49th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 377, offered by Representative Keicher; House Resolution 387, offered by Representative Halbrook; House Resolution 391, offered by Representative Harris; and Senate Joint Resolution 27, offered by Representative Mazzochi, are referred to the Rules Committee. House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor... referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 391, and Senate Joint Resolution 8."
- 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: "Let us pray. Almighty and everlasting God, source of all wisdom, giver and sustainer of all life, we pray today your blessings to be upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, its Leaders, all of its Members, all of its staff. We pray, oh God, as we come before your great throne. We humble our hearts that we may reverence you. We pray and ask of you, gracious and loving God, today teach us in all things to seek first your kingdom and all of your righteousness that we may honor and bring you glory. We pray that you would guide us to perceive that which is right

49th Legislative Day

- in your sight, and grant us both the courage to pursue it and the grace to accomplish it. That we will perform that which is the good, that which is the perfect will of God. This we pray in your name, Amen."
- Speaker Manley: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Leader Harris."
- Harris 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."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record show that no Members on the Democratic aisle are excused today."
- Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Leader. Leader Welter is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Welter: "Madam Speaker, there are no excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Manley: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 111 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2643, and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 3714.

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3139. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 731, and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House 2499. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Ethics & Elections reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 2908. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 562."

Speaker Manley: "Members, an announcement. This is the reminder that House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face coverings that cover the nose and mouth, except for when necessary for eating or drinking. But Members may remove their face covering when speaking into the microphone at their desk. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, as pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Thank you. Leader Welter for an announcement."

Welter: "Madam Speaker, the Republicans request an immediate caucus in... listen for it, Room 114."

Speaker Manley: "Leader, how long will you need?"

Welter: "An hour."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "That is great. Thank you. Republicans will caucus in Room 114. Democrats will not. We will... meet each other back here at 2:13. Approximately 2:13 p.m. The House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Under Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of Resolutions, we have House Resolution 391, offered by Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 391 is the Resolution that would allow remote participation in Session of the General Assembly. As you know, for many months we have had remote participation in committee process. And this would extend participation to floor action, under certain circumstances and for a limited period of time. So, let me just briefly explain what the process or the procedure we envision to be for remote participation. And under the new Rule 49.5, the House could adopt a Motion to allow Members of the General Assembly to participate remotely in each day's Session. The rule is limited and only applies until the first day of the fall Veto Session in 2021. It would require that remote participation be conducted through a platform conferencing technology administrated by the Legislative Information System. Currently, as you know, those of you who have participated in the committee process, the Zoom platform is what is currently being used. The procedure for remote participation would be that Members intending to participate remotely should notify their respective Leader as soon as practicable proceeding the Session. You know, prior to the Session. So, Democrats would notify Speaker Welch that they

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

needed to participate remotely. Republicans would notify Leader Durkin. Once Session has commenced and the roll has been taken, there would be a Motion to allow Members to participate remotely, which would be for that Session day. Upon adoption of the Motion, the Members will be asked to verify their presence visually and would be added to the roll call. During a record vote, the Clerk will call the roll of these participating remotely, who must announce themselves orally and they must be visible at the time. And this would be visible on the LIS Information System. It would be visible on the screens that we're seeing here. It would be visible to anyone watching ilga.gov or watching remotely at home. So, any person in the State of Illinois would not only be able to watch us vote, but would watch those individual Members who chose to vote remotely cast their vote. Their remote would be... their vote, I'm sorry, would be entered by the Clerk. And it would also show on the tote board so that people both in the chamber or watching at home could follow along on the tote board. Members participating remotely will be otherwise able to participate in floor Session, as those physically present do. As with Members on the floor, participating remotely would be muted until called upon by the Chair and would apply... would have to abide by all applicable decorum rules and practices of the House. As I said, this Session will be broadcast on the General Assembly Web site at ilga.gov. The Sessions are otherwise recorded and also transcribed. And all of these procedures would apply for any Member who was participating remotely in the same way that they would apply to Members who would be here in person.

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

And as you know, we've adopted rules that allow us to participate legislatively in committees. The Senate has adopted rules that allow them to participate legislative committees and substantially similarly to this on the floor. This is under the broad powers of the House and Senate to establish the rules of its own proceedings under the Constitution. And just want to point out that nothing in the Illinois Constitution or the U.S. Constitution would prohibit remote participation and that all of this participation would be done publicly. It would be broadcast and any person watching a Session of the General Assembly or any member of the press or media would see those public participants in the same way they see and watch and listen to us. This is not unique to Illinois by any means. This year 29 states, plus the District of Columbia, have allowed for temporary or emergency floor votes. The U.S. House of Representatives has chosen to allow proxy voting for Members who are not in Washington. So, that's a summary of how this proposal would work. So, questions have also been raised about how verification would be handled. Verification would be handled as each person who cast their vote, we would know because we saw them do it and it would be recorded, would be known to be physically present and having cast their vote for the purposes of a verification. And then there is a question of how is attendance roll maintained. Should a person have signed in, been recognized by their respective Leader, declared a remote participant for the day and somehow were to lose an electronic connection, or some other technical difficulty, and would be disconnected from the Session, and that would be handled as

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

they were still on the roll. Very much as while we're in our seats here, we get on the roll in the morning but at some point during the day you may go back to your office to meet with a constituent. When you come back to the floor, you are still considered to be on the roll. So, it would be a similar situation. And now I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Members, we will be using Standard Debate. As a reminder, that would be allowed two Members in support of the Resolution, three in opposition. I'll be using a three-minute timer. That being said, the Chair recognizes Leader Butler for three minutes."

Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Manley. I'm glad we got back here by 3:13 p.m. A few questions of the Sponsor, please. And I am in opposition, by the way."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Thank you. Leader Harris, are there any ground rules, extenuating circumstances about how someone could participate in remote legislating?"

Harris: "I'm not sure I understand your..."

Butler: "So, does it have to be medical emergency? Does it have to be persons on FMLA? They have a... some sort of family issue they have to deal with or could they be on the beach somewhere on vacation?"

Harris: "It is our expectation, our hope, that this would be used responsibly by Members for emergency situations or if there were unavoidable conflicts that detained them. Riding helicopters to campaign events, for instance, would not be..."

Butler: "Yeah, I don't think that that should be allowed either.

I think that's a bad use of remote legislating. Believe me.

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

And you kind of touched on it, but will people who are participating remotely be eligible for debate on legislation? Or is it just for voting?"

Harris: "They would be eligible for debate very much in the way you do in committee. You would raise your hand. It would be seen on the screen. You'd be called on by the Speaker as if you were here in person. You would be shown on the screen and your audio would be transmitted to us."

Butler: "So, will we be able to see all the people on the screen all the time?"

Harris: "Only when they're speaking. Just as you and I are now."

Butler: "So, how will we know how they'll be recognized? How will we all... you know, we can walk down there and see whose button is pushed to see who wants to speak. How will we know who wants to... how will we all know? How will our side know if our people are recognized, I guess?"

Harris: "That's a good question. But I'm assuming that there will be a record that whoever's operating the Zoom system up..."

Butler: "Okay."

Harris: "...here from LIS. You could go up there and similarly look at their screen. It would show, as we see now, hands raised when we're chairing a committee and you'd be able to verify it that way."

Butler: "Okay. Just... and I only have a minute, 20 seconds here.

Will someone's vote be recorded on the roll call in any sort

of special way to note that they were voting remotely, as
opposed to voting in person?"

Harris: "I do not believe so."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Butler: "Okay. Thank you. To the Resolution. Look, folks, we had a very robust debate about this last spring, last May. For those of you who weren't here, it did not pass to allow remote legislating. I just tried to work with some folks over the summer on some things, especially one of my friends from Chicago on this, and that didn't seem to go anywhere. I am really concerned that this sets a precedent. We... this isn't a slippery slope. We're sliding down that slope now by allowing remote legislating. I understand, certainly, maybe some extenuating circumstances. But without any quidelines as to why people can participate remotely, I think this is an extraordinarily bad idea. Beyond that, as I said a year ago, we are the General Assembly. We are here to assemble together, face-to-face, so we can do the people's business. And I think, while doing through Zoom committees have made things a bit easier, I would say most of us, in my discussions, have really not liked that. And it has made to a worse product that we do here in the Legislature. So...

Speaker Manley: "Leader."

Butler: "...I urge a 'no' vote on this. And I just worry about the precedent that this sets. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Brady for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, just a quick question and hopefully point of clarification. Who's going to determine what the criteria is for an individual to be able to vote remotely?"

49th Legislative Day

- Harris: "Those requests would go to the respective Leaders of each caucus."
- Brady: "So, they go to the respective Leaders of each caucus.

  Let's say that we have an important vote and that vote is due to come up in a relatively short period of time. And let's say those Leaders on... in a position to where they can respond to give a answer of what their interpretation is, if someone's priority, criteria, purpose of not being able to be here to vote specifically. Then what happens?"
- Harris: "Well, I think it would be very much as it happens today, with the issue of excused absences versus regular absences. You know, each caucus receives requests from its Members to be excused each day. I believe that those happen on pretty short order. So, they'd have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, as they are now. And just one point I also wanted to make then. The other step is that then we would have to vote on the floor on a Motion to allow these Members to participate. So, if somebody had reason to believe or wanted to object to somebody participating remotely, the Body would have a chance to weigh in on that."
- Brady: "So, it's open to interpretation. There's no set criteria, even though we're being asked to vote on a Resolution that does not clarify what that criteria is of a reason to be able to vote remotely?"
- Harris: "Again, we're looking at handling it the same way we use the issue of excused versus regular absences by caucus Leadership now."
- Brady: "And could someone remotely vote on the budget... on a budget Bill?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Harris: "Somebody could remotely vote on any piece of legislation were it to come to the floor that day."
- Brady: "Specifically something as significant as a budget vote?"
- Harris: "I think a lot of votes are significant and people would want to be able to have an opportunity to vote on those and represent their constituents on such important issues."
- Brady: "And I'm sure this could never be used to any disadvantage that would favor one side or the other as far as the importance of a vote?"
- Harris: "Yeah. And I think people's vote on Bills will be the same whether they were in person or remote. But somebody who's dealing with a family tragedy or medical emergency would not have to make the really horrible choice of where they are physically going to be."

Brady: "Thank you. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Brady: "As the Minority Spokesman on the Rules Committee, I don't remember that this Resolution came before the committee for any type of substantive discussion, whatsoever, before it was placed out here. And so, therefore, with many unanswered questions of the significance of this, I'll be voting 'no' and encourage the Body to do the same. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "And the last and final person in opposition, I'm assuming, Leader Demmer."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Leader Harris, you indicated that this rule allows the House to consider a Motion on any specific Legislative Day between today and the first day of Veto Session. But the House

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

would consider a Motion to allow, for that day, certain Members to participate remotely. Is that correct?"

Harris: "That's correct."

- Demmer: "Is that a Motion that would be... apply to all Members who seek remote participation? Or would it be done individually per Member?"
- Harris: "It could be done either way. But we anticipate it to be done as a group, listing out the individuals but as one Motion. Does that answer your question?"
- Demmer: "It is my question. But would it be possible for there to be a vote on an individual Member? Say, these three are permitted to vote remotely and this one is not?"
- Harris: "You could divide the question under current rules."
- Demmer: "Okay. So, we could have a situation in which this Body, having established no criteria for remote participation, is then asked to weigh in on the specific merits of an individual Member's request for remote participation, perhaps granting some, perhaps denying some, even though there is no underlying policy or qualifications for eligibility?"
- Harris: "If somebody went ahead and tried to affirmatively divide the question and put people in that situation, that could transpire. But I think the regular course of business would be a Motion that would list out those persons that the Leaders have put forth for virtual participation."
- Demmer: "Dividing a question, though, it would be possible to say we're going to decide to vote to allow Democratic Members to participate and not to allow Republican Members to participate because each one of these will be individual

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

votes. You have more votes than we do. What's to prevent something like that from selectively applying eligibility?"

Harris: "You mean, you're saying would we try to divide out your Members and..."

Demmer: "What prevents a selective interpretation, based on who the Member is, what political affiliation they are? Perhaps what votes are anticipated for that day. There's really... we have unlimited ability to determine, selectively, which Members are given the ability to remotely participate. That is a power which is... has no equal for in-person participation. This Body cannot choose to not... to disallow someone from entering this chamber. But this remote participation would give the Body an option to vote individually on whether a Member is eligible to participate remotely."

Harris: "And that's the reason that we are proposing to put everyone in one Motion so it would be done on a bipartisan way and that there would be no such division or favoritism that you're implying."

Demmer: "Leader Harris, is this a rules change, a product of the Rules reform working group?"

Harris: "This is something that's been discussed multiple times in General Assemblies and committees dating back from the beginning of the pandemic over at the Bank of Springfield Center. And you know, we changed the position of the House on other rules, like remote participating in committees and those kind of things. And this is an evolution of that."

Demmer: "Is there a House Rules reform working group?"

Speaker Manley: "Leader Demmer, can you wrap it up? Thank you."

Demmer: "Is there such a group?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Harris: "There has been groups that have been meeting to discuss rules. It's not a formal group."

Demmer: "Okay. Madam Speaker, to the Resolution."

Speaker Manley: "Quickly."

Demmer: "This is an Amendment of the House Rules. Now, when we originally adopted these House Rules, we pointed out a number of problems. And, I think, on both sides there were substantive requests for change to the House Rules to improve transparency, to empower individual Members, to truly have a new day in the House of Representatives. We were told, when the House Rules were adopted, that there would be this working group put together and they'd come up with recommendations for improving the House Rules. Here we are, having gone through the entire regular Session this year, with no changes to the House Rules. Only today, when we're in Phase 5 and the end stage of the pandemic, are we making this change to allow remote participation simply because of a significant budget error that has to be corrected today. This is not an appropriate place for the House Rules to be amended."

Speaker Manley: "Leader."

Demmer: "We should instead do the substantive reforms that we both talked about at the beginning of this year. Vote 'no'." Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks to the folks who made comments in opposition to this Motion. Just a couple things I'd like to close with is... the one thing I think I neglected to say that was important to say about the process is that a physical quorum must present to begin Session. So, it is certainly our anticipation that Members come to

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Springfield, that this would be used in exigencies only for remote participation. We would expect our Members on both sides of the aisle to be here doing their duty, as we are today and as we are most days, in person. And then just... there was another comment that was made by a previous speaker that while there was no debate about this in Rules Committee this morning... we held Rules Committee. And I remember asking my colleagues in Rules, 'Do you want to discuss this in committee?' And the answer was, 'No, we want to do this of the floor.' So, there was an opportunity. I just wanted to be clear about that. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of House Resolution 391. 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 66 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Leader Harris is recognized on a Motion."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, I move that the following Members be allowed to participate remotely. Representatives Cassidy, Crespo, Lilly, Tarver, Niemerg, and Sosnowski. Let me remove... I see Representative Tarver has arrived. So, let me... leave him on. Leave him on."
- Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Davidsmeyer: "I'm sorry. I was trying to rise on the previous Resolution. I understand that we are on severely limited debate."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris has moved to allow the identified Members to participate remotely. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk... 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 67 voting in 'favor', 43 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And the Motion prevails. Mr. Clerk, please identify the Members voting remotely and confirm their attendance for purposes of the quorum."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy. Representative Crespo.

Representative Crespo. Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly, present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "I am present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representatives Crespo, Harper, Lilly, Niemerg, and Sosnowski have answered the roll."

49th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "Proceeding to Concurrences on page 2. House Bill 25, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Out of the record. House Bill 25, Representative Gong-Gershowitz."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move not to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 25."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Butler: "An inquiry of the Chair. Can you please tell us the roll on which peoples checked in remotely? I... that took a while and I'm not sure... I mean, I don't know which Members checked in or not. There was no affirmation that they were checked in remotely. So, could you give us the roll of which Members checked in remotely?"
- Speaker Manley: "Do you want a list of all Members that are here..."
- Butler: "No, just the ones that checked in remotely."
- Speaker Manley: "...or just the ones remotely? The ones we all heard on the screen that said 'present'?"
- Butler: "I thought there was one that asked... that did not respond.

  Is that correct?"
- Speaker Manley: "Which one was that? Leader, which one was that?"
- Butler: "The first one that was called, I believe."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, can you read the roll call for those participating remotely for Leader Butler?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Participating remotely at this point is Representative Crespo, Representative Harper, Representative Lilly, Representative Niemerg, and Representative Sosnowski."
- Butler: "Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

49th Legislative Day

- Davidsmeyer: "Actually not related to this Bill. I had pushed my button prior to this for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Manley: "We'll come back to you later. Leader Batinick, do you rise regarding this Motion?"
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I absolutely rise to talk about House Bill 25 and was wondering if the Sponsor would concur... if the Sponsor would yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
- Batinick: "Representative, it's very rare that we have a nonconcurrence. So, could you explain what the path of this Bill is? My understanding of the nonconcurrence is we're basically voting on the exact same Bill that passed the House previously, correct?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah, Leader. So, this is the Bill that we talked a lot about in committee, as you remember. It's to establish a task force to study how we might implement a universal right to counsel for immigrants in removal proceedings in Illinois. Passed out of the House, went over to the Senate. And they included Amendment that had advice to consent... advice and consent of the Senate, with the Governor appointing the members of the task force. In my judgement, the House Bill is a better approach where each of our caucuses and the Governor appoint our Members to the task force. And so, I'm asking the Body not to concur with particular Amendment."
- Batinick: "So, when we don't concur with this Amendment, what happens to the Bill next?"

49th Legislative Day

- Gong-Gershowitz: "So, I'm going to ask that the Senate Sponsor rescind the Amendment. And then the Bill would stand as it passed through the House."
- Batinick: "Okay. So, it'll get two bites at the apple in the Senate. So, essentially we're taking the exact same vote we took on... looks like April 16 on my..."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah. It was a.m. it was back in April."
- Batinick: "Okay. All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "You've heard the Motion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion... and the Motion carries. The House not... you have heard the Motion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Motion carries. The House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 25. Continuing on to Concurrences, House Bill 132, Representative Delgado."
- Delgado: "I move to concur on Senate Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 132."
- Speaker Manley: "Can you explain a little bit?"
- Delgado: "Absolutely. This Amendment provides that the Business Enterprise Program, rather than state agencies, shall recognize and accept the certifications of businesses that have been certified as minority-owned businesses or womenowned businesses by the City of Chicago, Cook County, or other entities approved by the Business Enterprise Council for purposes of participating in the Business Enterprise Program. This Amendment addresses a concern that was raised by CMS. So, in summary, starting on January 1, there will be no need for a vendor that is certified by Chicago or Cook County as an MBE or WBE to get certified, again, by the state. That

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

means no additional paperwork. We're cutting some red tape here. This is an improvement on the fast-track program that CMS currently administers, and it goes beyond simply codifying that process. There are no opponents. 132 passed out of this chamber unanimously, passed out of the Senate chamber unanimously. And I ask for your support again."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "I think that you touched upon it at the end there, Representative, that it was unanimous in the House, wasn't substantively changed in the Senate. Even Senator Bailey voted for it in the Senate. It came back unanimously here. Is that correct?"

Delgado: "That is correct. This has bipartisan support."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Delgado to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 132?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct the roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Rep Harper votes 'yes'."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'.

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "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'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 132. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to House Bill 165, on Concurrence, Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do concur with this change that came over from the Senate. This is a study by the Prairie Research Institute on carbon capture. Again, I do concur. The House Bill passed unanimously. The Senate Bill passed also unanimously. It did come back with a clarification of wording on the study, which is as said, 'description of existing and selected subsurface storages projects, and best practices for carbon storage.' That was a part that was in there to help clarify. So, with that, I do move for a concurrence and 'aye'. Thank you."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 165?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call with those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes. Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'.

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "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', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 165. Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to House Bill 275, Representative Guzzardi. Please proceed."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 275 contains three separate provisions. One of which was passed by this Body as House Bill 1744. That was a rebuttable presumption for employees... the spouses of employees of the City of Chicago, municipal employees, who passed away during the COVID-19 pandemic, a rebuttable presumption that their illness was caused at work and that they were, therefore... the spouses were therefore eligible for a death benefit. That measure passed this chamber with, I believe, 95 votes earlier in the year. There are two other additional provisions that come to us in the Senate Amendment on House Bill 275. The first is... pertains to return-to-work for municipal employees in the City of Chicago. The same provision currently applies to Chicago teachers and downstate teachers. This would also allow it to apply to special education classroom assistance. So, these folks could return to work after they had retired for less than 128 days a year... excuse me, 120 days a year, provided that they make less than \$30 thousand a year. Their new work would be nonpensionable. So, it would be no impact on the pension funds. Finally, there's a provision inserted pertaining to transfer of service time from the Chicago Police Department to downstate police departments. There's a small window that's been opened that would allow a member of a downstate police pension fund to buy up to five years of their service time from the Chicago pension fund. They would have to pay the employer contribution, the employee contribution, and any interest accrued. So, therefore, it's cost neutral to the fund. With that said, I appreciate the

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

consideration of this measure. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I just wanted to clarify. This is completely... this had... I think it only got 62 votes the first time. But this is a completely different Bill, right?"

Guzzardi: "Yes. The provisions in House Bill 275 are no longer here."

Batinick: "Right. They're no longer there 'cause it seems like most of the other provisions... I'll use the word... are going to be palatable to most of the Members on my side. Just wanted to confirm that. So, thank you."

Guzzardi: "That's right. Yeah. The bulk of this Bill passed with almost 100 votes in this Body earlier this year."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. No more questions."

Guzzardi: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "I appreciate your time, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 275?' This is final action. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct the roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Harper: "Rep Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'.

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting opposed, and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 275. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 4 of the Calendar, under Amendatory Veto Motions, appears Senate Bill 2800. Amendatory Veto Motion #1. Leader Harris is recognized."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As folks know, there was a drafting error in portions of the effective date Section of SB2800, which we passed, which was the state budget. The Governor's Amendatory Veto makes technical changes to correct that error. And I move that we accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I'd like to move for Unlimited Debate on this Motion."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "Leader Demmer, you're the only one with a light on. Oh, now. It's like Christmas."

Demmer: "I had that inkling."

Speaker Manley: "We'll go to Standard Debate. I'm going to keep a three-minute timer. We'll see how it goes."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Demmer: "Leader Harris, we had a very abbreviated debate on this important budget Bill when it came before us on the House Floor. We all recall how this 3 thousand page Amendment was filed mere minutes before midnight on May 31. Voted on very, very quickly thereafter, having allowed only a single person to debate the Bill on the House Floor. Do you think that we may have avoided some of these problems if more time had been given to Members of this chamber, to our staffs, and to the public to review this budget Bill?"

Harris: "Would you repeat your question?"

Demmer: "Do you think we may have caught these errors had we had more than 10 minutes to look at the budget?"

Harris: "It's possible. It's possible that they could have still gone by also."

Demmer: "It's possible, and I'd say it's pretty likely, in fact.

Does this Amendatory Veto make any changes other than changing the effective dates of certain sections?"

Harris: "It does not, as I read it."

Demmer: "So, this budget still includes legislative pay increases?"

Harris: "It includes funding for the COLAs, which are recently decided in a court case. Yes."

49th Legislative Day

- Demmer: "Does it still include a billion dollars in capital projects for Democrat only districts, funded by the Federal Government's ARPA?"
- Harris: "That federal money would go into water, waste water, and broadband."
- Demmer: "And you testified in our very limited debate that there were Member requests from... only from Democrats for capital projects that were funded in this budget. Does this budget still include those?"
- Harris: "I believe the reappropriation includes requests from Democrats, from Republicans, from both the House and the Senate, and projects of regional significance and others."
- Demmer: "And new projects."
- Harris: "And there are some of them that are new. There are some that are reappropriated."
- Demmer: "Does it still include 46 new programs in the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity and 76 new grant programs in DHS funded, supposedly, at request of Members?"
- Harris: "It certainly includes funding in DCEO to help small businesses recover from ARPA. It has funding in DCEO to help kick-start our tourism and convention industry. It has money in DCEO to provide funds for affordable housing and homeless youth."
- Demmer: "I know DCEO has many functions. But what I was focusing..."
- Harris: "It does. So, I'm just trying to… you said there was a large number of ones. I'm just trying to remember what some of them were."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Demmer: "Yeah, there... 46 new items there. Over 70 in another area.

  Does this budget still pay 0 dollars toward the \$5 billion debt we have in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund?"
- Harris: "This budget does not address the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. That's a different set of issues."
- Demmer: "And does this budget still include revenue of over \$650 million from tax increases on businesses across Illinois?"
- Harris: "It certainly includes money from cutting loopholes that the very wealthiest corporations in our state have used to avoid taxes for many years. It pays down \$3 billion of our debt. And it brings us to the lowest backlog of unpaid bills in over a decade."

Demmer: "Madam Speaker, to the... to the Motion. Look, this is a..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Motion."

Demmer: "...this is a state budget Bill that we debated here on the House Floor very, very briefly. You all remember. Not a single one of us had the opportunity to look at this Bill before it was voted on. Now, since we've passed the Bill, we can figure out what's in it. And what's in it are errors and omissions. What's in it are all these kind of programs that each of us, probably as a standalone, wouldn't vote for. But they were all rolled into a 3 thousand page budget that was dropped at the last minute and voted on with only one speaker on this House Floor. This is the opposite of transparency. And what happens? We make mistakes. What happens? We fund programs that shouldn't be funded. What happens? We have political games being played with Member requests for this or that, or you get funding and this person doesn't get funding. This is ridiculous. We hold units of local government in Illinois to

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

a statutory requirement that their budgets are posted and available online for public inspection and for public input for, in some cases, 30 days. We didn't even have 30 minutes with this budget. How can we ask those units to adhere to a standard of transparency that we come so far away from meeting. Transparency doesn't just matter for the people in this room. It doesn't just matter for the constituents who are asking us questions about the budget. It matters to every person in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Manley: "Leader."

Demmer: "Bringing my remarks to a close..."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you."

Demmer: "...Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you."

Demmer: "This is what happens when we ignore common sense principles. This is what happens. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi. Three minutes."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This current Bill that we're now being asked to vote on, once again, revoting on some portions of the budget because the budget got wrong, there's so much that the budget got wrong. Precisely because the budget... when I tell people back in my district that the way in which budgets are done in Springfield is we have a whole bunch of budget appropriation meetings that don't really mean anything. Because when the actual numbers get put into a Bill, nobody knows where they came from, nobody knows exactly where they're from. They're all being written behind closed doors by staff, by lobbyists, by others. We don't have transparency

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

into that. The only way you can make sure that the public is going to be protected by bad things in public entities! budgets is to post it, publish it, and be honest about the amount of time and effort it's going to take to review it and read it. This is a budget... the only reason why we're here today to have to revote on it is because somebody decided at the last minute, let's throw in an \$1100 pay raise for Legislators. And that screwed up a whole bunch of other line items in the budget leading to other programs, critical things, not... line items not getting funded. So, think about what that means for the State of Illinois. This is what happens when you have unaccountable Majority power who doesn't really care about the public. They just care about checking off the boxes. We have a situation where we've got tax increases. The Bill Sponsor says, 'Oh, these are going to fix corporate loopholes.' No. What you're doing is you're raising taxes on small businesses that had to incur a whole host of capital costs because of COVID and they need to carry those losses forward from 2021 to 2022. You're saying, 'Nope, sorry. You're going to have to pay taxes on more of your money.' That's insane. This is a budget that was passed after midnight because the Majority Party hoped the world wasn't watching. You rammed through a \$42 billion budget to give pay raises to Legislators, new spending, hundreds of millions in new taxes on Illinois businesses. And the public doesn't even get a chance to give real world, meaningful feedback before you push that 'yes' button. You screwed it up. You shouldn't be doing it this way. You shouldn't be cutting people out of the process. I urge a 'no' vote."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Marron."

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

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

"Every day I talk to a lot of people. I talk to my Marron: constituents. I talk to people who visit me in the office. I talk to people at public events, people who call me on the phone. I have e-mail exchanges. I talk to people on Facebook Messenger. And an overwhelmingly large portion of the people I talk to are mad as hell. They have lost faith. They've lost faith in this Body. They've lost faith in you. They've lost faith in me. They don't believe in the system anymore. And I think, when we evaluate where we're at in June of 2021 and the crises that we face in confidence in government, we need to take a long look in the mirror on how we conduct business. This budget process is ridiculous. I was a county board chairman for four years. There is no government entity in this nation that conducts business like this. This is absurd. We had to put our budget on display for 30 days. If you're on a city council, you have to put your budget on display for two weeks so that the public, the media, the other party can vet it. And you know what, it's a pretty good process. You come to a consensus. You meet the adequate needs of your constituents by doing it that way. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need to take a hard look at how we do business. And this stuff of cramming things in at the last minute, dropping 3 thousand page budgets with hours left to go in the Legislative Session, amending it at the last minute to provide for legislative pay increases. You know, people... it's no wonder people have lost faith in us when we do stuff like that. When we drop life-

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

altering legislation in the middle of the night at the end of a lame duck Session. When we do things like change the rules to allow for remote voting at the end of a pandemic because we can't get Members here. We face a crisis of confidence that's tearing at fabric of our democracy. And we need to ask ourselves what role we've played in this. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Brady for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Leader Harris, I just want to be clear. This is a budget
Bill fix, a cleanup, because of mistakes that were made in
the budget. Is that correct?"

Harris: "It's a cleanup of Section 999 where there was a drafting error."

Brady: "Okay. That's a different way of saying a mistake made in the budget. But that's a drafting error, so a mistake made."

Harris: "So, Leader, we vote on corrections in trailer Bills all the time. You vote on them. I vote on them. Sometimes staff makes mistakes. Sometimes people are human."

Brady: "But, Leader..."

Harris: "And after working late hours... so, I... I just... I trying to make this like, oh, they made this big mistake..."

Brady: "...if you don't mind, this is my time. This is my time.

This in my time. This is my time to speak right now, I believe."

Speaker Manley: "Leader, I'll give a few extra... I'll give you a little bit more time."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Brady: "Thank you, very much. And, Leader Harris, just back to your our discussion there. A mistake's a mistake. Okay? Call it what you want. Call it what I want. But I think we're probably... most people in this chamber would agree we're here 'cause there was a mistake made in the budget. There was a mistake made in the budget, and that's why the Governor did what he did. And that's why we are here voting on it."

Harris: "I think that was my opening remark."

Brady: "Then I don't know... I don't know why you didn't agree that a mistake was made. In any event, I believe I understood you correctly. And help me understand. If this is a budget cleanup due to mistake that was made, this does not address the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund that of 5 billion and some dollars. Is that correct?"

Harris: "That's correct."

Brady: "And I think you said that's a different issue. I think those were very, very close to your words when the previous Speaker was asking you about that, 'Does this address it?' And you've indicated this does not address it. This budget does not address that debt. Is that correct?"

Harris: "And there is a working group around that that is a bipartisan working group, including both sides of the aisle, both chambers, business and labor, that works on those issues. So, yes, that's correct. It's an issue being addressed in that group."

Brady: "So, it's a different issue. So, the Unemployment Trust Fund, which was a lifeline to many Illinoisans during this pandemic, that's in jeopardy in the future, is a different

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

issue. Can you explain to myself and the people of Illinois how that is a different issue when this is a budget Bill fix?"

Harris: "The issue that I talked about is done through an agreed Bill process. This is the unemployment and similar items that involves business, labor, the Governor's Office, and four caucuses. It, like many others, follows a separate track, usually, from the budget process. Sometimes there may be some overlap between them. And you talk about the fact that there needs to be some adjustments made in the future, and I think that labor, both of our caucuses, both chambers, Governor's Office, and business are looking at how to work with those issues in the state. And also hoping that the Federal Government takes it responsibility for Illinois and other states to help address those shortfalls."

Brady: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Brady: "I hope the people of Illinois are listening. I hope the people of Illinois are listening, especially those who benefitted and survived because of the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund, which now sits over \$5 billion in the hole. And this budget Bill fix does absolutely nothing to ensure its future. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Leader Harris, you're going to be surprised by my line of questioning here, but I was going to ask you, since we didn't get a chance to debate this the night that the budget

49th Legislative Day

- was passed originally, but can you point me to any language in Senate Bill 2800 that refers to a revenue estimate that was adopted by the House in the Senate?"
- Harris: "I don't believe that we adopted a formal revenue estimate."
- Wheeler: "All right. Well then, I assume you had some kind of informal estimate, which doesn't serve the same purpose. But for the sake of that discussion, can you tell me what numbers were being used in the working groups?"
- Harris: "The working groups use numbers drawn from the latest estimates from COGFA, from GOMB, and DOR that were updated on a regular basis to be sure we had the most up to date and complete information."
- Wheeler: "I was under the impression that... pretty much following GOMB's numbers through the process. But at the actual final product, it was a kind of hand-selected, cherry-picked version of what would make the most revenue work out for the budget."
- Harris: "Like I said, there were inputs from a variety of sources that were monitored, very up until the last minute to make sure we had the most accurate and complete information."
- Wheeler: "Can you give me just a very quick insight into how that decision of which numbers were selected was made? Just..."
- Harris: "They were recommended by the Governor's Office of Management and Budget and DOR."
- Wheeler: "Okay. So, not as much from COGFA as we would've maybe hoped then. I'll go to the... to the Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Wheeler: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I know I've done this for the... this is my seventh year now asking why we don't adopt a revenue estimate on behalf of the taxpayers of Illinois. For those of you who aren't familiar, the revenue estimate is actually a constitutional requirement. And if you want to look it up, it's in Article 8, Section 2, paragraph (b) of our State Constitution. There's also a statutory requirement in the COGFA Act. This is meant to serve as a taxpayer protection, which we don't have this year because we didn't follow the process that was outlined for us by the framers of the Constitution. Nothing prevents us, after this Bill goes through and gets... the veto gets amended to and we actually accomplish that for the first time... but nothing prevents us, as a General Assembly, from appropriating more money next week, next month, later this year that would put us past what the unofficial revenue estimate was. So, we, the Members of this Body, the taxpayers of this state, for many reasons, but for me this one in particular, we deserve a more transparent process. We deserve to follow a process that actually protects all of us and our system and our State Government. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The last speaker would be Representative Davidsmeyer for three minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I look forward to my point of personal privilege sometime soon. Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Manley: "He will answer your questions. Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. And you're doing a wonderful job with

the new system. Not being facetious. Thank you. So... so, how

many votes does this Bill require?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Harris: "Seventy-one."

Davidsmeyer: "Seventy-one. Can you tell me how many Democrat Members are currently voting remotely?"

Harris: "I think the Clerk could."

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Clerk, could you please tell me how many Members..."

Speaker Manley: "I can ask him that question if you'd like me to."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell Representative Davidsmeyer how many Democrats are voting remotely?"

Clerk Hollman: "At this time, there is three."

Davidsmeyer: "Three Members voting remotely. So, you have 71 here in person then? I'd like to request a verification while I'm here. But my point is, we came here, we passed legislation after the pandemic to allow voting virtually, correct?"

Harris: "Yeah. And I think that seems to have worked out well 'cause you have two Members on your side who have already taken advantage of that, who are voting virtually. So, apparently..."

Davidsmeyer: "And they will be voting..."

Harris: "...Republicans and Democrats are already taken advantage of this."

Davidsmeyer: "And they will be voting 'no' on this, which means that..."

Harris: "So, does that mean that somehow they're being deprived of their right to speak because they're voting 'no' virtually, that..."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Davidsmeyer: "That has... that has nothing to do with this. I'm saying you changed the rules because you screwed up the budget and you didn't... and you couldn't even get your people to show up to vote for the budget that they already voted for. So, you changed the rules to get your people to come and do it."

Harris: "So, if you're asking... if you're asking that somebody who is dealing with a dying parent and somebody who has a family member who is grievously ill should be forced into making this decision, you can go ahead and say that. And I'll have a conversation with you..."

Davidsmeyer: "And you can try to put words in my mouth, but this is specifically the reason why you need to file the Bill further in advance, not drop it on us in 10 minutes and say, here, we swear it's good. And then come back a few weeks later and say, oh yeah, we screwed up. If we have more eyes on the budget, it's better off. I think that if the budget was filed earlier, I think some of your Members may have looked at it and said, oh, you know, maybe we shouldn't be doing this. Maybe we shouldn't be spending an extra billion dollars on Democrat pork projects. And maybe we shouldn't be giving... maybe we... and by we, I mean you guys. Maybe you guys shouldn't be voting to give yourself raises when we've shut down businesses for a year. This is absolutely insane. There's a lot..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Demmer, you're out of time."

Davidsmeyer: "Davidsmeyer. Thank you. I will close."

Speaker Manley: "Sorry about that. Sorry about that."

Davidsmeyer: "I will close. Let me just say that this has been a completely broken process. This past year has been a hurry up

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

and wait. And we've screwed up a lot of things in this State of Illinois that are going to take a lot of fixing. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "I apologize for mistaking you for your colleague.

Leader Harris to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, as we do this cleanup, I think it just bears repeating, especially in the light of some of the comments we heard before, what this budget does. And people who have spoken in debate are right. There are a lot of folks in this state who have suffered because of COVID. But if you want to help those folks, you should vote 'yes' for this budget. This budget is putting hundreds of millions of dollars into our small businesses. It's putting hundreds of millions of dollars into tourism, conventions, hospitality, hotels. It's putting money into our colleges and universities. It's putting money into our hospitals and health care systems. It's putting money into our FQHCs. It's investing in health care equity. It is reducing the effects of the social determents of health. It is providing money for child care. It is keeping our elementary and secondary schools open. So, every single thing that is in this budget is helping people in every single community across the state. And I'll tell you what's going to happen. People over there are going to make their speeches, they're going to vote 'no' on the budget, they're going to go home. Their colleges and universities in their towns will be thriving. Their professors will be paid. Their schools will open on time because of what we did. Their hospitals will open. Their health care centers will open. Their seniors will

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

get services. Their child care will get services. And they will cash their checks. So, yes, please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Davidsmeyer has requested a verification. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 2800?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open.

Mr. Clerk, please conduct the roll call of those Members voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes. Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

"A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Clerk Hollman: Andrade; Representative Representative Representative Buckner; Representative Burke; Representative Representative Collins; Representative Carroll; Representative Costa Howard; Representative Crespo; Representative Croke; Representative D'Amico; Representative Representative Delgado; Representative DeLuca; Representative Didech; Representative Evans; Representative Representative Ford; Representative Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Representative Gonzalez; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guerrero-Cuellar; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Representative Barbara Hernandez; Representative Lisa Hernandez; Representative Hirschauer; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Representative Representative Kifowit; LaPointe; Representative Lilly; Representative Mah; Representative Representative Mason; Representative Manley; Mayfield; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Ness; Representative Nichols; Representative Ortiz; Representative Ramirez; Representative Rita; Representative Robinson; Representative Scherer; Slaughter; Representative Representative Smith; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Stoneback: Representative Stuart; Representative Tarver; Representative Representative Walker; Representative Representative West; Representative Ann Williams;

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Representative Jawaharial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yang Rohr; Representative Yednock; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative Crespo?"

Speaker Manley: "I saw him on the screen myself and heard him say 'ves'."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Representative Harper?"

Speaker Manley: "Saw her on the screen and heard her say 'yes'."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. How about Representative Lilly?"

Speaker Manley: "Oddly enough, I saw her on the screen and heard her say 'yes'."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker Manley: "Can you be more specific? There's two."

Davidsmeyer: "J."

Speaker Manley: 'Could you stand up, Sir? Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "I got you. I withdraw my Motion."

Speaker Manley: "With 71 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present', this Motion, having received a required Constitutional Majority, the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 2800. And the Bill is passed. Moving to page 3, under Concurrences, House Bill 292, Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 292."

Speaker Manley: "Could you explain a little bit about the Amendment?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

LaPointe: "The underlying Bill allows adults who have developmental disabilities, who live in CILAs, to keep their earned income if they have a job where they earn income. And the Amendment simply moves up the effective date from October 1, 2021 to July 1, 2021 at the request of the Department of Human Services."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick.

Representative LaPointe moves... the question is, 'Shall the

House concur with Amendment 1 to House Bill 292?' This is

final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote

'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll

call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly... Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'.

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 292. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to House Bill 562, Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 562, I move that we concur in House Amendments #1 and 2... or Senate Amendments #1 and 2. What this would do would be to modernize the FOID Bill. Currently, the FOID... the number of FOID applications has continued to grow by 277 percent from 2017 to 2020. In 2020 alone, there were 461 thousand new applications for the FOID card here in Illinois, compared to 166 thousand in 2017. The number of FOID cards have grown in Illinois from 1.2 million to 2.2 million in the last decade. This has created an extreme hardship on the Illinois Department of State Police, in that there is a huge backlog in fulfilling renewals and new FOID cards. This would modernize the FOID system. What it would do is it would, for the first time, provide background checks on all gun sales in Illinois. Will provide \$9 million of funding for community-based mental health programs. Would remove guns from people with revoked FOID cards that have not surrendered them. Would provide for voluntary fingerprinting as part of the FOID application. Would provide for a stolen gun database that will be run by the Illinois State Police. It would require the Illinois State Police to monitor state and federal databases for prohibited gun buyers and update the FOID records. And it would improve processing to secure more national instant criminal background checks in the system's

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

funding. This Bill is supported by not only most of the major, if not all, the major gun violence prevention advocates in the nation. It is supported by G-PAC Illinois. It is supported by the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, GPECICHV, The Gifford Foundation, the Brady Foundation, Every Town for Gun Safety, Mom's Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, Ann & Robert Lurie Children's Hospital in Chicago, Strengthening Chicago Youth, LIVE FREE Illinois. And the list goes on and on. In addition, this Bill is... the Illinois State Rifle Association is neutral on this Bill, as is the National Shooting Sports Federation that represents not only manufacturers but also dealers of firearms. I believe this will save lives in Illinois. I believe it'll ensure the constitutionality of our FOID system, and it will move us forward in making sure that universal background checks take place on all gun sales in Illinois. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "Members, this is on Standard Debate. There will be three in opposition, two in favor, and a three-minute timer. Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. I would request Unlimited Debate, please."

Speaker Manley: "Let's see how this goes."

McCombie: "All right. I'm asking for a wish. I think you grant them to Batinick all the time. Would the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

McCombie: "Leader, why do you think there's an increase of FOID applications in Illinois?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Hoffman: "I would say that individuals have begun to not only increase their request for FOIDs, but also the Firearm Transfer Inquiry Program has seen a great increase as well. I can't... I can't totally put my finger on it. I think a lot has to do with some of the... some fear and civil unrest and crime."

McCombie: "Okay. Do you think it's possibly because... that could be part of it. But also because we passed policy that makes people feel their Second Amendment rights are threatened?"

Hoffman: "I don't believe that's... that's the case."

McCombie: "Okay. Unfortunately, I disagree with you on that. There's a lot of things in this Bill that the Illinois State Police are... administrative changes as you had mentioned. Some of those thing are actually... the electronic FOID is actually a Bill that I filed as well. There's things in here that are certainly necessary that are going to, hopefully, I'm cautiously optimistic, streamline processes for ISP that's going to help actually meet the requirements that they set forth for folks to get the FOID card. One of the questions that I do have is with the automatic FOID renewal. That comes with a volunteer of the fingerprinting, correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

McCombie: "Okay. So, I volunteered to get my fingers... to get fingerprinted, and in 10 years is my renewal. What happens if I have not transferred or purchased a gun in that period of time? Will my FOID automatically renew?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

McCombie: "No."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Hoffman: "Well, it's my understanding they'll have your fingerprints, and they'll be able to run your background check. You'll have to pay a \$10 fee."

McCombie: "But it's not automatic, just so we're clear. That is not an automatic renew. I would have to request a renew?"

Hoffman: "Well, an automatic... I guess... yeah. It's not automatic if you didn't buy a gun. However, the process will be severely streamlined because of the fingerprints being available."

McCombie: "But I'm still going to have to apply for a renewal and pay the \$10. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

McCombie: "Okay. Thank you. Obviously, the private transfers are an issue. And from my understanding, an advocacy group wrote the language for this piece. Why maintain records for 20 years compared to 10 years?"

Hoffman: "I apologize. I was asking staff a question."

McCombie: "Okay."

Hoffman: "I apologize."

McCombie: "On the transfer piece, why extend the keeping of records from 10 years to 20 years?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding, if you go, currently, to a Federal Firearms Licensed dealer, that if you purchase... if you purchase a firearm from them, that they are required to hold the... keep the record for 20 years. This would be consistent with that."

McCombie: "Okay."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi, I'm going to give you extra time. Meeting you halfway on your request for unlimited, I'm going to give you extra time. Twice... three more minutes."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

McCombie: "Who are you giving extra time to?"

Speaker Manley: "Am I calling you something else now, too?"

McCombie: "You sure are."

Speaker Manley: "I am very sorry. There's something happening up here. Did I call you Mazzochi?"

McCombie: "You sure did."

Speaker Manley: "You blonde Ladies all look alike. Sorry. My apologies."

McCombie: "That's okay. No problem."

Speaker Manley: "I'm going to give you extra time, but we're keeping it to three speakers in opposition."

McCombie: "Okay. Is there any penalty for... let's say you and I, buyer-seller. Okay? I'm the seller. You're the buyer. You as the buyer have 10 days to report that to an FFL dealer. Is that correct? Yes, it is."

Hoffman: "That is correct."

McCombie: "So, what happens if I don't... you as the buyer, what happens if you do not take that to an FFL dealer? Is there a penalty?"

Hoffman: "So, can I just... and I'm not trying to take up your time.

I just want to kind of go... I think it would be easier if maybe..."

McCombie: "It wouldn't actually. Sorry, Sir. It..."

Hoffman: "Well, I'll take you through the process and maybe it answers your question. If that... so, we can understand what the process is."

McCombie: "Well, just because of time, let me just clarify it.

So, you're the buyer. I'm the seller. You, as the buyer, have

10 days to report that to an FFL dealer. If you do not do so,

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

there is no penalty for you not doing that. Okay. That being said, there's no record then at that FFL dealer of that transfer. Now, if a cop comes to the door and asks where your gun is... I hope everybody is listening to this part. And asks you where your gun is and you say, 'Well, I reported it to Hammond FFL.' Hammond FFL is no longer in business. There's no record of where that gun is. Sir, can you tell me how that promotes safety in Illinois?"

Hoffman: "I'm not quite understanding your question."

McCombie: "It doesn't promote safety."

Hoffman: "Well, you..."

McCombie: "It doesn't."

Hoffman: "...you're not going to listen to what I say. So, why am I answering?"

McCombie: "No. I'm just trying to... I'm just trying to help you understand that it's certainly not going to. At 12:30 a.m., the last day of Session, prior to that, several hours, I had gone over to the Senate and asked them to talk about this transfer piece. And it was stated in a text by the Senate Sponsor that if we could get HB452 passed that they'll address the issues of private transfers, as we have over two years to do that. Can you tell me what the issues are with the private transfers that we're going to address?"

Hoffman: "First of all, let me... let me say that it isn't... you keep saying the buyer does the reporting to the FFL."

McCombie: "Correct."

Hoffman: "It is actually the seller who does that. Okay?"

McCombie: "I don't think so. No, it is the buyer."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Hoffman: "You're never going to... you're never going agree with it no matter what I say, regardless of what the facts are."
- McCombie: "Well, it doesn't matter. Six one way, half a dozen another, whether it's the buyer or the seller. If they report it, there's no penalty. Let's say for your sake that you are correct."
- Hoffman: "And I think you had asked the question, if a business goes out of business, they can turn the records over to the state to hold."
- McCombie: "But they don't have to, correct? They don't. Okay. All right. DNR is going to be losing their original six dollars for the card."

Speaker Manley: "Last question, okay?"

McCombie: "Oh, shoot. Hang on then. Can I pick a different one?"

Speaker Manley: "Pick a different one."

McCombie: "All right. All right. This is a pretty important question, Leader."

Hoffman: "I'm listening."

- McCombie: "All right. Thank you. Is there anything in this legislation, that we're about to possibly pass here, that addresses crimes committed by non-FOID carriers?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. This would provide for a task force that would, number one, be able to stop crime because it would be in place... of the \$10 that is paid for the FOID, 5 will go to a revocation task force that will then go out and will go to... go and collect guns from individuals who have a revoked FOID."
- McCombie: "Well, that is great. I don't know about everybody in this Body, but I feel so safe that we're going to have a task force challenge this issue. Vote 'no'."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "Representative Frese, do you rise in opposition or support?"

Frese: "Opposition."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Frese: "I think I'll take up where the previous speaker was going to ask, but ran out of time, about the aspect of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. They used to be a recipient of some of the funds paid for these FOID cards. But I understand... and I don't know what happened in the Senate with that Amendment. Did they... was the Department of Natural Resources able to reclaim some of that money, Representative?"

Hoffman: "They were able to make it up through general funds."

Frese: "Through general funds?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Frese: "But the fees are no longer... no amount of the fees are going to go to the Illinois Department of Natural Resources?"

Hoffman: "That is correct."

Frese: "Are they going to be... what's the position of the Illinois

Department of Natural Resources on this particular Bill? Did
they take a position? Did they take a stance?"

Hoffman: "I don't know if they took a specific position. But I don't believe that the Governor's Office nor the Department is opposed."

Frese: "I see. How about the... somewhere in here there is an electronic fee charge. Is that true? Was that... did you answer that question earlier? Is there... what is that charge?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Hoffman: "There's a \$25 charge. So, if you have a private transfer of a firearm, an individual to an individual, when you then send that record to the Federal Firearm Licensed dealer, there is a \$25 filing charge."

Frese: "Okay. Well, thank you for that. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Frese: "I think some people would say maybe there's some good aspects of this. But I see a whole lot of bad aspects to this Bill, and I cannot be supporting it. And should it receive the adequate number of votes to pass here today in this Assembly, I would request a verification of the vote. Please. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative... Leader Wheeler, do you rise in opposition or support?"

Wheeler: "Possibly in support."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Leader Hoffman, does this Bill have a provision to create a prohibited persons portal regarding people who have lost or had their FOID card suspended or revoked?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler: "And is it the intention of this portal would be accessible only by law enforcement personnel? Not to the general public? Not on the open Internet?"

Hoffman: "The public will be able to access that, Representative."

Wheeler: "So, that would be a tool then for law enforcement to be able to use when they pull someone over or they are some way

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

intertwined with the public and they have a concern about, potentially, a weapon?"

Hoffman: "Well, yes. As well as... I think the general public would also have access. But let me... I'd like to address something real quick about..."

Wheeler: "Sure."

Hoffman: "...this task force. It's not just a task force that meets."

Wheeler: "Yeah. I'm going to get to that in just a second with you."

Hoffman: "Okay."

Wheeler: "Okay. But I want to go back to your answer. I don't believe that this portal is... no one from the public can see this portal. I think it's like the (unintelligible) database."

Hoffman: "I apologize. It is not open to the public."

Wheeler: "So, it be like if a squad car... a law enforcement officer would be able to use this database to see if a person has had their FOID card revoked or suspended. Is that accurate?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Okay. So, I want to talk about this task force here.

The Bill does contain language, coming from the Senate, to create a Violent Crime Intelligence Task Force, right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Wheeler: "And I think we've got some confusion about... the task force that we talk about in the General Assembly all the time are usually studies of something that we wanted to learn more about as a Body in order to be able to maybe enact legislation. This is a different kind of task force, is it

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

not? This is one that actually does something on the ground with real people. Can you give me some background on what you expect that to be?"

- Hoffman: "Yes. Actually, this task force will be made up of individuals who will be... put together in an entire system throughout the entire state. So, if you have a revoked FOID card, they will be able to get special agents, whether they're local police departments, and they will make them special state police agents who can go and, on their behalf, will able to go and collect firearms from individuals who have revoked FOID cards."
- Wheeler: "Thank you. So, you'll a series of potentially intergovernmental agreements that would allow those things to occur. Is that right, Leader Hoffman?"
- Hoffman: "That's my understanding. And there will be administrative rules that will be put in place to carry this all out."
- Wheeler: "Thank you. And is it your understanding that had these two tools that we're talking about... had these tools been in place at the time that the shooter involved in that horrible tragedy at the Henry Pratt facility in Aurora, when his FOID card was revoked, law enforcement would have had the tools needed to recover that person's revoked FOID card and, potentially, the weapon that was used in that tragedy? Is that your understanding, Representative Hoffman?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. It's my understanding that this is an attempt to address some of the shortcomings and the loopholes that allowed that terrible tragedy to occur."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Wheeler: "And just so it's clear to everyone, that person had his FOID card revoked almost five years before that horrible incident occurred. Five years before the shooting. But law enforcement had no tools to be able to recover that. I'd like to go to the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Briefly, please."

"Thank you. Those of you who were here in the chamber Wheeler: immediately after that Pratt shooting may recall that that occurred just outside of my district boundary. Just a few blocks. And that two of the victims of that horrible day have direct connections to my family, including Trevor Wehner, the intern who was working on his very first day, who's the son of a high school classmate of mine from Oswego High School. A gentlemen named Tom Wehner. And after reflecting on the broken and flawed process that we have right now regarding FOID card revocation, I engaged in lots of discussions with Members on both sides of the aisle, with stakeholders across the spectrum on how we can fix this system. That when someone loses their FOID card, we actually do something about it. That can make a difference. I made a commitment to my classmate that we, as a Body, would someday actually make that difference through legislation. I talked with Tom Wehner earlier today. He reviewed the legislation that is before us right now. And he asked me to be in support of what is in front of us for this very, very reason we're talking about right now. There are a lot of things in this Bill that I don't love, that I don't think that are going to work the way they're maybe intended. And I commit to all my friends in Oswego community that we will work on getting those corrected

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

before this Bill takes effect in 2024 for that part of it. But this Bill gives law enforcement the actual chance, the necessary tools to prevent another tragedy from happening to another Illinois family like the Wehner's. We have to give that chance. Here's an opportunity today. I'll be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi, do you rise in support or in opposition?"

Mazzochi: "In opposition."

Speaker Manley: "Three minutes, please."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. Question for the Sponsor. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Mazzochi: "We already have in current law that the Illinois State Police is supposed to process and reach a final decision on FOID cards within 30 days, right?"

Hoffman: "Are you talking about renewals? Or are you talking about appeals? Or what... what are you talking..."

Mazzochi: "No. The original application. Section 5, there's the FOID application that's supposed to be approved or denied within 30 days under current law, right?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. That is correct, and it's not being met."

Mazzochi: "Right. And one of the… so, one of the reasons though why it's not being met… I mean, it's not even being close to being met. Thirty days is pretty quick. But in reality, there have been people who have called my office who have been waiting for eight months, nine months, close to a year to actually get their FOID card. Are we providing any additional

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- resources to the Illinois State Police to process these applications monetarily?"
- Hoffman: "It's my understanding that we have provided additional resources. And the backlog is such and the total amount of volume is such that all the personnel and technology simply is not going to be able to solve the problem."
- Mazzochi: "Well, what data or actual evidence do you have that any of these 'reforms' that you've put in here are actually going to allow the Illinois State Police to achieve the 30-day compliance... the 30-day deadline that we've set by statute."
- Hoffman: "Well, I can only tell you what I've heard from the Director of the Illinois State Police. And through the synchronization of the Concealed Carry License, as well as this one, as well as allowing electronically and not having the paper, eventually to have electronic cards, and there'll be one single FOID card and a concealed carry card. And you'll be able to apply six months before your card is up. And the provisions concerning the voluntary fingerprinting, they believe that this will, in the long run, be able to have them meet their statutory obligations."
- Mazzochi: "All right. And you can't even guarantee that they're going to be able to meet their statutory obligations within the next two years, even if this Bill passes, correct?"
- Hoffman: "I apologize. It's my understanding there's also a study that had been done where the ISP identified redundancies. And through this Bill, we're trying to address those redundancies, and there will also be a continuously renewed

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

FOID card whenever you purchase a firearm or you renew your CCL."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. Now my question is simpler. Can you guarantee that if we pass this Bill that the FOID backlog and the Illinois State Police is going to come into compliance within the next two years?"

Hoffman: "They tell me that this will allow them to come into compliance. Yes."

Mazzochi: "Within two years?"

Hoffman: "They believe for them to come into compliance, if we don't do this, it would probably take three to five years to come into compliance."

Mazzochi: "All right. So..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative, bring your comments to a close, please."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "This Bill has been called the fix the FOID Bill. It's not going to fix the outstanding problems that people are experiencing when it comes to actually getting their FOID cards. It's also not doing anything to increase the penalties on individuals who are arrested for gun crimes without a FOID card. It's not doing anything to mandate prosecution of people who are arrested for gun crimes without possessing a FOID card. And it's further... also, while you're calling this process of fingerprinting to be an optional one, I think that the way in which you've drafted this language there are too many loopholes where, again, what you're calling a 'may' is going to become a 'shall'. Particularly through the appeals

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

process because the language is not written correctly to be limited to only those instances where fingerprinting is required. I'm concerned that this is also going to run afoul of U.S. Supreme Court precedent. And I also think it's rather ironic that you're creating a new..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Mazzochi: "...fingerprinting... I'll bring it to a close. You're creating a new fingerprint database, even though Members of the Black Caucus who have announced their pillar needs to be expunging all kinds of records, including fingerprint records."

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Mazzochi: "You're going to create a fingerprint database..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Mazzochi: "...that is then going to be there ... "

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Mazzochi: "...for innocent people. Thank you. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chesney, do you rise in support or in opposition?"

Chesney: "Support-ish."

Speaker Manley: "Nope. You've got to tell me support or opposition. I'm not playing that game today."

Chesney: "Okay. Support."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. Thank you. Please proceed."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Chesney: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, does this improve public safety?"

Hoffman: "I believe it definitely will."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Chesney: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Chesney: "You know, I always get a little bit... I always get a little bit nauseated when we talk FOID cards. And the reason I get nauseated when we talk FOID cards is, first, I can't name a constitutional right that has a tax or fee. I don't think you can name one in the entire country where we have a tax and fee on a constitutional right. There are a few states that have followed the lead of Illinois, that include New Jersey and Massachusetts. New Jersey and Massachusetts actually have FOID cards similar to ours. About eight percent of the country has these FOID cards. But we always talk best practices in the State of Illinois. We always want to talk about what other people are doing. And for whatever reason, nobody seems to care that over 90 percent of the country doesn't have these things. I don't believe that the FOID card addresses public safety. And we all know that a criminal is not going to willfully partake in these firearm transfers. We know this. But I think, Leader Hoffman, this does give people false sense of hope. And I know this because the City of Chicago is, for all effective purposes, a war zone. It has more murders in the City of Chicago than New York City and L.A. combined. Mayor Lightfoot blames Indiana for her gun problems, her violent problems... her violence problems. But then again, she also blames the unions and parents for her public school problem. So, maybe we share a little bit of agreement on that as well. I understand why we have violent problems in our state. The Majority Party has endorsed efforts to defund the police and cash bail, vilify our police

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

departments, and absolutely disarm our community. This is what we do in the Majority Party. Republican districts, for all effective purposes, Leader, we don't have the crime problems. We just don't. It makes absolutely no sense because I represent the City of Galena. We get people from Chicago that move to Galena. We have over a million visitors a year. And they leave for taxes, and they leave because of crime. We arm our citizens and we put bad people in jail. That's why people move in our districts. I know this is uncomfortable, but I think the Majority Party needs to hear this because this will do nothing to make your community safer. Absolutely nothing. So, in closing, I would say in this, Leader. In a crisis, we have to call the right people. If we had a fire, we would call a fireman. If we had a food crisis, we would call a farmer to teach us how to farm and how to take care of ourselves. If we needed a vaccine, I'd probably call President Trump. In the events..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative, your time's expired."

Chesney: "I'll bring my remarks to a close."

Speaker Manley: "Quickly."

Chesney: "In the event of a public safety crisis, I ask that you rely on your Republican colleagues. This is a false sense of hope. This FOID scam does nothing but disproportionately impact people of color and people in urban communities."

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Chesney: "And I ask you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "You told the Chair you were in support."

Chesney: "Madam Speaker, I asked if he thought this improved public safety. And after he said it did, I changed my mind."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let me just say this. I want to, first of all, make it clear. There have been questions on our side of the aisle by some of the Members concerning the Illinois State Police. And they will work with the medical cannabis users to ensure they don't lose their FOID cards. And there's a method for the proper transfer of firearms. But let me just go to the crux of this. This is very... this is very, very clear. First of all, we have a problem that needs to be fixed. We have a problem where we have this backlog of FOID cards and all the litigations that that is ensuing that is jeopardizing the FOID card system in Illinois. That is a system that we have put in place so that law-abiding citizens can have and reasonably use firearms. We don't want that to go away. If we do nothing... if we do nothing, we're in jeopardy of there being a constitutional challenge to get rid of the FOID card system because of this backlog. In addition... in addition, let me just indicate that of all the time that I've been here in the Illinois General Assembly, I have never been able to carry a Bill where there have been qun violence prevention advocates such as G-PAC of Illinois, such as the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, The Gifford's, the Brady's, Every Town for Gun Safety, Mom's Demand Action for Gun Safety in America, Ann & Robert Lurie Children's Hospital, Strengthening Chicago Youth, LIVE FREE Illinois, Heartland Institute, UCAN, and the list goes on and on. Now, let me just say, the Illinois State Rifle Association is neutral on this Bill. So, we have gun violence prevention advocates, while we have the State Rifle Association is

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

neutral. To me, that shows this is a reasonable piece of legislation. It is not only a piece of legislation that is going to ensure that the backlog of the FOID card gets fixed at the Illinois State Police, but it is a public safety piece of legislation, because the first time in Illinois, we're going to have background checks on all gun transfers in Illinois. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, it's come to my attention that Members who were previously authorized to vote remotely have joined us for the... may you... will you please recognize them for the purposes of the quorum?"

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Here."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy is present. Representative Tarver. Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "They keep muting me, but I'm present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver is present."

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative Frese has requested a verification. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 562?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yes."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Crespo votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes. Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'no'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Representative Frese withdraws his request for verification. On this question, there are 75 voting in 'favor', 40 voting 'opposed', 0 voting... 0 voting 'present'. This... the House does concur with Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 562. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1092, Representative Stoneback."

Stoneback: "Madam Speaker, I move to concur on Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 1092. House Bill 1092 is a Bill to strengthen our state's firearms restraining order by closing loopholes in the original law and educating law enforcement and the general public on its use. Based on conversations, changes

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

were made to the Bill in the Senate, Committee #1, to narrow the scope of the Bill. Since IDPH plays a significant role in the education portion, they take the place of the nonprofit whose mission it is to reduce gun violence. The Amendment removes several mentions of 'victims of domestic violence' to prevent them from focusing only on this option, in lieu of seeking it as one... instead of seeing it as one option of several. Finally, the scope of a person with whom the respondent has, or allegedly has, a child in common was narrowed to read, 'a person with whom the respondent has a minor child in common'. I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their input, and the Amendment reflects their input. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1092?' This is final action. Representative McCombie, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCombie: "Just to... would like to request verification of the vote, and just a comment to the Bill, please?"

Speaker Manley: "Quickly?"

McCombie: "Yes. Very quickly."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. Thank you."

McCombie: "This is still a bad Bill. It's still a gun grab. Vote 'no'.

Speaker Manley: "Members, Representative McCombie has requested a verification. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1092?' This is final action.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of all those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Crespo. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Rep Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'.

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'no'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

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

Representative Avelar; Representative Buckner;

Representative Burke; Representative Carroll; Representative

Cassidy; Representative Collins; Representative Conroy;

Representative Costa Howard; Representative Croke;

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Representative Davis; Representative Delgado; Representative Representative Didech; Representative Evans; Representative Gabel; Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Gonzalez; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Representative Greenwood; Representative Guerrero-Cuellar; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Representative Barbara Hernandez; Representative Lisa Hernandez; Representative Hirschauer; Representative Hoffman; Representative Kifowit; Representative Representative LaPointe; Representative Lilly; Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Mason; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Representative Mussman; Representative Ness; Representative Nichols; Representative Ortiz; Representative Ramirez; Representative Rita; Representative Robinson; Representative Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Scherer; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Representative Stuart; Representative Tarver; Representative Vella; Representative Walker; Representative Representative Ann Williams; Representative Jawaharial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yang Rohr; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Representative Kifowit?"

Speaker Manley: "Give her one second."

McCombie: "All right. Mussman?"

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mussman."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- McCombie: "Thank you. Costa Howard? Scherer? She's right there.

  There she is. She's there. Williams? Didech? I withdraw."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative McCombie withdraws her request for verification. On this question, there are 61 voting in the 'affirmative', 47 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1092. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1738, Representative Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill... or House Bill 1738. This is a small fix in the small cell wireless sunset extension. And basically just changes the word 'Section' to 'Act'. Happy to answer any questions. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi for three minutes."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. This is, once again, a..."
- Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."
- Mazzochi: "...we are back, once again, to talk about the Small Cell Wireless Act. And this is a consequence of what happens when you drop a Bill in the wee hours of the morning, after everyone's gone to bed, and nobody's allowed to see the language until it magically shows up at around, I think, it was about 2, 3 in the morning. This is not surprisingly a Bill that has errors and problems. And it should be allowed to simply expire, or the portions of the Act that apparently were not included in the Bill that were filed before. Let the Act expire and let's go through a proper negotiation process

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

where all of the issues are put on the table and where homeowners are not actually cut out of the process as they were this time. And, yes, they were cut out of the process. Because to say that they were allowed to have a couple of minutes at a House hearing is not the same thing as having a seat at the negotiating table. Homeowners are not being represented. And as all of you may have noticed, as you're starting to drive down I-55 to the Capitol Building, there's a whole host of 5G towers that are going up. They're going to in your suburban and residential aoina up neighborhoods. Those are not going to make your residents happy. One of the reasons why you can have these cell towers going up in places where people don't want them, in their residential neighborhoods, right in their front yard, right in their backyard, is because the State of Illinois has been too lazy to make sure that we're actually protecting our residents in terms of how we define things like easement, like right of way. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Chairman Walsh, tell me what the... this just affects just one word. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Replaces the word 'Section' with the word 'Act'?"

Walsh: "That is correct."

Wheeler: "And this was language originally from House Bill 3743, right?"

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Walsh: "Correct."

Wheeler: "So, if a person wants to maintain their consistency, they would look on how they voted on House Bill 3743, and they would understand that they're not changing any of the actual content of the language, they're just changing one word."

Walsh: "That is correct. We had 96 'yes' votes on 3743."

Wheeler: "Okay. Let me make sure I understood what had happened there. I understand and I appreciate the previous speaker's comments about what can be done to improve some of the things within the... our approach in Illinois. But at the same time, this is a simpler Bill than that gets to be this time. So, thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Amendments... shall the House concur with Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1738?'

This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes. Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly... Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This... the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1738. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2499, Representative Yednock."

Yednock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to HB2499, which is a Bill for the Department of Natural Resources, generally to make sure we get federal funds for boating safety."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, this is a complete change, gut and replace, correct?"

Yednock: "That's correct, Sir."

Batinick: "Could you explain... now my understanding was there was some definition changes. Can you explain a little bit more

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

than what you did in the intro there what exactly the Bill does?"

Yednock: "Not so much on the definition. But what had happened is there was... let me just say the story to you. This was in probably, maybe the budget or the BIMP, and it was inadvertently left out. What this Bill does, is it... or what this is..."

Batinick: "Common."

Yednock: "...pardon me?"

Batinick: "I said that's common. Go ahead. Inadvertently left out."

Yednock: "Okay. What this Bill does is that there... under the Boat Registration and Safety Act, the section of legislation Illinois utilizes to enforce both federal regulations established by the U.S. Coast Guard and laws for Illinois citizens in order to maintain safety and recreation of boaters in Illinois. The Coast Guard is responsible for allocating federal monies collected from every state's registration fees and then sending them back to the states through the U.S. Coast Guard Grant. Eligibility for the grant and funds we need to operate the agency are only allocated if we meet the requirements that was set forth. And to go a little bit more, we had to do this and make sure that it's in our law, in our budget. Otherwise, we won't get a matching grant. Basically they're not giving us the one and a half million dollars that helps pay for a lot of the programs and payrolls unless we show that we have matching funds for this, essentially."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. I mean, it looks like there was one 'no' vote in the Senate, Senator Wilcox. Do you have any idea what the nature of the 'no' vote was?"

Yednock: "He actually never reached out to me. And I'll say I never reached out to him."

Batinick: "All right. Thanks. Thanks for answering the questions."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Yednock to close."

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

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment 1 to... Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2499?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy, how do you vote?"

Cassidy: "Yes. Sorry, I'm having trouble with my..."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Harper."

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "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 111 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2499. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2643, Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill... Amendment #1 to House Bill 2643, I move that we concur in that Amendment. It is a Senate Floor Amendment #1. And what is does, it is an agreed Bill under the Unemployment Insurance Act. This is agreed between business and labor, as well as the department. It takes several pieces of legislation and combines them into one Bill so that we have this agreed Bill. First of all, it would allow for the permanent waiver of the recovery or recoupment of nonfraud overpayments of the regular UI unemployment received during the COVID disaster period if the recovery would be against equity and good conscience. This effort was led by several people, most prominently Representative LaPointe and Representative Hernandez. It also would extend an expired provision in the Unemployment Act that we passed last May December 31 of 2020, sunsetted on noninstructional education employees to receive unemployment benefits. This would be completed at September 4 of 2021. It

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

would be retroactive to January 1 of 2021. It would be done provisions 4, 2021. provides September Ιt Representative Keicher's Bill that would prohibit Illinois Department of Employment Security from disclosing individual's entire Social Security number correspondence physically mailed to an individual or entity, or using the entire or partial Social Security number in an unencrypted e-mail. And finally, it includes provisions from Representative Wheeler's Bill that would provide additional exceptions to the confidentiality requirements contained in the Unemployment Act and allows for disclosure of certain information to legislative offices and the Department of Revenue. I believe that there is no opposition. And I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick. Three minutes."

Reick: "I'd like to move to Unlimited Debate, Madam Speaker, please."

Speaker Manley: "We haven't done that yet. Let's see how it goes."

Reick: "All right. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Reick: "Leader Hoffman, I have a couple questions for you. First one is, is the Unemployment Trust Fund currently insolvent?"

Hoffman: "I believe that there is a significant deficit that is a result of the pandemic. And we certainly are going to have to come back and address that deficit."

Reick: "How big is it? Do you know?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. Their estimates... the most prominent estimate is about \$5 billion."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Reick: "Five million or billion?"

Hoffman: "Billion."

Reick: "With a B? Thank you. During your discussions between business and labor on this agreed Bill, were there any... was there any discussion of how this money was going to be paid back to the Federal Government?"

Hoffman: "Well, the deficit, at some point, it's going to have to be dealt with."

Reick: "Was it discussed during the discussions between business and labor as to how that was going to be done? I know it has to be done."

Hoffman: "I don't know why you're so angry."

Reick: "I'm not angry. I got a sore tooth. I got a toothache."

Hoffman: "Sorry. It was discussed, but it was determined by business and labor that that issue was so large that we kind of had to... we had to defer it to see if there was going to be further federal action. As you know, that type of a deficit cannot just be handled by reduction in benefits or increase in taxes. And so, that's the way we've done it in agreed Bill processes in the past. It's just too large and it's historic. So, we're going to be working together long term to try and address that."

Reick: "To the Bill. Three Representatives from the... this side of the aisle, and three Representatives from the other side of the aisle, and six Senators were brought into what is called the agreed Bill process. We were not put in place to negotiate this Bill. We were put in place to opine and pass judgment on what came out of this Bill. And I will tell you, frankly, that we were not involved in any of the discussions. The first

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

time we saw the Bill that came out of the agreed Bill process was the Bill that we have in front of us today. Out of that Bill... that Bill results in a hundred million dollars coming out of ARPA funds to do the things that the Representative described in the Bill, dealing with noneducational employees and paying back... we're allowing people not to be paid back money that was given to them inadvertently. But the biggest thing that is the problem here is..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative, I'm going to allow you some extra time. Meeting you halfway."

"Thank you, Ma'am. The thing is, is that the sword of Damocles that's hanging over this Body is \$5.5 billion of money that has to be paid back. And interest begins to accrue on it in September if we don't start doing it now. We're sitting on \$8 billion, give or take, of ARPA funds, which would be perfectly allowable as the means by which this deficit could be paid back. However, the Governor has decided to hold this money hostage on the hope that the money he borrowed to balance the budgets or to keep people working during the pandemic can be paid back out of this money. Even though Federal Law says, no, you cannot do that. We've got five and half billion dollars of unemployment money that has to be paid back. Because if there is another economic downturn and we have to start paying out of the trust fund, which we don't have any money in it, benefits are going to be cut. Everyone's constituents are going to be pounding on our doors, 'Where is my unemployment?' Businesses are going to go out... are going to be saddled with higher taxes to pay this back. And here's the deal. This is an agreed Bill, and I'm going to

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

vote for it because I don't want to see... I don't want to see people who got money inadvertently have to pay it back under duress. I think they should pay it back, but that's another story. The thing I don't like is the fact that this Bill does not even address... it doesn't even address what we're going to do to pay this back. We're going to leave it to future negotiations. Here's one thing that I don't think that many of us know. The Bill... the Bill that we're voting on is what was considered to be labor's 'asks'. These were the asks that labor had. The business community agreed to it. But the business community also kind of thought that maybe the Governor would do the right thing with the ARPA funds and put them back into the Unemployment Trust Fund where they could be used to pay benefits in the future. No, that didn't happen. Silly business community for trusting us. Here we go. We're going to come back. We're going to negotiate. Do you think labor is going to be satisfied with its asks in the original Bill? Oh, no. They're going to want more. So, at some point in time, we're going to have to pay back five and a half billion dollars the Governor... of money, which the Governor is holding hostage could be used for. And then we're going to have to make more concessions to labor in order for them to agree to do even that."

Speaker Manley: "Representative, can you bring your comments to a close?"

Reick: 'Vote 'yes', but... I see that Vella. Vote 'yes', but be aware. This thing is going to come back and bite us in the butt."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ugaste. Do you rise in support or in opposition?"

Ugaste: "In support. Not ish. In support."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Please proceed."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, is the money being used here part of the ARPA funds to fund this Bill?"

Hoffman: "Yes. And if... I'm not trying to take up your time. I just would like..."

Ugaste: "No, that's fine."

Hoffman: "...I would like to... the previous Representative... I agree with you. I agree with you that we need to use a considerable amount of the ARPA funds to shore up this trust fund. I agree with you."

Ugaste: "Then I'll go right to the Bill and we'll make this very quick. I agree with both Representative Reick and Leader Hoffman on this, that we need to use the ARPA funds to pay back the unemployment deficit we currently have. And I'd just like people to keep this in mind because this is the way it works. A lot of us are newer to this and don't fully understand it. But it's not just business that will be taxed to pay it back. These are businesses that were shut down during COVID and many of whom are struggling to stay afloat right now. Increased taxes will result... having to pay this back by using anything other than the ARPA funds, which we will have some say over, everyone, will result in two things. First, it will result in decreased unemployment benefits going forward. It will have to. We won't be able to afford it

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

otherwise. Second, it will result in increased taxes on business, which will force some businesses probably to close, falter, or lay off people, which will lead to greater unemployment. We need to be careful and make certain we use these ARPA funds in the best way and that is to pay back the Unemployment Insurance Fund, the deficit. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Clarifying question for the Sponsor. We've heard about ARPA funds in this discussion so far. So, is it our intention to use some portion of ARPA funds to pay back the Unemployment Trust Fund? Some portion?"

Hoffman: "In the… yeah. Well, this Bill has a potential price tag and it varies. It really depends on if you apply for your… if you apply for your permanent waiver of the nonfraud overpayment. And the department… this is… I know this is wide. The disparity is wide. The department estimates that could cost from 29 million to 74 million. They're just not sure. So, we took… put 100 million into… from the ARPA funds into the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund for that purpose and for the purpose of the noneducational employees."

LaPointe: "Terrific. That answers my question. I also agree with the other speakers that we should be using ARPA dollars for this purpose. I'm just going to speak to the Bill. This... we hear a lot about fixing IDES in this chamber, and this Bill is a big step in that direction. The component that I'm going to speak about is just the component that waives the repayment of overpayments for regular UI that had nothing to do with fraud. Thank you, Leader Hoffman, for bringing this forward, for being a big player in negotiating this. We have so much

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

to fix at IDES. And again, this is just one important piece of it. When you're trying to survive a pandemic, the very last thing that you need is to be trapped inside a bureaucratic nightmare that's created by your own State Government. This will bring relief to people in every corner of the State of Illinois. Nobody knows that more than the staff in our district offices who have been taking phone calls for the last... more than a year, walking the people we represent through their anxieties and their fears after they've received letters saying, whoops. We messed up. We miscalculated your benefits. Now, you owe us 3 thousand, 5 thousand, or even 10 thousand dollars back. Our staffs and the residents of Illinois have been carrying the weight of a state agency that has been struggling. So, thank you, Leader Hoffman, for bringing this forward. I'm very proud that this Bill is going to have bipartisan support. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Wilhour, do you rise in support or opposition?"

Wilhour: "I think I..."

Speaker Manley: "Now, I'm not... I'm not going to do this."

Wilhour: "No. I really need to ask him a question. I'm going to say opposition, but I can be convinced. Leader Hoffman, could you give some insight into the nature of these overpayments as far as amounts? Are we talking like \$20,000? Are we talking like \$200? Or, kind of, what's the average? And is there any parameters?"

Hoffman: "I apologize. I do not know the average, but it varies.

A good very widely. And this has to be... there are several

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

provisions in order to make sure that this actually was not done in bad faith. And it also has to... you have to file for the waiver within 45 days, which is going to be a limit as well."

Wilhour: "Okay. But there's no... there's no idea on these? I mean..."

Hoffman: "I don't have that."

Wilhour: "I mean, it would change my perspective if we're talking a couple thousand dollars. But if we're talking somebody getting overpaid \$50,000 or \$20,000, or something like that, I think that that's unreasonable. I'd really like to..."

Hoffman: "So, one of the provisions is a provision that currently exists, whenever you temporarily waive, in that you have to... that the overpayment or the... it must be an equity in good conscience. In other words, you have to show, specifically, that you don't have the ability to pay it back, that you have no ability to pay it back. And that's very specific in the Act currently."

Wilhour: "But you don't have to... there's no mechanism to show that this person, in good faith, had no reasonable expectation to be overpaid by an extremely significant amount. I mean, I see how that works one way, but I'm not sure how it works the other."

Hoffman: "I understand your question. But they would have to show that there would be extreme financial hardship in order to not pay it back. But there's no dollar amount limit. And I would just say this, and this may influence your thinking. Again, business and labor agreed to this. So, I don't know if that does or not."

Wilhour: "I appreciate it, Leader. Thank you."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Caulkins, do you rise in opposition?"
- Caulkins: "I'm going to support the Bill, but I have some questions."
- Speaker Manley: "I'm sorry. We're on Standard Debate. And four people have already spoken in support. But it's nice to know you're going to be supporting the Bill. Thank you. Leader Hoffman to close."
- Hoffman: "Thank you. Once again, I would just like to thank all the individuals who had components put in this Bill. That would include Representative LaPointe, Representative Hernandez, Representative Keicher, Leader Wheeler, Senator Villivalam. And this is... once again, business and labor have agreed. And I ask for a favorable roll call."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2643?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct the roll call with those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidv: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Harper."

Harper: "Yes. Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly... Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'.

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'yes'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Tarver is 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "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 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2643. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to House Bill 2908, Leader Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Madam Chair, I move to concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2908. I'm prepared to speak to the changes of the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader, give us a brief explanation of those changes."

Ramirez: "Sure will. Senate Amendment 1 and 2 do a few simple things. One, it moves the elected representative school board from what we have voted in the past to be effective 2023 for all seats, to 2024. With 10 seats appointed in 2024, 10 seats elected, and the at-large president also appointed by the mayor through 2026. This moves a... the Amendment makes it where we have a hybrid transition period so that we have a pathway to fully elected by 2026. It also establishes listening to a number of our constituents in my community and all over the

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

City of Chicago. A noncitizen advisory committee that would be appointed by the mayor. We recognize that's not everything, but we certainly want to make sure that we have this noncitizen advisory committee appointed by the mayor. We have a moratorium on school closures through 2025. And, finally, we've established an independent financial review. And this independent financial review has been set forth where the board shall commission an independent review and report of the district's finances and entanglements with the city. The report is due no later than June 30, 2025, and shall be provided to the Governor, ISBE, General Assembly, Chicago mayor, and the Chicago Board of Education. ISBE will then review the independent report and make recommendations to the Legislature on the Chicago's board ability to operate with the financial resources available as an independent unit of local government. This Bill has been a Bill that you have voted on in 2016, in 2017, in 2019, in March of this year. And I thank you for all of your support on both sides of the aisle because, at some point, I think many of you have already voted on it. It is time for an elected representative school board. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Members, we're going to adhere to a strict Standard Debate, which is two in 'favor', three 'opposed', on a three-minute timer. Strictly. We're going to adhere to that. Chair recognizes Representative Ann Williams for three minutes."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I do support..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Williams, A.: "...the elected school board for Chicago, as I have the previous four times that I voted on it. The issue of the elected Representative school board in my district is probably the issue I've heard most about during my tenure in the Legislature, I've spent most of the time talking to constituents about, and I heard from the most constituents about. All, every way, every mechanism, every means of communicating with constituents, the support for the elected school board has been great. It's one of those rare issues where we have empirical data in support of the issue. In 2 separate referenda held on the issue, it received 85 percent support in the wards in my district alone. And higher in the rest of the city. This is an important issue and one that is certainly a long time coming. It is a big change. And because it's a significant Bill, some of our colleagues and some of the residents have some concerns, understandably. I want to thank the Sponsor for her hard work and commitment to this issue and her commitment to continue conversations and consider follow-up legislation if we deem it's necessary. To wrap up, I think we need to recognize this is a major revamp of the Chicago school board, and bringing democracy to the board is a big deal. It's going to be a journey. We may have to refine our approach along the way to ensure it accomplishes our goal and works the way we want and need it to. Most importantly, that it works the way the children of Chicago need it to. Today is that long awaited first step. Thank you." "Chair recognizes Representative Buckner for Speaker Manley: three minutes."

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

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Buckner: "Leader Ramirez, I have a couple of questions about what was volleyed to us from the Senate. So, I hope that you'll oblige me here. We've heard a lot about the phrase 'financial entanglements'. Essentially a phrase that creates a narrative that if Chicago gets an elected school board, that the state... it will create a \$500 million financial problem for the state. From what I read, the truth is that the problem, which consists of inability of the city to pay a debt exists, regardless of whether the board is elected or appointed. And that liability, in fact, exists today. Is that true?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Buckner: "Okay. Am I correct? Am I understanding that this Amendment requires an independent financial review that requires a report that would go to the Governor, ISBE, the Mayor of Chicago, the General Assembly, and Chicago Board of Education? And then those recommendations would be made by ISBE, based on the report, and how we should move forward with financial issues. Is that correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Buckner: "Okay. A person of valid points from folks who have been on both sides of this about compensation of board Members. We've heard about a possibility that the board could create these exorbitant salaries for themselves. Is your intention that this be a volunteer board that does not receive compensation?"

Ramirez: "The intent is, in fact, that this be a voluntary board that receives no compensation. Yes."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Buckner: "Okay. Great. And let's talk real quick about campaigning finance, not reform, but limitations because this is new legislation. Can I ask you, on the record, if you would work with me to craft language that would speak to the fact that none of us want these to become big money endeavors? And because the young people in Chicago are our focus, we don't want to create an equitable Democratic process and then immediately put a huge price tag on it which would go against the spirit of why we're here in the first place?"

Ramirez: "Absolutely. I'm committed to working with you on this very important issue."

Buckner: "Awesome. To the Bill. Colleagues, this is not a perfect piece of legislation."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Buckner: "This is not a silver bullet. But what this is, is follow-through on a promise that has been made. We can't continue to do nothing because we can't do everything. We have not found a way to do everything, but we'll figure a way to get there through this. What this is, is a down payment on democracy. This is a practical, commonsense Bill. This is not revolution. This is reform. We know about the sordid past of school district that I am a product of. We know about the history from Willis Wagons to the mass closings of 50 schools, which I think would give anybody in the chamber pause if that happened in their community. In this chamber, we often talk about not treating Chicago differently than the rest of the state. Let me be clear. District 299 is the only district in Illinois that does not have an elected school board. Today we have a chance to change that. And for my Republican friends

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

who saw fit to vote for this in April, to give kids in my community the same chance that the kids in theirs have, thank you. And I hope that you would join us once more in this fight. For those of you who may not have voted for the original Bill this year but have over the years, as Leader Ramirez said, over the years have voted 'yes' on this issue and stood with us for the right thing, including the Minority Leader who's done this in the past, we welcome you back as well. We've put this off and played these games for far too long. Today we have a chance and we have a choice. It's choice time, and the time is now. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi for three minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. And actually, before we go to that, Madam Speaker, I would like to have verification of the vote. All right."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you."

Mazzochi: "You said that there's going to be a report about financial entanglements that are... that's going to be issued June 30, 2025. But you're creating a new legal entity with this elected school board before then. So, what's going to happen to the existing intergovernmental agreements and contractual obligations that are currently with the City of Chicago?"

Ramirez: "This Bill doesn't stop that work from happening. It will continue."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Mazzochi: "No, no, no. But they're not going to be a party to the contract. So, who's going to be the party to the contracts? I mean, this is not something simple. You've got collective bargaining agreements, purchasing agreements. You've got real estate contracts. You've got all... service agreements, procurement. This is not something where you can just wave a magic wand and have everything transferred over. So, which legal entity is going to have responsibility for that financial aspect of actually running the schools and paying the teachers?"

Ramirez: "Representative, this is not going to stop the city and our public schools from operating. The independent review that we have put in this Bill, in response to the city's concern, will be done no later than 2025. But all of us will work really hard to get that done as quickly as possible. And it will certainly be done before we have a fully elected representative school board. The mayor and its appointees will be majority over the other."

Mazzochi: "When are you creating the new school board of any new type? When does it come into existence, legally, under your legislation?"

Ramirez: "The fully elected representative school board comes...

Mazzochi: "No. Any new form of board. Whatever you're changing from the status quo, when is that new legal entity going to come into existence?"

Ramirez: "We have a hybrid transition board..."

Mazzochi: "Right."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Ramirez: "...that will begin... that will begin in 2024, and it will commence in a fully elected representative school board by the end of '26."
- Mazzochi: "Okay. That legal entity you're creating for 2024, are they going to assume all existing contractual obligations or not?"
- Ramirez: "The contracts were formed under the city."
- Mazzochi: "Well, how's that going to work then? Because you're saying that the City of Chicago isn't going to have control over the board anymore, and they're not going to actually be the board anymore. You're creating a new legal entity. But somehow, the City of Chicago is going to be liable under those existing contracts. Like, legally, how's that going to work? You're not going to have a new board actually running and operating anything because they're not the... they're not the contractor. Or the contracting party."
- Ramirez: "Representative, in the Bill, we have a transition board where the mayor still has majority control of the board until 2027. The independent financial review will be completed two years prior to that. And..."

Mazzochi: "Yeah."

- Ramirez: "...I have a feeling it will be done way before that. So, that fear should not be there because it will be done before we have the fully elected representative school board where the mayor is no longer in majority control."
- Mazzochi: "You're really not answering the question. This should be a..."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi. Representative Mazzochi, your time has expired."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Mazzochi: "Madam Speaker, I ask for Unlimited Debate because these are really important questions and the speaker's been..."

Speaker Manley: "Your request has been denied. I explained earlier how we were going to do things. I appreciate you, but we're moving on."

Mazzochi: "All right. Well..."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Spain."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Spain: "Thank you very much. Leader Ramirez, a couple different questions for you. Your Bill requires the General Assembly to conduct the creation of districts for an elected school board by February 1 of 2022, correct?"

Ramirez: "Yes. We will be drawing those pursuant and consistent with Federal and State Law."

Spain: "And when does your Bill become effective?"

Ramirez: "The Bill becomes effective June of 2022."

Spain: "So, the Bill is effective in June of 2022, but the General Assembly will be required to perform an action prior to the effective date of your legislation. Is that correct?"

Ramirez: "The intent of drafting was that that date would've been moved. And so, I am going to be filing trailer language to make sure to correct those dates."

Spain: "Question for the Chair. What is the required number of votes for passage of this legislation?"

Speaker Manley: "Sixty."

Spain: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Spain: "The Sponsor has indicated just one of a number of issues that are to be resolved in a trailer Bill at a future date. The very underlying threshold of the Bill, the date of which it becomes effective, is already questioned through other language that is included within this legislation. We spent a lot of time talking in committee earlier today about items that would need to be resolved in this legislation through a trailer Bill. It's a long list. Already, just for today. First, the issue of compensation for school board members. Would these school board members be intended to receive compensation? Second, this has already been discussed, the issue of financial entanglements with the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. Number three, the question that I just asked, the creation of districts, the data that would be used. The timing of which school board districts would be created by the Illinois General Assembly and what that process would look like. What would be the composition and population bases for those districts is something that is not resolved today. We heard in committee this morning that, for the first time I've ever heard on this topic for a number of years, the notion of public financing for campaigns. And I asked the question, who would pay for the campaign financing for the intentions of an elected school board for the City of Chicago? I didn't receive an answer to that question. Another issue that came up with significant discussion in committee was the overall size of the school board, which would be one of the largest, I think, the largest school board that's ever been assembled for a major city in the United States of America. The issues go on and on. And we've convened here today fixing

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

a lot of issues for things that we have had in need of correction. I would urge a great deal of caution. We can work together to create a solution on this topic. But this Bill is not ready to go yet today. We should not be passing legislation where the trailer Bill actually is the more substantive and complete legislation. This Bill is not ready. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ugaste, are you rising in opposition?"

Ugaste: "Yes. And I would like to yield my time to Representative...

Leader Mazzochi, please."

Speaker Manley: "That's fine."

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

Speaker Manley: "Indicates... she indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "All right. Do you know the history of the collateralized pension obligations that are currently associated with the school expenditures?"

Ramirez: "Are you referring specifically to the Chicago municipal one?

Mazzochi: "Either the Chicago municipal one or even any of the Chicago Teachers' Pension Funds."

Ramirez: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, a lot of those... some of those revenues are backed up by revenue streams that are not including property taxes, right?"

Ramirez: "Please repeat the question."

Mazzochi: "Some of those pension obligations are backed up by revenue streams that do not involve property taxes, right, that are currently paid by the City of Chicago? The answer is

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

yes, if that makes it easier for you. Yeah. So, because... so, the City of Chicago... why would the City of Chicago then want to share those revenue streams back with CPS, as opposed to just keeping them for some of their own current city obligations, if, again, they're not going to be taking over... if they're not going to have control over who's actually spending the revenues?"

Ramirez: "These are tax dollars. We put this in state statute.

And I don't believe that the city would not want to support its schools."

Mazzochi: "Really? Why would they? I mean, so you're making a lot of assumptions...

Ramirez: "Because they care about their children."

Mazzochi: "Well, because the City of Chicago, right now, has a whole host of expenditures. So, do you know how much money the City of Chicago is currently contributing each year to CPS because it's got control over the school board?"

Ramirez: "Yes, I do."

Mazzochi: "How much?"

Ramirez: "Five hundred and eighty-six million is what's being sent."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Has the mayor pledged that that 586 million is going to keep getting spent if she does not have the appointees over the school board? Because that's exactly what was done in 1995 to ensure that the City of Chicago was, in fact, going to actually be supporting the schools, was to give mayoral control over the school board."

Ramirez: "Representative, we have incorporated an independent financial review to address all of these concerns."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Mazzochi: "Has she said she's going to make sure the money keeps going there or not? Answer the question."

Ramirez: "She has not said that she will not continue to fund it."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, now you're going to... this school board is going to be capped by PTELL by statute, right?"

Ramirez: "Repeat the question."

Mazzochi: "This school board is going to be capped by PTELL, correct? In terms of property tax levies that it can charge, it's going to be capped. All right, I'll answer that question for you. The answer is yes. You're going to be subject to PTELL. So, if Chicago doesn't pay, you're capped by PTELL. Where are those revenues going to come from? You don't know."

Ramirez: "We get federal, we get state."

Mazzochi: "All right. Here's another thing that maybe you can answer. Right now, do you know how much money the Governor put into the evidence-based funding formula above and beyond last year... last year's budget? That was limited to \$350 million. You're creating a budget shortfall with this school board, with the City of Chicago, that's going to be more than the entire State of Illinois' increase. So, where's that money going to come from? Because I can tell you what's going to happen. It's going to happen... exactly what happened... to the Bill. In 1979..."

Speaker Manley: "Your time's expired. I'll give you a few extra seconds..."

Mazzochi: "It's going to come from us, and all of these students in this State of Illinois..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Mazzochi: "...are going to suffer to bail you out."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ramirez to close."

Ramirez: "Colleagues of the 102nd General Assembly, we've been here for a long time. We have been arguing and voting for a fully elected representative school board Bill. And people on that side and people on this side have voted for it, not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, but today... today could be that fifth time. If kids in Western Springs can have an elected school board, if kids in Joliet can have an elected representative school board, if kids in Waukegan can have an elected representative school board, why can't kids Chicago? Why can't families in Chicago, made up of mostly black and Latino children, also have that opportunity? You have voted 'yes' before. And I urge you to do so again. We have a simple decision in front of us. Do we believe that the people of Chicago deserve this right? If you do, then you should vote 'yes'. As is the case with any change this magnitude, it's historical. There are a few concerns that have been raised in which I commit, on this floor, to work with you alongside to address in a collaborative process with stakeholders. However, what I don't appreciate is a number of attacks and scare tactics to keep us from supporting an initiative which we have supported, again, four times. And now we're going to the fifth time. So, today, at about 6:15 p.m., I invite you to be on the right side of history, again, by voting in final action and finally giving my niece, my nephew, and all of us who wish in our public schools when we were there to have an elected representative school board

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

that's accountable to us, finally, an elected representative school board. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi has requested a verification. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2908?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Harper."

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Tarver's a 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: Representative Tarver votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of the Members voting in the affirmative."

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

Representative Andrade; Representative Avelar;

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Representative Buckner; Representative Burke; Representative Carroll..."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Mazzochi withdraws her verification request. On this question, there are 70 voting in 'favor', 41 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This House... the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2908. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3139, Representative Morgan."
- Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3139."
- Speaker Manley: "Can you explain a little bit about the Amendment?"
- Morgan: "Of course, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill... House Bill 3139 is a complete gut and replace. This Bill, very simply, expands the protections and the opportunities for young children with disabilities who are trying to protect their health and who use medical cannabis to deal with their medical health conditions. This expands park districts to those eligible areas where a young child who has a disability can use medical cannabis. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Batinick for three minutes."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Batinick: "Representative, it looks like this passed the Senator Bailey threshold. Is that correct? Fifty-nine to nothing in the Senate?"
- Morgan: "I believe that's correct."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Batinick: "Okay. And this is just allowing medical cannabis to be administered to special need kids during park district activities, correct? Is that... they're allowed to take it on their own."

Morgan: "Correct. And that's an important clarification. In schools, you may remember, we have a young child, Ashley. And Ashley's Law was passed in the State of Illinois to allow her to use medical cannabis in schools. And last year, we amended that to allow school nurses and personnel to help and supervise in the administration. This only allows the child or their caregiver. It does not put any kind of obligation on park district staff to administer in any way."

Batinick: "Okay. I appreciate it. Thank you, Sir."

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

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am in support of the Bill, but I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Hammond: "Representative Morgan, thank you, again, for bringing this Bill. There was a concern from some of the Members on our side of the aisle. We are talking about children that are patients with a legal medical cannabis prescription, correct?"

Morgan: "We are not only dealing with an only limited... it's only applying to those are under the age of 18..."

Hammond: "Easy for you to say."

Morgan: "...who have... who are medical cannabis patients and those with a disability. In Illinois, you do not have to have a

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

disability to be eligible for medical cannabis use. So, this is a double restriction, in that sense."

Hammond: "And in most cases, Representative, would you agree that the products that these individuals are using are generally either topicals or edibles?"

Morgan: "That's correct. They are not allowed, under the age of 18 in Illinois, to use any smokable products."

Hammond: "Thank you. Appreciate it very much. Urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Morgan to close."

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to note, there were several people that were involved in making sure we got this done at this very late stage to help Ashley and others like her to be able to go to camp and to do it safely. Representative Mussman was very involved and somebody who is a constituent of Representative Mussman. The Governor's office, Senator Castro. So, I appreciate the support. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3139?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Cassidy votes 'yes'. Representative Harper."

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."
- Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'. Representative Tarver."
- Speaker Manley: "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 in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3139. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 16, 2021: approved for consideration, referred to the Order of Second Reading is House Bill 1165."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Slaughter. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Slaughter: "Madam Speaker, I inadvertently voted 'no' on House Bill 1738. Please allow the record to reflect that I am a 'yes' vote. Thanks."
- Speaker Manley: "We will do so. Thank you. Chair recognizes Leader Bennett."
- Bennett: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Manley: "Quickly, please."
- Bennett: "Yes, Ma'am. Thank you. Speaker, I rise today to speak up for the very many small businesses in my district and around the state who are continuing to struggle, even as the

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

government's pandemic restrictions are being lifted. Small businesses in Illinois have been through so much in the past 15 months. Now that they're at long last free to fully open their doors and get back to work, they are facing another government created challenge. Because Illinois will not commit to a plan regarding IDES and unemployment payments, businesses across the state continue to face staffing shortages and uncertainty. I've seen several signs, 'Job openings available. Please apply within.' And they even offer extra incentive at times. And many of them are coming to me and saying, 'We can't go on like this anymore.' Some businesses have closed down one day a week or have shortened their daily hours, and they can't find the workers. Some may not be here a few months from now. Several other states, including many of our neighbors, have announced implemented plans to get their economy back to normal. Illinois should follow their example. And now that Illinois has returned to Phase 5 and is fully reopened, friends, I would urge the Governor to take action and join those states which are getting back to work. And I ask Governor Pritzker to help our small businesses now, who are finally getting back on their feet, by giving them a plan and a timeline and helping them truly begin their recovery from the shutdown and help address serious staffing shortages now. Thank you, Madam Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Page 4, House Bill 3714, Representative Willis." Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for concurrence of Senate Amendment... I believe I actually only need Senate

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Amendment 2, but they put it in as 1 and 2. So, let's just go that route to be safe."

Speaker Manley: "Can you explain them?"

Willis: "Sure. This is a gut and replace. And what it is, is it is a compromised Bill that takes care of updating a lot from the Fire Sprinkler Act that we passed in 2019, which changed the requirements of those that inspect and install fire sprinklers from NICET II to an NICET III Level. That will be going into effect in January of 2022, if we do not pass this Bill. We have had many, many meetings with the stakeholders. Probably about two dozen of them with the fire marshal's office to clean up some of the language. And the bottom line is, that this Bill is almost totally agreed. There are a few places that we still need work on, and we will continue to work on that. And it does extend that deadline for the NICET III until 2023 so that we can continue doing that. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Representative Willis, you and I have talked about this Bill a number of times. We did in committee, I think, today as well. Just to be clear for the Body and a little clarification for everybody because this is kind of a complicated process we're going to go through, and I'm going to try to make it as simple as I can see it. Is that helpful?"

Willis: "That's wonderful. Thank you, Sir."

Wheeler: "The Bill that we passed a couple of years ago has some concerns for many people that are involved about raising the

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- requirement from Level II to Level III for some of these inspections. Is that correct?"
- Willis: "That is 100 percent correct, Sir."
- Wheeler: "And this Bill, while not addressing that directly, is going to put off for a period of time, one year, that requirement where their (unintelligible) goes from II to III.

  Is that correct?"
- Willis: "Correct. It will extend that for one more year for us to continue to work on this."
- Wheeler: "Okay. At the same time, there's a group of people that are involved and are supportive of this particular measure. There's one group who's not. And they wanted to correct it, I think, now, rather than later, if I understand their opposition. That would be the Associated Builders and Contractors. Is that your understanding also?"
- Willis: "Right. And, unfortunately, if we don't do anything, the Bill is going to go in effect and NICET III will be required, and that's where their argument is. So, to not do anything is really not an option at this point, in the best interest of that one group that is concerned about it."
- Wheeler: "Right. And I appreciate their concerns, as I share that as far as how we get this thing actually landed and solved going forward. Can you give me just some context... are there enough people that are Level III qualified in the State of Illinois that actually do the inspections who you would need in the following year?"
- Willis: "Well, that is... that is part of the concern of it. To go from a NICET II, my understanding is NICET II is approximately a two-year program. NICET III is almost a five-year program."

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

Wheeler: "A five year... right."

Willis: "And it also does have an internship and a class that you need to go to, a 16-hour class. And there's some controversy on that. But I do believe, from what I'm hearing of those instructors, there is a pathway to have enough on hand. But certainly, by extending it a year, it'll give us a better chance of having those that need to be there."

Wheeler: "Thank you. The... let me just go to the Bill then at this point. You usually say, 'To the Bill.'"

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Wheeler: "There you go."

Speaker Manley: "I couldn't find the button. Give me a second,
I'm changing my shoes. Please continue."

Wheeler: "Thank you. I don't know how to follow that. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is some merits of what's in this Bill regarding the extension for one year for those who are concerned we cannot fix this in the Veto Session. But there are some other group of people that want to see us take this up in Veto Session and correct the issues that are there. It really comes down to, do you believe we can do that in Veto Session or do you want to give us a year to talk about this? That's kind of the basis of what this Bill is. I think some folks on our side are going to be in 'favor'. Some are going to be 'opposed'. So, you'll just vote your district. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Great. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. One of the things that is also in this Bill that's very important, it does gives the enforcement... clarifies the enforcement

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

mechanism of the fire marshal's office. And that is very important to everybody concerned. So, with that, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3714?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please conduct a roll call of those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Harper."

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'.

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Tarver."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 3714. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

- Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 31, offered by Speaker Welch, presented by Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Yes. I'm here to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 31, which calls on the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide sufficient resources to the Illinois Department of Transportation to begin engineering the Interstate 290 Corridor. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Collins moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 31. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Joint Resolution 8, Representative Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Could I have the Body's attention please? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, SJR8 designates a section of Illinois Route 53 that passes in front of the Illinois State Police Headquarters District 5 in Crest Hill, Illinois as a 'Trooper Richard G. Warner Memorial Highway'. Trooper Warner was a 12-year veteran of the Illinois State Police. And he was shot and killed by a suicidal man at the Illinois State Police Headquarters District 5 in Lockport or Crest Hill on April 21 of 1969. Trooper Warner brought a man to the station for questioning after he'd been involved in an accident. It was suspected that that accident was an attempt by the subject to commit suicide. And while in the headquarters, the subject was able to gain control of another officer's weapon and shot two officers, fatally wounding Trooper Warner. And then the shooter turned the gun on himself and committed suicide. And at the time of the passing, Trooper Warner was survived by his wife and four children. Again,

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

this Resolution seeks to designate that stretch of highway in front of the Illinois State Police Headquarters as the 'Trooper Richard G. Warner Memorial Highway'. And I'd ask for its passage. And before we vote, if we could have a moment of silence for Trooper Richard G. Warner."

Speaker Manley: "The Members will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. Pardon me. All those in favor say 'aye; opposed say 'nay'. In the... Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 8. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please do the roll call for those voting remotely."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Cassidy votes 'yes'.

Representative Harper."

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Representative... Representative Lilly votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Lilly votes 'yes'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'yes'."

Speaker Manley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. The Resolution, having

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 373, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 374, offered by Representative Ness. House Resolution 375, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 376, offered by Representative Robinson. House Resolution 378, offered by Representative Walker. House Resolution 379, offered by Representative Walker. House Resolution 380, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 381, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 382, offered by Representative Scherer. House Resolution 383, offered by Representative Scherer. House Resolution 384, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 385, offered by Representative West. House Resolution 386, offered by Representative Niemerg. House Resolution 388, offered by Representative Buckner. And House Resolution 389, offered by Representative Croke."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Greenwood moves for the adoption to Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Chair recognizes Representative Costa Howard. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Costa Howard: "Quick point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Quickly."

Costa Howard: "I want to make sure that everyone received the e-mail to come to out to the Frida Kahlo exhibit at the College of DuPage for Legislator Day on Monday. Please sign up to get

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

your tickets for your families, for you for Monday for Legislator Day. Welcome to the 48th District."

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

Haas: "Another quick point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Quickly."

Haas: "In my brief time that I've been here on the floor, I have heard many compliments given to staff working for us in our district office's. And my district director, Jessica Kinnersley, is not to be left out of that group of exceptional individuals. I want to take a moment to congratulate Jessica and her husband Kent on the birth of their first child. Jessica gave birth to a healthy baby boy, Liam Christopher Kinnersley, on June 27, weighing seven pounds and four ounces. Congratulations to Jessica, Kent, and Liam. And best wishes from the House on becoming a family of three."

Speaker Manley: "Congratulations. Representative Davidsmeyer, I saved the best for last."

Davidsmeyer: "That's... you beat me to it. Thank you. Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Quickly. Super quick."

Davidsmeyer: "Really quickly, I want to thank LIS for doing some quick work with the new rules changes. I think they did a great job considering... I'm sure they had very short amount of time to try to put that together. It didn't work exactly the way we wanted, but you guys... I know a lot of times you're not given very much time. So, I appreciate all that guys do."

Speaker Manley: "Members. I have an announcement. The Calendars for Fall Veto Session are available in the well. And now,

49th Legislative Day

6/16/2021

allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Greenwood moves that the House stand adjourned to the call of the Speaker. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Pursuant to HJR50, the House stand adjourned to the call of the Speaker."