for the State of Illinois. We

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

did have some discussions in the Executive Committee earlier today. And with the number of Amendments and the lateness of the hour, and we're all trying to work our best to get things done, I thought I would ask you a couple of questions for purposes of legislative intent regarding VGTs and some of the issues in communities. The first thing I want to make sure I understand clearly. We are making changes to the terminal fees for video gaming terminals in communities. Am I correct that non-Home Rule communities currently charge \$25 and would now move to \$250 per terminal under this legislation?"

Rita: "That is correct."

Spain: "Thank you. And we also had discussions because Home Rule units of government have a widely varying fee schedule for video gaming terminals. There were some discussions about imposing a cap, which was a concern of mine and others that represent Home Rule communities. We have removed that portion in this legislation and Home Rule communities would continue to make their own decisions about their fee schedule for VGTs. Is that correct?"

Rita: "Yes. We've pulled out a series of these Amendments that we had filed that has become the Bill, pulled out that there would be no caps, no ability to stop any fees or licensing or fees for Home Rule. Like yourself, you brought that as a big concern to Peoria. Leader Gordon-Booth also called me before committee with a number of Representatives on your side and this side of the aisle to that effect. And so, that we adjusted that and fixed that, that we were not going to change or cap any fee structure for Home Rule communities."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Spain: "That's perfect. And I thank you for your prompt attention to that and immediately creating a solution. The last thing, there is a preemption, though, in this Bill, and it is a preemption of further communities implementing a push tax. And this is a preemption that, quite frankly, I'm comfortable with. But you mentioned that we would grandfather the two existing communities that have already imposed a push tax, that's correct? Oak Lawn and one other?"
- Rita: "Oak Lawn started it and then Waukegan is, I believe, adopted it after that. So, this would grandfather the City of Oak Lawn... or Village of Oak Lawn and Waukegan, or any of those that had this passed by June 1, I believe 12:01 would maybe be the correct timing."
- Spain: "I think that would be good. I wanted to ask you that question. Any... any plan adopted prior to June 1, 2021... we're on June 1, though now 2021. So, your purpose is for 12:01, any action needed it to be place prior to this current day, correct?"
- Rita: "Yes. And I would add to this this was... I was working with the Senate, Senator Cunningham, who requested to have this language put this way in terms of working with both chambers and dealing with a gaming Bill."
- Spain: "Chairman Rita, thank you very much. You're a great man of your word. This is a good Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

Rita: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Crespo for questions.

Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yeah, thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "Sponsor says he will."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Crespo: "Representative, the initial... the underlying Bill for Senate Bill 521 put the service... fire service in priority with law enforcement so they, too, can conduct raffles. Is that still in this Bill?"

Rita: "Yes."

Crespo: "Okay. Thank you."

Rita: "Yes. That was... we didn't much talking about that part for the last few days, but yes."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Gonzalez for questions."

Gonzalez: "To the Bill. As far as I understand, the casino will built union under a project labor agreement, but what about after the casino's built? I think that there should be a labor peace agreement in the Amendment so the service entity can be union or have the option of being union or under the LPA agreement. But I look forward to discussions as they arise. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Brady for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative Rita, I, as well, too, want to thank you for all your hard work on this piece of legislation. And to the remarks of Representative Spain in particular, thank you for making the adjustments as it pertains to municipalities and the gaming Bill applies to them. Thank you. There's still one troubling piece for me and that happens to be the betting on college sports. Could you walk me through that one more time real quick?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Rita: "Yes. And we did a subject matter hearing. We had the various universities, I believe it was Mr. Whitman from the University of Illinois testify..."

Brady: "Right."

Rita: "...on allowing betting on college... Illinois colleges. And so, what we did here was to look at, okay, instead of just opening it completely up, let's look at like a pilot project that has a sunset. So, it has a two-year sunset. We looked at not allowing any bets on player performances, and the bets would be just on the team, team outcome. And that you would have to place them bets in house, whether it be in a racino, when they're there, or a sports book. So, it would have to be put in without allowing any Internet so that they'd be allowing collegiate sports betting over the Internet. And I came up with that compromise with Representative Zalewski working hard on that portion of this Bill. Thought this was a good start to take a look at these two years, see what it does, how it does it. It will end in two years. If it's something that has worked out, we'll revisit that. And we took that very seriously, their testimony, and Representative Zalewski worked very hard on that part of that portion of that Bill."

Brady: "So, you would have to go to a facility, right? A casino or something to place a bet on Illinois teams. Is that correct?"

Rita: "Yes. You'd have to be in a casino or those that... if a racino was up and running to place that bet."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Cassidy for questions."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Cassidy: "To the Bill. First of all, Representative Rita, thank you for all your hard work on this. This is a complex area and you manage it really beautifully. So, thank you for all that you've done. I really just rose so that I could use Norine Hammond's name in debate and suggest that she share with us more about her strong feelings about horse semen."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Walsh for questions."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Walsh: "Representative, is there a carve out in here for fraternal and social clubs and veteran organizations for having these VGTs in municipalities or counties that may not allow them?"

Rita: "Yes. You know, I failed to mention that in the opening statement. And it also allows for fraternal... VFWs or fraternal order organizations, one like up in your area, one out in Representative Stuart's area, to allow the VFWs to have video gaming in their VFW, even if they were opted out or any otherwise. As long as they would have a liquor license for that facility, they would be able to be granted in, even if the county and/or municipality has opted out. But we're going to allow the veterans' organizations and fraternal organizations to allow VGTs in their organizations. I think that's a good provision."

Walsh: "And they would be able to get that licensing straight from the gaming board, correct?"

Rita: "I don't believe they would have to get a license. They would just be able to... they would be licensed to receive it. So, in the passage of this Bill, it would... my understanding,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

it allows them to have them to go in. There wouldn't have to be a licensing in that."

Walsh: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Rita: "That's my understanding."

Walsh: "All right, bud. Thank you."

Rita: "Yes."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Nichols for questions."

Nichols: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would this... would this only be pertaining to Division I college athletics?"

Speaker Evans: "The Sponsor will yield for questions."

Rita: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?"

Walsh: "Would this only... would betting on college sports, would it only be pertaining to Division I college athletics?"

Rita: "Hold on, let me check on this."

Walsh: "Like the Big Ten, you know? Is that one of those questions nobody was ready for?"

Rita: "Let me... we're going to check on that. Hold on there a second 'cause I want to give you an accurate answer here. We were just focusing on just the colleges, but we..."

Walsh: "Yeah. There's different levels of college though."

Rita: "...didn't get in depth on what it would be, what it wouldn't be."

Walsh: "Division I, II, III, community college."

Rita: "Yeah. Just give me one minute here."

Speaker Evans: "Was that the only question, Representative Nichols?"

Nichols: "Yes, so far."

Speaker Evans: "Yeah, okay. You have any others? He can follow up on that question if you have any others?"

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Nichols: "That's the only one."

Rita: "It's going to take us a second here."

Nichols: "Seems to be a..."

Rita: "I want to answer this correctly to you."

Nichols: "Okay."

Rita: "How you feeling the first Session here?"

Nichols: "You know, I figure since I'm going to be here, I'd just kind of ask a question, but this is a pretty good one."

Rita: "Feel it good..."

Speaker Evans: "Can I go to the next speaker? And I'll make sure he follows up on that question."

Rita: "All right. So, I'm being told by staff and the legal that it just allows for collegiate... Illinois collegiate teams.

It's not defined by any divisions, any other criteria."

Nichols: "Okay."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you. Representative Meyers-Martin for questions."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill.

Representative Rita, can you clarify, as it relates... would
the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Rita: "Absolutely."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you. Could you just clarify about the horse racing... I think you called it a racino?"

Rita: "So, this is from the racing board. All it does is allow for the racing board to review and receive amended applications. This was a request at them... what was that look for? It's an internal thing from my understanding. The racing board could receive... and receive amended applications. Now,

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

I know you're going to go to the south suburban racino, which was authorized in the 2019 Bill. That is still authorized that a Standardbred racing track is allowed in the seven townships that were outlined. At this point, it would be up to the racing board and how their process would go if racing dates were given to an organization that would provide Standardbred racing. All it does is this allows for them to take amended applications. They currently could put in an application, my understanding, and it needs to be done at a certain time length. So, this doesn't... whether this provision was in there or not, someone still could put in a license for the Standardbred in that south suburbs. So, it's really a... my understanding, a internal procedure that the racing board has requested."

Meyers-Martin: "Okay."

Rita: "This isn't on behalf of anybody trying to do this, except the racing board asked for this."

Meyers-Martin: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Further discussion? Representative Meier is recognized."

Meier: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Meier: "Is Keno included in this or not? Early on, I heard that it was possibly in here, and I haven't really seen it."

Rita: "No, there's no Keno. You know, there was a lot of provisions that we... that were filed. There was a lot of talk of different various things. Our approach, working with the Senate, working with your side of the aisle, we put together a smaller package, as we indicated, each year and put various components

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- in. That was a provision that was floated around that wanted to get included in this. There was a lot of different provisions. But by putting this together, putting a little package, Keno or e-instants, or waiving the in house registration, or waiving the five block radius, none of that is part of this package."
- Meier: "Thank you. And on one other note, I want to thank you as the Minority Chair of Ag that I will about have to see Norine Hammond coming and doing her horse semen Bill anymore."
- Speaker Evans: "Our final speaker on this Bill is Chairman Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. To Cyril's question, it's all college. Not just Division I. I was able to get you that answer. To the Bill. Thank you to the Sponsor for the hard work on the Bill. With respect to the collegiate sports rule, this is a very fair compromise. We took the concerns of Josh Whitman to heart, who said that a saturated sports betting market would do damage to collegiate athletics. That's not what this Bill does. This Bill was... is a good balance between what we heard from stakeholders and in being able to improve our sports betting market. Congratulations to Representative-Chairman Rita. Please vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Zalewski. Chairman Rita to close. Rita to close."
- Rita: "What's that? Well, thank you. Everybody's thanking me."

  Speaker Evans: "Close it up."
- Rita: "I... you know who needs to be thanked are these guys behind me, the staff here that... they're the ones I've been driving

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

crazy. James Hartmann, Sam McGee, Sam the dope man, Ryan Trevor. Again, we're preempted Home Rule on this, but I believe it's a good thing. And while we're going forward by grandfathering those in that have that tax... because you got to remember, what... the funding from the VGTs is the major funding for our Capital Bill and this will help us move forward with that. I'd ask for everyone to vote 'yes'. This will need 71 votes to pass."

- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 521 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting in 'favor', 11 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 1, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 3743."
- Speaker Evans: "Attention, Members. Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3743, Chairman Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Sorry to keep everybody up so late tonight, but... I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3743. This was a gut and replace and basically put the telecom small cell and 9-1-1 sunset extensions into the Bill. The sunset

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

extension for telecom went from three to five years. The sunset extension for small cell went from two and a half years to three and half years. There's negotiated changes that were agreed to between the industry and the IML for greater local input. There was prevailing wage language put in there for certain limited circumstances that was agreed to from the telecommunications industry and labor. And the 9-1-1 sunset that we passed on... earlier out of the House was extended for two years with no fee increases. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Chairman Walsh. Any questions? Representative Mazzochi for questions."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you. And I'd like to just request verification of the vote as well. Thank you. When it comes to... I just want to be clear, Mr. Walsh... even though you... Representative Walsh. Even though you committed to the many people who were interested in this 5G issue, including a whole host, thousands of property owners from across the state, they were not allowed a seat at the negotiating table. True?"
- Walsh: "What I will say, Representative, is we had a long hearing in Public Utilities when we did the sunset extension change.

  Their advocates got to speak in front of committee."
- Mazzochi: "Yeah, that's nothing in terms of actually protecting their rights and interests because your hearing gave them a few minutes to speak. They couldn't get their expert in front of you. And you committed that they would actually have a chance to be heard, and what actually happened is..."
- Walsh: "I said they would be at the table at the committee hearing, and that's what I promised them."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Mazzochi: "Well, you know what? Being at the table at the committee hearing when you're not allowing them to present language, not allowing them to discuss language, and then you let industry and the IML... who by the way are not adequately representing my municipalities who are actually having difficulties under this small cell wireless Act... that is not good faith negotiation. Good faith negotiation is to let a whole host of interested parties, particularly when they represent thousands of people, to actually have representative in one voice. You gave them nothing. Here's the reason why this is a problem. The definition of colocation is still overbroad. We have not changed the definition of co-location as including, not only installing, mounting, maintaining, or operating or replacing, on or adjacent to a wireless support structure. You're giving them the right to put wireless support structures in all over the place, including on people's rights-of-way. You have not done anything to tighten up the extraordinarily broad right-ofway definition, which is creating a whole host of problems. And from what I can see in terms of what's actually been amended, and the Amendments seem to start in around on page 87 of the Bill, all that you're requiring telecom to do is certify that they are compliant with FCC standards. When in reality, the issue was is that there are instances where they are not complying with FCC standards, notwithstanding their certification. And the local municipalities need to have some ability to exercise oversight to make sure that they're actually compliant, and you have denied them even the opportunity to do that. Furthermore, if we scroll further on

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

down, the only other ... one of the things that actually concern me, particularly now that you're putting it in the context of all of this, is that when... you know, so one of the other big concerns is, is that we've seen this in other states that have had... that have restricted what municipalities can or can't do, is that what will wind up happening is that these small cell wireless installations will actually be placed in a location that is very close to a person's bedroom window. They will be put in all sorts of inconvenient locations right where children are playing. And all... again, all that you're requiring here is not third-party verification, but that the ... again, that the wireless provider can simply confirm their compliance with the FCC standards. That is a promise of compliance with no verification. Finally, I know that there were several of our Members who had previously voted for this because they were promised that this was going to lead to broadband. In fact, in other parts of this Bill where you are defining these small... the small electing provider, it seems to me you're now making it easier... for people who are in 40 thousand service providers or less, you're making it easier for them to have their service discontinued. You're essentially saying that they can follow the large provider, which starts off that your service can get cut off with a certified mail saying, sorry, we don't want to service you anymore. This is definitely not something that respects the homeowners who have put in countless hours trying to actually get a law that's responsive to them. This is an inside deal where Legislators, themselves, were actually cut out of the

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

process. This is not substantive. This is not a meaningful advancement. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Thank you, Representative. Our final speaker is Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Chairman Walsh, I want to pivot to a different topic within this Bill that has to do with the 9-1-1 system. That's a component of what we brought over from the Senate. Is that right?"

Walsh: "That's correct."

Wheeler: "And what was the... if we don't do this Bill, what's the sunset date on the 9-1-1 part?"

Walsh: "It was a two-year extension. I..."

Wheeler: "I think it's this year, though, it expires. So, this..."

Walsh: "Yeah, it expires this year, and it will be extended out another two years."

Wheeler: "Okay. What I want to ask you real quick is that, I got calls when we first started bringing this up from some different municipalities who are concerned about the surcharge that we'd be allowing to put on 9-1-1. Is there any changes in this Bill regarding the 9-1-1 surcharge?"

Walsh: "From my understanding, there is no fee increases in this extension."

Wheeler: "Okay. And everything else regarding the consolidation processes, that all remains the same from what we did... what was that? Four years ago, I think, when we passed it."

Walsh: "Correct."

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

- Wheeler: "And then, the last thing I want to talk about real quick, Chairman Walsh, has to do with the limited expansion of prevailing wage, including language that's agreed to between CABA and the laborer's union. Is there anything you can tell me about that that I didn't just outline?"
- Walsh: "So, my understanding is, there is a prevailing wage component that is on public right-of-way sites that extend, I believe it's 10 miles, but it may be 15. But it'd have to be projects larger than that."
- Wheeler: "All right. Well, thank you for that. The point of that,

  I guess is, notwithstanding the previous speaker's

  perspective, there's no witness slips that are, I guess, are
  known opposition to this current framework of this Bill?"
- Walsh: "There is no opposition. I did talk to the cable folks, and they are not opposed."

Wheeler: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is simply a simple sunset Bill, and there's a couple of add-ons in there that different entities had asked for. As far as the component of giving access to people to speak on different issues, these negotiations take place all the time. We had the opponents of... any concerns within these Bills, they were heard, they were given that opportunity in committee. Their feelings were expressed. It went out in committee on overwhelming majorities. I'm not saying everybody was for this Bill, but at the end of the day, these folks came across and it's been done in a bipartisan way. We sent over our sunset extensions to the Senate back earlier on deadline week for House Bills.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Those Bills passed with overwhelming majorities on the bipartisan level. These are, again, simple sunsets with some concerns that were addressed with different issues that were in there. And as we move forward, if we see more things pop up that we need to address, that's what we're here for. But this gives the industry the certainty that they need to move forward with what's going on in this... different sectors. I'll also say that the Bill is supported by IBW Local 9, IBW Local 134, the Chicago Cook County Building Trades, the Illinois Chamber, Illinois Retail Merchants Association, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, the Chicagoland Chamber, TechNet, Wireless Industry, CenturyLink, and the Illinois Telephone Association. So, there's overall support across both sides of the aisle. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Members, Representative Mazzochi asked for...
requested a verification. The question is, 'Shall the House
concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3743?'
This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting
'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On this question, there are 96 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nay',
and 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate
Amendment #1... Mr. Clerk, please read the names of the
affirmative."

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

Representative Andrade; Representative Avelar;

Representative Batinick; Representative Bennett;

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

Representative Bourne; Representative Brady; Representative Buckner; Representative Burke..."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Mazzochi withdraws her request for verification. Continuing the Motion. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 in House Bill 3743. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Thank you very much. I believe we're past our last Bill. And we're going to adjourn shortly, and we'll reconvene at some point at the call of the Speaker. But it's been a fascinating but also a very tragic year, and I'm glad that we're all here together. I'm glad none of us are gone. We've lost friends, we've lost family in an historic year, one that I can't say that's been great, but also one which we have to prove to our... and make sure and to reinstill with our citizenry that we believe in this democracy of Illinois and what we stand for. We're going to disagree on many things, but the fact is, we have to continue on and do the best we can for our citizens no matter what the conditions are. So, I'm going to take this moment to thank every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle of staying true and fast under very difficult circumstances to execute upon the ... what we were sworn to do. Our citizens need us desperately right now, more now than ever before. Please keep that in mind. So with that, I just want to thank everyone for being here, being responsible. But also I can't say enough about the staff, not only on my side of the aisle, but also the Democrat side of the aisle, for what they do for us. And I just hope that we can stand up and say thank you. And

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

particularly, I want to talk about, at least recognize my chief of staff Andrew Freiheit, who is the consummate professional, who works day in and day out for us. And also, Jessica Basham, who works so hard for... on behalf of the Democrats but also on behalf of this chamber. So, we'll see each other again pretty soon. But the fact that we're here in an historic time, something that we will look back on and people will say, did we do the right thing? But the most important thing is that we came back together, and we made decisions, and we did not abrogate at all our responsibility towards our citizens. So, thank you. We've got a lot of work to do, and I hope that we can do more collaboration. I know the spirit and the willingness is there. Let's be better as friends. Let's be better as colleagues. And let's make this state better. Thank you all."

Speaker Evans: "Speaker Welch is recognized."

Speaker Welch: "Thank you, Leader Evans. Good evening, Members, and thank you all for sticking through this final day of Session. I guess it was kind of appropriate that we ended it the way we began with... in the wee morning hours. It's been a productive last few days, and I'm proud of the work we've done to support working-class families in our great state. I think we've moved our state toward... a little bit closer toward racial and gender equity, led by the most diverse leadership team this Body has ever had. We acted swiftly to aid struggling families as we've dealt with this tough pandemic that we had to deal with this last year or so. Really proud of the work of so many people in this chamber, on both sides. On both sides we did the work. We came here every week to

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

represent our constituents. We didn't always agree, but we rolled up our sleeves and did the work for our people. Representative Ramirez passed the COVID-19 federal Emergency Rental Assistance Program Act. We adopted four strong pillars of the Black Caucus. We passed specific policies to support and affirm our Latinx and Asian communities. Today, my friend and our Leader, Lisa Hernandez, passed the Illinois Way Forward Act, Trust Act 2, which increases protections for immigrant communities by separating local police from ICE. Representative Jennifer Gong-Gershowitz, with support from Latinx Caucus, passed legislation to allow public defenders... public defenders in Cook County to protect immigrants from deportation proceedings. That's big. As we have seen a rise in hate crimes against Asian Americans, we also passed a Bill championed by Representative Gong-Gershowitz incorporating American... Asian American history into our school curriculum. These are some great Bills, just a few of the great Bills that have passed here the last few weeks that truly reflect our Democratic values. And I promise you that at every turn we will always affirm women and women's reproductive rights. I want to ... I want to thank Representative Mussman. You know, she doesn't just fight for the disabled like she did today. I mean fight. And she made a difference today for the DD community, but she also passed legislation to ease access to birth control. Going back to Leader Hernandez who passed a Bill allowing SNAP, WIC, and TANF funds to be used for menstrual hygiene products. Representative Welter. Representative Welter passed legislation to create the Domestic Violence Task Force to establish a uniform

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

statewide system to protect victims and survivors of domestic violence. Thank you, Representative Welter. Representative Collins, I tell you, I've never seen anyone work so hard, passed a Bill that lowers the income requirements for child care benefits. Representative Cassidy, I've seen her work long before I got here, passed a measure that would protect rape victims confidentially with counselors. These are Bills that are going to change people's lives. These issues are important to us, and I thank all the women in our caucus who led us every day. Not just on these issues, but across several policy fronts. We did some great work this Session. We also demonstrated, clearly, our commitment to labor rights and collective bargaining, and we hope to see voters codify these rights within our State Constitution. And, folks, we believe the economy is built from the ground up. We do. Not by big corporations who exploit national crisis for profit. Today, we put our money where our mouth is. We passed a responsible, balanced budget that kick-starts our state back into business and supports struggling families all while taking steps to restore fiscal health in Illinois. We are paying down \$2 billion in debt early. When have you ever heard Illinois do that? We are fully paying our pension responsibility. You haven't heard that too often either. We are closing corporate tax loopholes that allowed those at the top to increase their wealth while families suffered during the pandemic. We put our money where our mouth is. And we are funding critical efforts around affordable housing, thanks to Representative Will Guzzardi and Senator Sarah Feigenholtz and the whole team that made that a reality. Violence prevention, long term

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

care for families, and aid to tourism and hospitality industries. What we did here today is going to make a difference in people's lives tomorrow. Lastly, I am pleased that today we were able to pass an overwhelmingly bipartisan ethics reform package. It was real. It was substantive. We made it happen because we know that we have to rebuild trust in what we do here in Springfield. And I want to thank us for doing that in a strong bipartisan way. On that note, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for a very spirited Session that saw several instances of bipartisan action. Now, I think it's time to conclude this Session and go home, see our families, hug our kids, report back to our constituents. But before I do that, I want to thank all of the Members. I want to thank my chief of staff, Jessica Basham, who really... I've never seen anyone work as hard as Jessica and really knows this institution like no other. Can we give her another round of applause? I met him when we were Edgar Fellows in 2016 and... just stay on your feet 'cause you can give Andrew Freiheit another round of applause as well. I didn't really appreciate him until this go around. Our Clerk of the House, John Hollman. John, thank you for keeping the trains on the tracks. And all of the staff of the House of Representatives, on the Democratic side and the Republican side, the unsung heroes. You all really do make us look good. When we adjourn momentarily, I do want to say we will be adjourning to the call of the Chair. We are hoping to return sooner than later. We didn't get an energy Bill done tonight, but we're still working to get there. It's extremely important. We're still working to get there. And so, we're hoping that we can return

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

sooner than later. Keep your ears open so we can get the job done once and for all on energy. Until then, everyone, it's been great. It's been a historical first Session for me, for you, for our great state. God bless you all and goodnight."

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

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 355, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer. House Resolution 371, offered by Representative Batinick. And House Resolution 372, offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris moves for adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "Adjournment Resolution. House Joint Resolution #50, offered by Representative Harris.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, June 01, 2021, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until the call of the President."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House in adjournment to the call of the Speaker. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

47th Legislative Day

5/31/2021

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."