61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Speaker Hoffman: "The House will come to order. Members, please be in your chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off the cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Padget."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear heavenly Father, we give you all that we are on this day. Please brush away our weariness so that we may be inspired in our work. Help us to discover new ways to reveal your love to all that we meet. Keep our minds clear and focused on all that we need to achieve. Lord, give us the wisdom to overcome difficulties and to find solutions. I look to you and trust you are with us on this day. These things we ask, Amen."
- Speaker Hoffman: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Sonya Harper."
- Harper et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Greenwood is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record show that there are no excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick for excused absences on the Republican side."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On... this is literal Cranky Co-Workers Day. There are no absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 116 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 for Senate Bill 336, Floor Amendment(s) 3 for Senate Bill 828, and Floor Amendment(s) 3 for Senate Bill 1169; and approved for consideration, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 516."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Members, an announcement. This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers the nose and mouth, except for when necessary for eating or drinking. Members may remove their face covering when speaking on the microphone at their desk. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Thank you. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 528, which is offered by Representative Niemerg. Mr. Clerk. Representative Niemerg is recognized on the Resolution."
- Niemerg: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today, I rise for Resolution 528 to honor the life of Elizabeth Ann Weidner. At age of 12, Elizabeth was diagnosed with Stage 4, high-risk

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

neuroblastoma. She battled this horrible disease with grace, determination, and strength for nearly six years, during which she touched so many lives, not only locally, but nationally as well. To raise money and awareness in the fight against childhood cancer, Elizabeth started Crowns Fight Cancer after being crowned Junior Miss Effingham County Fair with the motto, 'Just a Girl Changing the World One Rhinestone at a Time.' Elizabeth was kind, caring, loving, passionate. A graceful young woman who inspired influenced many. Elizabeth loved all things dance and could convey such emotion through her routines. They were really moving. She was a cheerleader and pomerette at her school, participated in theater, 4-H, FFA, winning a long list of awards along the way. So many awards, we need two days of Session to go through them all. She did not want her disease to define her. All too often, she would leave treatment and head straight to a basketball game or a dance competition and no one would know what she had just gone through. As an advocate for childhood cancer, she traveled to Washington, D.C. numerous times and was the national spokesman at many American Cancer Society events. Her calling was to be a pediatric nurse, to help other children in the hospital because she knew what they were going through. She knew how hard it was, and she wanted to be there to help them. It's difficult to put into words here today what Elizabeth means to her family, friends, and community. She is truly an inspiration, an example of what a person should do in life. Forgiving and understanding, selfless, even though she had great reason to be selfish. Sadly, Elizabeth passed away at

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

her home in rural Dieterich on September 29, surrounded by her family who are with us here today. Her parents Matthew and Jennifer, brothers Ethan, Eric, and Evan. Country roads take me home. Fly high, E. We would ask this chamber to observe a moment of silence in honor of her memory."

Speaker Hoffman: "The House will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Representative Niemerg moves for the adoption of House Resolution 528. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those (sicopposed) say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Leader Evans, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Evans: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

Evans: "On a point, I wanted to just... it's very difficult after a moment like that. My thoughts and prayers are with you, Representative Niemerg. But today I just rise to bring attention to House Resolution 506, just recognizing 125 years for the Chicago Federation of Labor. I know, here in Illinois, we recognize all of our great labor partners. But as a young man that was born in the City of Chicago, Chicago means a lot to me. I love Chicago. Just want to recognize all of the hard work and the past struggles that our labor community has went through in Chicago. You know, you think back, Chicago's the home of some of the most significant labor events for this country and, quite frankly, the world, including the Haymarket Affair, the fight for the eight-hour work week, the Pullman Strike on the South Side of Chicago, which I proudly represent, along with Nick Smith, which resulted in President Grover Cleveland designating the first Monday in September to

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

be Labor Day. So, Chicago, for the world and, quite frankly, this nation, has been a great place for our labor unions. And, of course, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters was founded by A. Phillip Randolph, the first black union in the United States. It is home with Republic Steel Strike, the Memorial Day massacre of 1937. The Union Stock Yard and so much many more. Chicago has been on the forefront of our labor movement. Looking back to the past, I want you to think about John Fitzpatrick, who served as the president for one year in 1900s. But his second tenure would start in January of 1906, would last until his death in 1946. President Fitzpatrick moved the CFL forward innumerable ways. He created a weekly publication, and it was a vehicle for helping workers, again, fight the many issues of the early 1900s. Of course moving forward, they helped pass the Fair Work Week ordinance to give low-wage workers a predictable scheduling. And, course, it most recently helped to enact the hotel workers rights return to work ordinance to bring back hospitality workers who bear the brunt of the economic downturn. As our hotels come back and as we get back from COVID, we know that our union workforce in the City of Chicago and throughout the State of Illinois deserve their jobs. And it will be checked and we're going to do our part. So, again, moving into the future, I'd like to thank the leadership of the CFL, President Bob Reiter, Secretary Don Villar. And, of course, you can't get anything done without a staff. Their Deputy Chief of Staff Andrea Kluger works hard to ensure that we're connected to the CFL because Chicago, again, is important. So, thank you. And I appreciate the support for the Resolution."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Under the Order of Agreed Resolutions appears
House Resolution 526, offered by Speaker Welch. Speaker Welch
is recognized on the Resolution."

Speaker Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I can have everyone's attention for a moment. As Speaker of the House, I am truly honored to rise today to congratulate one of our very own. I want to congratulate our Deputy Majority Leader Mary Flowers. For those of you who don't know, Leader Flowers received the National Distinguished Advocacy Award from the American Cancer Society Action Network. I can't think of anyone more deserving for this honor than someone who has consistently worked to improve accessibility to quality health care for everyone in our state. I think many of you have been involved in debates with Mary when she's been passionately fighting for quality health care for all. She is the quintessential elected official. She's well convicted in her values. She's determined, she's passionate, and she has a kind heart. That passion is because of her kind heart. Most importantly, she knows how marginalized communities can and should be better served by government. These are the qualities Leader Flowers brings with her into every issue and every debate. Trust me, I've tried to test her on some of these things. I never seem to win an argument, especially when it comes to health care. During her many years in this chamber, Leader Flowers has laser focused on advancing efforts to disadvantaged communities' access to health care. Because of her advocacy and determination, Illinois became the first state to pass comprehensive biomarker testing, which will help residents receive access to the proper cancer treatment

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

at the right time. Marginalized communities, including communities of color, rural communities, and others who are less privileged in our society, are less likely to receive biomarker testing. It is because of Leader Mary Flowers that these communities will have access to the care that they need. in addition to other initiatives, including empowering patients to better predict and plan their health needs. Those diagnosed with cancer need all the help we can provide. And we owe it to ourselves, as a society, to beat this awful disease. I think it's safe to say that just about everyone in this chamber has personally known the heartbreak that is a cancer diagnosis. Working to detect cancer earlier to give people a better diagnosis, a better shot at life is what Leader Flowers has fought for her entire career in this Body. I am proud to call Leader Flowers a diligent advocate, a tenacious leader, and, most importantly, my friend. Can we all put our hands together and give a hearty congratulations to Deputy Majority Leader, Leader Flowers? And may God bless the American Cancer Society and all of our cancer patients who can have a little more hope that science and public health continue to advance. And thank you again, Leader Flowers. And I certainly hope other Members have comments to follow."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All of us who have served with Mary know her passion and her concern and her leadership for the health of people all across this state from every community. And when you lead on these efforts, very often you don't have a chance to see your work come to fruition. You don't know all these millions

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

of people whose lives you have affected. But when I saw this Resolution... just very recently for me, one of my best friends, leader in my community was diagnosed with a kind of cancer and a rare variant. I don't know all the right words to describe this. And because her doctor at the time was astute and said there is such a thing as biomarker testing and we can give you access to this and, therefore, we will be able to better treat your condition. And that your treatment will be appropriate for the specific kind of cancer you have, as opposed to having one of these shotgun attempts at pouring every toxic substance into you and radiating her for days and days and days. She not only was cured, but she was saved from days of suffering and potentially ineffective treatment because this just happened to be available to her. And I know her husband and her children and her grandchildren are very grateful that she was able to get this treatment because it was life changing for her. It was lifesaving for her. It was life changing for her family. And what you've done with this Bill and why you're being honored by the National Cancer Society and by all of us here today is, for the thousands and thousands of other choices across the State of Illinois who now, regardless of where they live or who happens to cover them, or whether they're rich or poor, are going to have access to the same kind of care. So, thank you, Leader Flowers."

Hoffman: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you. On behalf of the women and families here in Illinois, I rise to honor and congratulate you, Leader Flowers. Your commitment to people has made a difference. And

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

I'm sure the American Cancer Society award today is only one of many you will and should receive. Leader Flowers is a champion of health care of marginalized people and she absolutely deserves the recognition and the honor for her Bills and for this Bill that's made Illinois the first state to pass comprehensive bio testing. Bio testing allows for medical professionals to better understand and target the cancer treatment. Her Bill helps underserved communities and individuals like my dad. And I am glad that the American Cancer Society understands that this is exactly why Leader Flowers is in office today. Her passion is real and authentic. And she never relents when fighting for people who need help and who are historically left behind. Congratulations, Leader Flowers. You are awesome woman doing God's work, and I love you. God bless you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Leader Flowers, Mary, my friend, it has been such an honor for me to serve with you in this chamber. I will tell you, I have learned a lot from you. And the day that you called me and asked me to join you on your biomarker legislation, it was an incredible honor for me. And I didn't take that lightly. I have the most incredible respect for you. And I know that you are the most passionate person, not only woman, but passionate person, perhaps, that I will ever meet. And I congratulate you on this award and hope that there are many, many more to come. God bless you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaker Welch, thank you for recognizing Leader Mary Flowers on this honor. She truly

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

deserves it, and I second your remarks. I would like to say that this Bill is going to be very helpful for early detection, Leader Flowers, and we know early detection saves lives. It saves the state and the insurance companies lots of money. So, this is great for not only for the state, for the insurance companies, but it's great for families and it helps save lives. It's important because there are many people in this state and the country that have been adopted and they may not know their mother, their father, and the history, their health history. And this type of work that you've done will help them understand their DNA better and help them detect early if there's cancer in their body. There's also people that may have never known their mother or father because... they just don't know. For instance, I never knew ... or I still don't know my biological father. That puts you at a disadvantage for your health because you never know what could possibly be in your future. And so, this will help people like me detect early and save their lives. So, Representative Flowers, long after you're gone, you're going to be saving lives. And this could be one of the most important Bills that you passed, and I told you that when you passed it. And the reason why I told you that was because I was fighting cancer at the time and I learned that early detection saves lives. So, God bless you, Mary."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Flowers, would you like to make a comment? Congratulations."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Speaker Welch, I want to take this opportunity to say thank you. You didn't have to do this, but you did. And I

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

want to thank the American Cancer Society for having the faith in me, giving me this burden to carry, and I was truly humbled by it. And, Representative Ammons (sic-Hammond), it was important that you joined me on this legislation because cancer knows no boundaries, it knows no politics, it just don't know. It just goes after people. And this should not have been a one-sided issue. I wanted all of us to be involved. And so, because I got all of your support, this Bill is now the law. One of the previous speakers that was talking about the young lady that died from cancer on September 29, I was thinking to myself as he was speaking, what if? What if she had that opportunity? Would she have been able to make it if we had done it a little sooner, had she known, had her doctors known about it? So, this is an issue that we really can't keep to ourselves. We have to make sure that every hospital, every doctor, every clinic, everybody knows that there is some intervention prevention if we have access to the care. Representative Ford, now that you've said it, I could tell it too. You told me that you had cancer and all I could do at that particular time was to pray. And I see God do answer all prayers, and thank you very much. But there are so many people out there that could've been saved if only they had known. Or if only they had the insurance. Or if only they did not live in the wrong zip code. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, what saddens me today is that my mother's not here, my husband is not here, my brother is not here. Because those people were my backbone. But because they were my backbone, I know that they would want me to stand on this floor and tell each and every last

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

one of you, as long as breath is in my body, I will leave no stone unturned on behalf of all the people of the State of Illinois. It doesn't matter what your color is to me because that is so insignificant in the whole scheme of things. It's about having access. And I will continue to fight for health care for all. See, Representative Ford told the story. He said that this biomarker testing will save the insurance companies monies. Representative Ford said the biomarker testing will save the State of Illinois money. We don't have to do those trial and errors. We don't have to burn up people because we gave them too much of this and not enough that, and testing and testing and testing. And then the next thing you know, they still die. So, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I appreciate you. I love you, and I wish you all the success. And to all the Members, the women, and the Republicans, I love each and every last one of you. From the bottom of my heart, I want to say thank you all very much and God bless you. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Speaker Welch."

Speaker Welch: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask that every Member in this Body be added as a cosponsor on this Resolution, and I move for adoption. And upon adoption, I would ask us to give Leader Flowers another well-deserved round of applause."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, please add all Members of the Body to the Resolution as Sponsors. This Resolution had been previously adopted on a previous day. Thank you, all Members. And, once again, congratulations, Leader Flowers. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Harris on the Motion."

- Harris: "Speaker, I move the posting requirements be waived so the following Bills can be heard in committee. House Joint Resolution 51 in Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges. Senate Bill 658 in Public Utilities. Senate Bill 1041 in Health Care Availability & Access. And House Bill 4160 in State Government Administration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. On page 3 of the Calendar, we'll go to the Order of Concurrences. House Bill 307, Leader Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 307. This is the second general revisory of 2021. As you can see, the underlying Bill is a totally different subject. So, I just want to be sure people are clear we are voting on the second general revisory of 2021. The general revisories are omnibus Bills that make all the necessary correction changes and clarifications to be sure that all the other laws that we passed during a Session are appropriately incorporated into the Illinois Compiled Statutes. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Hoffman: "State your inquiry."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Batinick: "I believe this has an immediate effective date. What's the vote requirement on this?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "We are checking with the parliamentarian, Leader."
- Batinick: "Okay. Can I... we're going to pause for that then?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "Yes. I'm told by the parliamentarian that this takes 71 votes."
- Batinick: "Okay. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Batinick: "I see you. I can... I'm not as tall as you, but I got it. Real quick, Representative, what exactly... we don't even have an analysis on this Bill. What exactly does this Bill do?"
- Harris: "This goes through all the Amendments to the compiled statutes that need to be done to conform them with Bills we've passed. There are also grammatical punctuation and syntax errors and clarifications. And I believe all four legislative staffs and LRB have worked through these, and it's my understanding that there is an agreement that that's what this Bill does."
- Batinick: "So, there's no substantive change to any of the laws here?"

Harris: "I don't believe so."

Batinick: "I think you used the word clarification."

Harris: "The only thing in here that could be considered..."

Batinick: "I'm just trying to wake my side up here. But, yeah."

Harris: "Yeah. There's only one thing in here that is even a clarification and that is clarifying how instances are

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

treated so that people can rely on sunset dates that expire before the Governor signs a Bill we passed that update the sunset date."

- Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you for your answers. Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 307?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 307. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Harris."
- Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I move that Representative Tom Morrison be allowed to participate and vote remotely today."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Members, we have to take a roll call vote to allow Representative Tom Morrison to vote remotely. Mr. Clerk. The question is, 'Shall Tom Morrison be allowed to vote remotely?' The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 individuals voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Motion, having received the required numbers, will allow Representative Morrison to vote remotely. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Is Representative Morrison present? Representative Morrison is present."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Speaker Hoffman: "On page 3 of the Calendar, we return to the Order of Concurrences, appears House Bill 359, Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It is purely only a technical change and changes virtually nothing in the Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 359?' I apologize. Representative Swanson."
- Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No apologies required. It's... you're a busy man up there. A lot going on."

Speaker Hoffman: "Proceed."

Swanson: "Thank you. We're going to be voting on this Bill, and I certainly support it. But I just want to share some of the history behind this piece of legislation. We're soon going to be approaching the anniversary on the death of 38 veterans at the LaSalle Veterans Home. I would just like to read a couple notes I've got here. Thirty-six veterans passed due to COVID. On Veterans Day 2020, there were seven deaths reported. Just on that one day, on Veterans Day. These are men and women, primarily men, who had actually gone... served, possibly on a battle field or trained for combat, who had put their name on the lines to go to World War II to be a soldier or Marine, or a sailor, or an airman, or a corpsman in Korea or Vietnam, died in our nursing home. On the 14th of November, and another additional veteran died. 15 November, four more. 16 November, two more. By 17 November, 21 veterans had died at LaSalle Veterans Home, which equaled about 21 percent of the total population at the veterans' home at LaSalle. I know... and it

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

goes on and on, losing one veteran a day, two veterans a day, all the way to the 2nd of March where we had lost 36 veterans just at LaSalle. I would like to read just a short bit of an Executive Order 2019-04. Executive Order. It says, 'Whereas, the State must ensure that all Illinois Veterans' Homes provide a safe, healthy environment where veterans and their spouses receive all necessary care.' Executive Order 2019-04. Once again, continues on. 'Whereas, residents and their family members must be assured that the Veterans' Homes have in place and are carefully following policies, protocols and procedures that have been reviewed by health care experts and are designed to protect the health and safety of all residents.' Once again, continuing on with Executive Order 2019-04. 'Whereas, as part of protecting their health and safety, Illinois Veterans' Homes also must have in place and carefully following policies, protocols and procedures mandating appropriate and timely communication regarding health and safety issues with residents and their families, as well as with other State, federal and local agencies involved in ensuring high-quality care for residents of our Veterans' Homes.' That was Executive Order 2019. On May 9... on May 17, 2019, I have a report filed by the Illinois Depart... for the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs by Tetra Tech. Within that report, it states that several policies at the home were found to be in error. Policies amongst our different veterans' homes were not being followed. And that was due... is pointed out in this report that we did not have a senior home administrator. A senior home administrator is the one who's the glue for those policies. It also goes on to

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

say that various infection control policies exist, but it's not clear how they are integrated. This was May 2019... in the year 2019 that report was placed... was put in place. And then we all know what happened in January of 2020 and into December of 2020, in March of 2020, and it continued on. From March of 2020, the VA home, and credit to their employees, were prepared to... for COVID, but in November, the COVID hit our nursing home in LaSalle. And it was tragic all the losses we had. But for those six, seven months, there was no continued training, no continued follow up, no guidance to how to prepare in case of that pandemic. Sure, standards were being checked by some, but still we lost veterans. The COVID came through the front door at the veterans' home in LaSalle. Many lost their lives, as I said, 21 percent by then. April 26, 2021, another report was filed. And we had several hearings. Leader Kifowit led several hearings, as we had hearings in Chicago. We had hearings with the Judicial Committee. We had hearings with several groups. And still, questions to our answers were not provided... or answers to our questions were not provided. May 21, 2019... or May 21, 2021, I sent a letter to the Governor, I sent a letter to IDPH, and I sent a letter to IDVA. IDVA has responded with many of my requests. But still today, there are unanswered questions of where the failures were at within the LaSalle Veterans Home. Why did we have veterans dying there? Many of those questions, as I've said, have gone unanswered. We've had several hearings and still no answers. But I've been asking for communications. I've been asking for emails. I've been asking for letters. I've been asking for documents. I've been asking for

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

information that we, once again, could bring our committees together to review to try identify why so many veterans died. Not only at LaSalle, but of all of our nursing homes. It's a tragedy. I'm still waiting for answers. It's a tragedy that veterans died and now there are several families without a grandparent, a grandmother, aunt, uncles because of what happened and the failure to protect. One investigation reports that the wrong hand sanitizer was being used. Nine months to prepare, and still using the wrong sanitizer. So, with that, I support this legislation. I feel it goes ... it may help us in future with providing an opportunity for people to make complaints because certainly... and I give credit to Director Prince. He... I've been to LaSalle Veterans Home with a couple Members. He's trying to do his job, but there's still too many unanswered questions that we need to get to the bottom of to figure out why our veterans died. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Mazzochi."

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

Mazzochi: "I support this legislation, but I want to be clear that this legislation is not going to solve the problems that we've seen at the veterans' homes. Because no matter what we do in terms of legislation, it's irrelevant when the administration won't do their job to fill the positions. In April of 2021, the inspector general reported, on page 32, that Tony Kolbeck was serving as the acting director for the senior home administrator position. He wasn't qualified for that position. The inspect... the Illinois Inspector General

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

who looked into what happened at LaSalle said it was critical that that position be filled because that's the policy making position, that's the critical oversight position, and that's the position that we, by statute, had said needs to have somebody who has long-term care experience filling that role. The inspector general specifically tied the failure to fill that position. He pointed out the Governor had a candidate in 2019 who was recommended to him for that role. The Governor refused to accept the recommended candidate for that role. Why? We've asked, the Governor refuses to say. Even though the inspector general specifically said you need to have somebody in that role full-time. You need to put as much time and energy you can to getting that role filled with a permanent candidate. To this day, that role is being filled by an interim person who, to my knowledge, based on his stated resume, still does not fulfill the statutory requirements that we have for that job. The administration and the Governor, in particular, needs to explain why. After all of these dead veterans, after his own inspector general has said fill that position properly, still not done. If you want to take veterans' care seriously, do your job, Governor."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you to my colleagues who have brought this forward and put this out for everyone to know, especially the lack of responsibility by the state. But we also have a responsibility on the floor here as well, as we all hit 'yes' and support this Bill. But I just wanted to add something to that for another responsibility that we all have as human beings here as well. Chances are everybody in

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

this room has a veteran that lives in their neighborhood, or somebody coworker, or in the family. responsibilities to them too because we wouldn't be here, none of these actions would be taking place without our veterans and our current military. Take a minute, if you recognize a veteran, know a veteran next door, a coworker, someplace that you shop regularly, however it is, ask them if they're okay. Ask them how things are going. Start a conversation. Just because things look okay on the outside does not mean that they're okay on the inside. That's where it all starts. Just something I wanted to add into all of this picture. As we discuss responsibilities, we should all feel a responsibility to our veterans. Not just through the state. Not just on this floor. But in our neighborhoods, at our work, wherever it is we go, we owe them a gratitude and a thank you and a responsibility to make sure they're okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Kifowit to close. Oh, excuse me. Representative Caulkins."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Caulkins: "I support this Bill. This is long overdue. As you know, my background is in health care. If this had happened in a facility that I owned, that my brother and I owned, that we ran, the State of Illinois would've been in there with a sledgehammer. This... we have let down our veterans. We have allowed this tragedy to happen because we weren't prepared, we didn't have the proper people in place. And we owe it... we owe it to the families of the veterans to get to the bottom

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

of this, to hold the people responsible, and this Bill goes a long way to doing that. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kifowit to close."

- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Members of the Veterans' Committee. They put in a lot of hours looking at our nursing homes and putting into place policies and procedures to start making sure that we are holding individuals accountable. This Bill is the Veterans' Accountability Unit. It is separate from IDVA. It is separate from the Governor's Office. It's an independent initiative to bring a voice to those who have concerns and issues in our veterans' home. And again, I want to just thank the Members of the Veterans' Committee for doing... the Veterans' Affairs Committee for doing an outstanding job as we continue to do the work for our veterans. I ask for the support of the Body."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 359?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison. Representative Morrison votes 'yes'."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morrison votes... on this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 359. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to Senate Bills-Second Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1784, Representative Buckner. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Buckner."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Buckner."

Buckner: "Speaker, I would like to adopt Floor Amendment 2. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today I rise to present H... House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1784, which is now the vehicle for the Chicago elected school board trailer Bill. In June of this year, we took a mighty step forward in giving children in Chicago what children in every other city in this state has, which is an elected representative school board. I thank you for all... I thank you for that. And like all things, this Bill needed some fixes. And when Leader Ramirez did the work to get us here in June, she promised these fixes, and these fixes are here in this current Bill. This Bill does a few straightforward things. One, in the current law, there's a requirement for independent financial review and report..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Buckner, how about if we adopt the Amendment and then..."

Buckner: "Sorry."

Speaker Hoffman: "...we go through the Bill on Third Reading. Is that okay?"

Buckner: "That's exactly what we should do. Yes."

Speaker Hoffman: "I'm glad you agree. Representative Buckner moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1784.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Buckner on Senate Bill 1784."

Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I got a little bit ahead of myself on that one."

Speaker Hoffman: "The presentation was great though."

Buckner: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "You're welcome."

"This Bill does a few straightforward things. In the current law, there is a requirement for independent financial review and a report. This Bill will require that the independent financial review and report is due no later than October 31 of 2022. And it will require ISBE to provide recommendations about the report to the Legislature no later than July 1 of 2023. That date is moved up in this Bill to June 30... from June 30 of 2025. The current law neither explicitly provides for board member compensation, nor does it explicitly provide that a member shall not receive compensation. During the House Floor debate in June, we promised that we would fix this. This language is in this Bill to make explicit that there is no compensation for board members. The current law also contains a moratorium on school closures that begins on June 1 of 2022. The new Bill moves that date up to an effective immediate date. And the Bill also extends the date in which electoral districts must be drawn from February 1 of 2022 to July 1 of 2023. Lastly, the original Bill gave the city council of Chicago the

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

responsibility to advise the mayor about nominees from the hybrid board and to consent to those nominations. Currently, the mayor appoints all members of the school board with no functional input from the city council. So, in this Bill, we removed that advise and consent language just doesn't remove a barrier... this removes a barrier that doesn't exist today already in the current iteration of how things are... how things proceed with the school board in Chicago. That is the long and short of this Bill, and I'm happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Tarver."

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

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

Tarver: "Kam, this is an agreed Bill, right?"

Buckner: "It is. The city, the teachers' union, and a working group of advocates who have been meeting since the summer."

Tarver: "So, first of all, congratulations on that. But much like law school, I have to toss in my dissenting opinion, even though it looks like the majority is already... have their ruling. I think overall it's a good Bill. I appreciate all of your hard work. I know it hasn't been easy. But so that I'm on the record 'cause my district is going to have an issue with my 'no' vote, the biggest issue to me is that the Chicago public school system is 11 percent white. I've already had concerns about overrepresentation of individuals who don't have kids in the school on the board. And to... and let me just say, from a historical perspective, I've been familiar with the board since I worked in the mayor's office in 2008. A lot

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

goes into working on this board, often 20, 25, 30 hours per week in order to do the job effectively. I'm really concerned about who would be incentivized to be on the board when there is no compensation. And I know that we don't share that and that's fine. I just want to make that clear for the record. I know there's a lot of talk about no other school board in Illinois that's elected gets paid, and none of them have 400 thousand students either. None of them have the gun violence that we have. None of them have the students with PTSD and things like that that we have in Chicago. And so, I just feel, personally, and I want to say this more for my district who will come after me about this, that I think we do need to pay people who are on that board. We pay people on the police board, and they do nothing. We pay people on Chicago Park District Board, and we know they do nothing. They don't even vet people before they hire them. That's on the side. And so, I think that the school board should be paid in the City of Chicago. And so, you have a great Bill, overall. Thank you for all of your hard work. I know it's on behalf of the students that you're working, and I applaud you. That's just my very minor dissenting opinion. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair."

Buckner: "Thank you, Representative Tarver. I appreciate your sentiments. We have a friendly disagreement on the conversation piece, but what I will say is that this is not the last Bill that we will see to tighten up the language for the school board... elected school board to make sure that it makes sense and it does exactly what it needs to do for the people who need it the most. So, there are some negotiations

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

and conversations that are ongoing about what the requirements for school board members would be and to... finding ways to make sure that the people who care most about our young people are on that board and that the board looks like the people... the young people in the Chicago public school system. So, thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Leader Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

Butler: "Representative, I know the previous speaker kind of touched on it a little bit, but it was quick. Is there any opposition to this Bill?"

Buckner: "There is... there is no opposition that I have on my analysis."

Butler: "And that's different than the underlying Act that passed earlier, correct?"

Buckner: "Yes, Sir."

Butler: "The position of the city has changed? Is that... is that correct?"

Buckner: "Well, I would've assumed that the city was still opposed to the initial Bill, but..."

Butler: "But not to this?"

Buckner: "...this is negotiated. Yes, Sir."

Butler: "Very good. Thank you for your work on this."

Buckner: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Buckner to close."

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

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1784 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "No."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morrison votes 'no'. 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 84 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 4 of the Calendar, Representative Ammons on House Joint Resolution 27."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move concurrence with a Senate Amendment that simply adds another organization to the task force to study access to education in Illinois Department of Corrections."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Leader Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, do you have at your fingertips what the vote count was on the original Bill?"

Ammons: "I believe it was 97 or 93, something to that effect. I have it in front of me."

Batinick: "I'm going to make your day. It was 109 to 0."

Ammons: "I appreciate you."

Batinick: "Yep. Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "I move for concurrence and an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 27?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "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 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 27. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately. The Executive Committee will meet in Virtual Room 1, Public Utility Committee will meet in Virtual Room 2, and Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee will meet in Virtual Room 3. Thirty minutes later, the Health Care Availability & Accessibility Committee will meet in Virtual Room 1, Revenue & Finance Committee will meet in Virtual Room 2, and the Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools Committee will meet in Virtual Room 3."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Manley for the purposes of an announcement."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Democrats will caucus virtually after committees conclude."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "So, Democrats will caucus... the committees will meet immediately. Democrats will caucus immediately after the committee. Members, we will be returning to the floor for floor action, further action, following committees and following the Democratic Caucus. Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "We are not caucusing."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Republicans shall stand at ease. The House shall stand at recess to the call of the Chair. The House will come to order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 370 and Senate Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 370, also Motion to Concur is Senate Amendment(s) 2 and 3 to House Bill 2778. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 658; and recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 280. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 51. Representative Greenwood, Chairperson from the Committee on Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 1041. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021:

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 217. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 101. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on October 27, 2021: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 for House Bill 1976."

- Speaker Hoffman: "On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1169, Leader Gabel. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Gabel, I will recognize Leader Welter for the purposes of announcement. Leader Welter. Or is this on the Bill or is it..."
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Hoffman: "How long?"

Welter: "An hour."

Speaker Hoffman: "The House Republicans have requested a caucus for the period of approximately one hour. We will reconvene around the hour of 8:34. The House will stand at ease to the call of the Chair. The House will come to order. Going to

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 101, Leader Andrade. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 101, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Andrade, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment 2."

Speaker Hoffman: "Any discussion? Seeing none, Leader Andrade moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 101, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 101 provides language for what Chicago Public Schools wants to establish a local school council and who may serve on the councils. This is an agreed Bill between Chicago Public Schools, the advocates, and CTU. That barely ever happens. This Bill only affects City of Chicago. And it does four things. It allows for seventh and eighth grade student to be a student representative, and it binds the election. Also, it moves the

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

vetting from the staff position from after the election to before the election. And it also allows that schools that have been on probation for five years, they can regain the right to vote on their improvement schedule, improvement plan, and to also vote on the budget. We also have other thing... and it passed out of committee, and there's no opponents to this Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote. We do have the intention of passing this right now because, the reason is, we would like to get this to the Governor's desk because it needs to get to... signed by him by December 6 and... so it can be applied to the next election. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 101, as amended, pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'.

The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Yes. Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "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 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Harris for a Motion. Leader Harris."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move that Representatives Tarver and Halbrook be allowed to participate and vote remotely."

Speaker Hoffman: "We will do both individuals, both Representatives ability to vote remotely in one Motion. The question is, 'Shall Representatives Tarver and Halbrook be

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

allowed to vote remotely?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes',
7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And Representative Tarver
and Representative Halbrook will be able to vote remotely.
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Is Representative Halbrook present?"

Halbrook: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Halbrook is present."

Speaker Hoffman: "On page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 280, Representative Walsh. Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 280, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Walsh on Floor Amendment #2."

Walsh: "I'd like to move to adopt Floor Amendment #2 and debate it on Third Reading."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 280. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 280, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Chairman Walsh."

Walsh: "Is there a Floor Amendment #3 or not? I'm just checking."

Speaker Hoffman: "One moment, Representative."

Walsh: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, the Amendment remains in Rules. Therefore, we will take the Bill, currently, we'll take it out of the record. Out of the record. On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1169, Leader Gabel. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gabel on Floor Amendment #2."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to adopt Amendment 2. I want to adopt Amendment 3."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Floor Amendment #2.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Gabel."
- Gabel: "I'd like to adopt this Amendment and speak on the Amendment on Third."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #3'... apologize. Representative Mazzochi on Floor Amendment #3."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

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

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

Mazzochi: "Leader Gabel, it's my understanding that Floor Amendment 3 that no individuals were able to file witness slips in connection with that. Do you know why that is?"

Gabel: "It went straight to the floor."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, just to be clear... so, when it comes to the over 50 thousand witness slips that were filed for Floor Amendment 2, because the Rules Committee sent this Floor Amendment #3 straight to the floor, that's the reason why nobody was able to file a witness slip, either in favor or in opposition, of your Floor Amendment #3. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Apparently."

Mazzochi: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... vote on this Amendment because it is clearly not been properly vetted by people who have an interest in the outcome."

Gabel: "This Amendment is very similar to Amendment 2."

Mazzochi: "Oh, no, it's not."

Gabel: "Technical... it was just a technical change."

Mazzochi: "No, it's not."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Batinick, are... was that a request for a roll call vote or... the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Halbrook votes 'no'. Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "No."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Morrison votes 'no'."
- Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1169 shall be adopted. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "On this... on this debate, there will be a three-minute time limit. Individuals will be able to give time to other individuals. Leader Gabel on Senate Bill 1169."
- "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1169, House Floor Amendment 3, is a clarification of existing law. As everyone knows, the Health Care Right of Conscience Act was created in 1977 to ensure that health care providers and pharmacists are not required to perform or provide medical treatment, specifically abortion care, against conscience. While the language of the Act is poorly drafted, the legislative intent is not a secret. We have over 40 years of legislative intent to rely on, established on the record, on the floor of the House and the Senate, by both Democrats and Republicans. We know with certainty that this Act exists to preserve the ability of health care providers, including pharmacists, to refuse to perform or provide health services related to abortion and reproductive health care that violate their conscience. In 1977, the House debate made clear that the HCRCA is about abortion and refusing to give advice or counsel concerning the use of contraceptives or any method stopping children from being born, birth control. That's House debate, page 94. Senate debate in 1977 made clear that

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

the Health Care Right of Conscience Act expands previous efforts to include other medical procedures, such sterilization or advice on family planning. Page 377, line 22 to 27. We also know with certainty that the Act is being intentionally distorted by those who favor misinformation over facts. And those who are using this Act to justify their desires to thumb their noses at the mitigation efforts imposed by employers to stop the spread of COVID-19, a deadly virus that has claimed the lives of over 25,682 Illinoisans as of noon yesterday, along with 700 thousand people in this country and 5 million across the world. According to the Attorney General, clarifying the statute will help to ensure that the original legislative intent is preserved. Contrary to rampant misinformation campaigns, this Bill is not a vaccine mandate. In fact, it does not require anyone to do anything. As the Bill itself says, this is simply a declaration of existing law and shall not be construed as a new enactment. addition, the Bill enshrines all federal protections available to anyone, including any civil rights or religious protections. The final sentence of the Act states that, 'Nothing in this Section is intended to affect any right or remedy under federal law.' The Bill before us today simply clarifies the well-established legislative intent of the Health Care Right of Conscience Act. That is all. Anyone who claims otherwise is engaging in the spread of misinformation. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "For discussion, Representative Niemerg. Three minutes."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Niemerg: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Niemerg: "I just have a few, quick questions. What recourse does an individual if have they do not wish to take the COVID vaccine, if this is amended as you so deem fit?"
- Gabel: "Well, contrary to rampant misinformation, this Bill is not a vaccine mandate. In fact, it does not require anyone to do anything. And the Bill says that they have access to what the Federal Laws that are in place now."
- Niemerg: "So, you're saying they have Federal Laws. So, if I decide that I don't want to get the COVID-19 vaccination, if this is passed, I can go to the Federal Law and take that up for what? For a release, a disclosure? How does that process work?"
- Gabel: "You can still request an exemption under a Medical Health,
  Disability Act or a Religious Act for exemption."
- Niemerg: "And what's the time frame on something of that nature with the Federal Government in order to receive that exemption?"
- Gabel: "No, actually it's a form that you fill out and you give to your employer and the employer decides."
- Niemerg: "And what if they don't accept it and they point to the modifications of the Health Care Right to Conscience Act as you want to pass them?"
- Gabel: "The Right of Conscience Act has nothing to do with the Federal Law of religious exemption."
- Niemerg: "So, we're here, in the State of Illinois, talking about the State of Illinois, talking about religious exemptions. I

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

don't know what... how the process would be for the federal level. I look at the Health Care Right of Conscience for everybody in the State of Illinois and they're able to say, here it is. This is... this gives me the exemption. Why would I need to go to the federal level? I just... I don't understand that."

Gabel: "Well, you don't..."

Niemerg: "I think we'd have a better chance of getting struck by lightning in a decent time frame than to hear back from the Federal Government whenever we have an exemption right here in front of us."

Gabel: "Well, you're not going to the Federal Government. You're using the Federal Law. And in this state, we oftentimes use the Federal Law."

Niemerg: "But still, we're here in the State of Illinois. We're in Illinois, and we're talking about religious exemptions in the State of Illinois. But I'll go to the second question. If this is passed as you want it to be, can a school mandate vaccinations for school-age children as amended? Can... will a school be able to do that, just mandate vaccinations for children?"

Gabel: "This law doesn't affect that one way or the other."

Niemerg: "Well, I think it does because, as your Amendment reads, it's a violation related to COVID-19 requirements. It reads, lines 8, 9, and 10, 'It is not a violation of this Act for any person or public official to institute any mitigations they see fit.' I'll go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is absolutely..."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Niemerg: "...atrocious. This is unbelievable that we're considering this on the House Floor. This is not about the Health Care Right of Conscience. This is about the last 18 months of unilateral authority from the Governor. Now, he's asking us to remove the only opposition. The inspector general... or the Attorney General discussed the temporary restraining orders that are ongoing, everything going in the courts. They want to remove this so they can force vaccination on us. I ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan for three minutes."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Morgan: "Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this very simple and straightforward Bill today. I know there are some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are angry. And I get it. I share their anger. I'm angry that COVID still exists. I'm angry that science has been politicized, it's substituted by misinformation and fear. I'm angry about that. I'm angry that people's discomforts and inconvenience with masking and taking COVID tests for purposes of contact tracing... their inconvenience and discomfort is threatening to outweigh the safety of my family and my community. The entire Legislature, this entire Body knows, and there's no dispute, none, that this law was enacted to protect health care professionals who do not want to perform abortions or administer contraceptives. There's no dispute. That is the purpose of this law. This entire Body knows that. That's it, and not one of bit of that changes here. Not one bit. What this law... this law is being bastardized by a few rural courts,

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

jeopardizing our efforts to protect the State of Illinois during an unprecedented, once-in-a-century pandemic that's threatening our health and safety. It would be laughable if it were not so real. Well, the majority will not stand idly by while that happens. This Bill is very simple. Regardless of what you might hear, it's very simple. It closes a loophole in a totally unrelated law that is being exploited to try and end COVID mitigations, COVID masking in schools, and end COVID workplace testing. So, vote 'yes' on this Bill. Vote 'yes' to continue protecting our most vulnerable from COVID-19. Vote 'yes' for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you. I'd ask first for a verification of the vote at the end, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste has requested a verification."

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

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

Ugaste: "Leader, what is the effective date of the Bill as amended?"

Gabel: "There's no stated effective date."

Ugaste: "I'm sorry."

Gabel: "There is no stated effective date."

Ugaste: "So, the Bill that you're running tonight has no effective date. So, it would be effective upon signing, immediately?"

Gabel: "No. It would be effective June 1."

Ugaste: "Okay. So, there's no stated date, but it does have an effective date. It's June 1 of 2022?"

Gabel: "Correct."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Ugaste: "Okay. So, what we're voting on then tonight won't impact anyone concerning this Act until June 1, 2022, correct?" Gabel: "I believe it will clarify the intent of the Legislature." Ugaste: "To the Bill. You know, it's interesting, we're talking about the intent of a legislation and what it was truly meant to say. And yet, I don't recall COVID-19 being around or being mentioned back in the 1970s when this was passed. But either way, this is about religious exemptions. You know, Article I of the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights... the First Amendment, I'm sorry. Not Article I. But the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution says, 'Congress shall make law respecting an establishment of religion, prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' It's one of the basis for the founding of the nation. It's the very first provision in the Bill of Rights. Yet tonight, after 19 months from the start of the pandemic, we're going to address for 7 or 9 months in the future, when we may or may not still be having a problem, when maybe everyone's been vaccinated who can medically be vaccinated, we won't know, we're going to address whether or not someone should be able to exercise their religious beliefs that was so important to the founding fathers of our country that they put it in the first provision of the Bill of Rights. You know, it's amazing what we've seen since this pandemic has started in this state alone, not to mention the nation. We've had increases in suicides. We've had increases in domestic abuse cases. We've had increases in opioid overdoses. We've had our children struggling to learn in schools. And we've had a mental health crisis appear, probably to an extent previously unknown. But not once, not

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

once did we, as a Legislature, come in and do anything to address those issues. We sat back as they unfolded, and we let them unfold without addressing how this state had dealt with the COVID crisis may have affected these very issues. But there was a way. I've had a Bill on file, but we didn't talk about it. But now, 19 months later, we're going to attack those who are holding their religious beliefs close to them. You may not believe they're telling the truth about it. The Governor may not. The employer may not. Whoever it is that's pushing this Bill so hard may not believe that they hold those beliefs that dear. But you don't know that. You don't know what's in their hearts. They aren't telling you what's in your heart. Why are we, as a Legislature, going to take that right away from them? To the prior speaker's..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste, would... Representative Grant would give you additional time."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Be done in a minute. To the prior speaker's statement about keeping people safe. Just because someone holds a religious belief dear doesn't mean they don't want others to be safe. I'd say probably much to the contrary. And as someone who's lost family members in part as a result of the disease we're here addressing, I can tell you that they, I know, would want to make certain that we're upholding and allowing people to maintain their religious beliefs because they cherished the freedoms that this nation had. They were immigrants to this nation and became citizens. And now, we're looking to strip people of that right that they all held so dear. I ask to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Representative Mazzochi."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I remove my mask?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, you may."

Mazzochi: "All right. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Mazzochi: "All right. Leader Gabel, because courts may not be familiar with our rules, do you dispute that for Amendment 2, which you said was the technical predecessor to Amendment 3, there were over 53,280 people who filed witness slips in opposition to your Bill?"

Gabel: "I don't dispute that."

Mazzochi: "All right. Now, Leader Gabel, one of the reasons you stated Illinois needs this legislation was to clarify existing law because people are using the Health Care Right of Conscience Act in a way that wasn't intended. But you do realize that with all of the various Amendments switches you've done here, you're actually muddying the legislative intent that will be applied to your legislation. Do you realize that?"

Gabel: "I don't agree."

Mazzochi: "Well, do you know how courts use the Amendment process when it comes to deciding what is in or what is not within a Bill for purposes of legislative intent?"

Gabel: "The Amendment is clear and it clarifies..."

Mazzochi: "Not against the background of Amendment 2. Well, we'll get to that. Now, you've said that the administration has indicated this Bill was needed to clarify legislative intent. But are you aware that the approach litigants have been taking in court recently is the same interpretation and meaning for

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

this legislation that has been in place for well over a decade when it comes to this Act?"

Gabel: "The courts are still deciding these lawsuits."

Mazzochi: "No, Ma'am. In fact, if you're... well, let me... let's try to get it this way. Are you changing the law or are you just changing, with this Bill, what you believe to be the legislative intent?"

Gabel: "I'm clarifying the legislative intent. It is..."

Mazzochi: "And that's it?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. So, when a court sees this legislation, the court gets to stick with all of the rights that a person had before this Bill? They're just going to know what they think the legislative intent was?"

Gabel: "This doesn't affect any of their other rights under any other laws, particularly under Federal Laws."

Mazzochi: "No, no, no. I'm saying about this Illinois Rights of Conscience Act. So, all we're doing is we're saying, hey, courts, here's a legislative intent you may want to take a look at if you care about legislative intent when you're applying this statute."

Gabel: "We're clarifying that this Bill originally was passed to direct... to impact a very... the health relationship between health care workers and patients."

Mazzochi: "All right. Well, you know what? That's irrelevant because are you aware that, in 2007, the federal courts..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, Representative Stephens would give three minutes."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Mazzochi: "...the federal courts specifically reviewed our Health Care Right of Conscience Act in Vandersand v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 525 F. Supp. 2d 1052, Central District Illinois 2007 and concluded that the courts of Illinois do not need to resort to aids for construction of this Act, such as legislative history, when the language of a statute is clear. Were you aware of that?"
- Gabel: "This law is being used in a way it was not intended, and we are just correcting that."
- Mazzochi: "I'm asking you if you're aware of that court case,

  Leader Gabel."
- Gabel: "I am not aware of that..."
- Mazzochi: "All right. Well, are you aware that in that same case the court held that the language in our Health Care Right of Conscience Act was abundantly clear? And, 'that health care includes any phase of patient care, and specifically includes medication. The court has no need to resort to legislative history to understand the plain meaning of this text.' The court does not need to resort to legislative history to understand that the statute protects any person and that the plaintiff had stated a separate claim under State Law, separate and apart from the Illinois Religious Freedom Restoration Act as well as Federal Law claims. Were you aware of that?"
- Gabel: "Well, I've been informed that that court case was about reproductive rights in a health care setting and..."
- Mazzochi: "Well, was... that's not... but that's not how the federal court interpreted it. The federal court... and so, was that misinformation by the federal court back in 2007 when the

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

federal court wrote what I just quoted? Was it a bastardization of the law?"

Gabel: "No."

Mazzochi: "Okay. Let's talk about an Illinois Appellate Court 4th District decision right here in Sangamon County. Morr-Fitz, Inc. v. Quinn. The court there explained that our Conscience Act was designed to bolster a person's exercise of their rights by, 'offering protections to those who seek not to act in the health care setting.' The court noted that this right not to act was a different kind of right, the right to refrain from acting as compared to instances where people want to act, such as when engaging affirmatively in religious activity under the Illinois Religious Freedom Act. Now, there again, Governor Quinn, much like Governor Pritzker today, arqued that the statute was ambiguous. Asked the court to examine the legislative history to resolve that ambiguity. And the court, again, said no because, 'the statutory language itself, given it's plain and ordinary meaning, is the best indication of legislative intent.' And the court reiterated that when the statutory language is clear ... "

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative."

Mazzochi: "...we will..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, please. Representative Severin will give you his three minutes. And..."

Mazzochi: "...the court reiterated..."

Speaker Hoffman: "...Members... Representative. Members, please keep the volume to a minimum. It's difficult for individuals to hear. Please proceed."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Mazzochi: "The court reiterated that, when the statutory language is clear, we will give it effect without resorting to other aids of construction. Do you know what that means, Leader Gabel?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. Do you know what the court said that means?" Gabel: "Tell me."

Mazzochi: "The court said that means the plain and ordinary meaning of our Right of Conscience Act is that you cannot discriminate against anyone, 'because of such person's conscience refusal to receive, obtain, accept, perform, assist, counsel, suggest, recommend, refer, or participate in any way in any particular form of health care services contrary to his or her conscience.'"

Gabel: "So, that case, again, was in a health care setting."

Mazzochi: "You don't think... you don't think COVID is in a health care setting?"

Gabel: "No, there's... no, this..."

Mazzochi: "Well, Leader Gabel, here's the question. If that is settled law, why do you think this law requires clarification of the legislative intent?"

Gabel: "Because it's being used outside of a health care setting."

Mazzochi: "It's not. The Morr... in fact, the Morr-Fitz v. Quinn decision continues and, again, I'll quote it. I'll leave out the citations. 'The Conscience Act, instead, states that personnel or entities may not be discriminated against or punished civilly or criminally if they make a conscience-based... conscience-based decision not to comply.' And the court continued that the Governor could not enforce his

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

administrative rules against the plaintiff. So, let's turn to your Amendments and how and why they're taking away rights and making the legislative intent less, not more, clear. Now, one thing you want to have happen with this Bill is that you will want a court to look at this legislative history now, in 2021, when interpreting the Illinois Right of Conscience, right?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. But the courts have already said they think our existing statutory language is crystal clear. And they don't need to go behind the statute and look at any further legislative intent. True? That's what the prior court decisions have said."

Gabel: "It's being... it's being appealed."

Mazzochi: "No, no, no. I'm talking about prior court decisions.

They're done, the two that I just mentioned. Those are done,
2007."

Gabel: "Oh, those were in health care settings. They didn't apply in this kind of a situation at all. Those were long before what we're facing right now."

Mazzochi: "That's actually not true if you look at the crystal clear language of the statute, which already applies to private sector actors, employers in private settings. Not necessarily a health care employer. But let's assume that the court is going to actually look at the legislative intent for your Bill, SB1169. You agree that SB1169 was originally a Bill about making it easier for kids with IEPs to get access to career and technical education, right?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McLaughlin gives the Representative three minutes."

Mazzochi: "Do you know? You don't know. All right. Well, that's what it said. So, that had nothing to do with the Health Care Right of Conscience Act. Now, House Amendment 1 to SB1169 also had nothing to do with the Health Care Right of Conscience Act either, right? It was just a shell?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. So, the first time we actually saw any substance for the Health Care Right of Conscience Act was with Amendment #2, and now you've got Amendment #3. Let's talk about some of the differences in the language between Amendment 3 and Amendment 2 to SB1169. One of the first changes you made between Amendments 2 and 3 is that Amendment 3, page 2, lines 1 to 2. Do you have that?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. Now, the original language in Amendment 2 in a comparable position read, 'It is not a violation of this Act to enforce such measures or requirements, including by terminating employment or excluding individuals from a school, a place of employment, or public or private premises in response to noncompliance.' True?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. Now, in Amendment 3, you keep the language,
'It is not a violation of this Act to enforce such measures
or requirements.' Yes?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. But what you did do was eliminate the language of, 'including by terminating employment or

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

excluding individuals from a school, a place of employment, or public or private premises in response to noncompliance', right?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "What was your intent when you took out the example of terminating employment?"

Gabel: "We listened to the feedback in committee and we wanted to
 respond to that."

Mazzochi: "And... okay. Explain that further. What feedback? So... so, now are you saying that..."

Gabel: "You were in committee."

Mazzochi: "...nobody can be... nobody can have their employment terminated in connection with any refusal in connection with any COVID-19 related issues?"

Gabel: "Federal Law still applies."

Mazzochi: "Right. Under State Law? Do you know? Or is your staff member just trying to tell you. Maybe you should let her have the microphone."

Gabel: "This is... this law does not determine if someone can be terminated or not."

Mazzochi: "All right. Well, your original Amendment too, though, was being pretty transparent that your Bill would let an employer fire someone for not doing whatever that employer wanted with regard to COVID-19, right?"

Gabel: "They can do that now."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, under... even with your Amendment 3, you think an employer can still fire someone for not doing whatever that employer wants in regards to COVID-19, right?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Gabel: "Even if this law had never existed, employers already can and already do set their own employee protocols regarding workplace safety."

Mazzochi: "Right. And before your..."

Gabel: "Including measures intending to stop the spread of COVID-19."

Mazzochi: "Right. And before your legislation, if an employer did that and an employee thought..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative."

Mazzochi: "...you were going too far... or the employer was going too far, they could sue using this Act, the Right of Conscience Act, right?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, this will be the final three minutes that will be allotted to you."

Mazzochi: "You can't make that decision, Speaker. I object to that."

Speaker Hoffman: "I just did. Representative, the final three minutes."

Mazzochi: "It's abusive."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please... please bring your remarks to a close."

Mazzochi: "Do you know the answer to that?"

Gabel: "So, that's true, regardless."

Mazzochi: "All right. And when it comes to ... "

Gabel: "That's being..."

Mazzochi: "...and when it comes to schools, you're also not being as transparent. Are you aware that a court can now say that because you took those provisions out from Amendment 2 to Amendment 3, then based on the feedback you said you got at committee, that those things are actually off the table? That,

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

in fact, people can still continue to use this law to object to those things by saying those are still rights of conscience. You thought you were going to keep them in, now you're taking them out."

Gabel: "Well, I disagree. All Federal Laws still apply."

Mazzochi: "No, no, no. You don't understand how State Laws are going to get applied and how the courts actually use legislative intent. Well, let me go to the Bill since the Speaker is prematurely cutting me off."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "I met a very nice lady as a pancake breakfast in my district. And when she and I talked, I asked her, 'Are you vaccinated?' She said, 'Yes.' 'So, do you think other people should get vaccinated?' She said, 'Yes.' I asked her, 'But do you think kids shouldn't be allowed to go to school unless they get vaccinated?' And her answer was, 'Oh, no.' I asked her, 'Do you think government should be forcing people to get vaccinated if they refuse or if it violates their right of conscience, or that their employer should be forcing that?' And she said, 'No.' She intuitively understood what over 53 thousand people and counting, who filled out witness slips against this Bill, are trying to tell the Governor and this Legislative Body, government is supposed to persuade, not force. Government is supposed to respect and protect our civil liberties, not disregard them. And that is because we are citizens, not subjects. If we're going to say that there are health care services that are so important that we need to mandate them, spit it out, say it plainly, and enact it into law using the regular legislative process. And then every

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

single one of us can be accountable to the people back in our districts for the vote that we took. What we don't do is destroy the separation of powers, let an Executive Order or even an executive threat become the equivalent of the legislative process. And then take away the very remedy that the little guy, the powerless, the poor, the people have against government administrative and corporate overreach when it comes to medical rights of conscience. Let's also be clear that, in this state, this is an unprecedented effort to backdoor a vaccination mandate without any lines of accountability, including at the Legislature, and without any escape valve for religious liberty. Every other vaccine mandate we have in the State of Illinois is specific, limited, was passed by the Legislature after years of conclusive scientific proof of beneficial outcomes, and they all still allow for religious exemption or independent proof of immunity to satisfy the statute. You haven't even offered a reasonableness or scientific efficacy standard for what you're doing here. If you were being scientific, you'd be testing everyone. For example, converging congregate care facilities. Because according to the September 16, 2021 New England Journal of Medicine, vaccinated health care workers with breakthrough infections, even though they may have had mild symptoms, they had high viral loads and had prolonged viral shedding for up to 32 days after diagnosis. But the Governor is not saying that in the ... even in his state facilities, he's not making those people test. So, so much for following science. This legislation is designed to lead to absurd results where you can let an employer or any person

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

employed by any unit of government in the State of Illinois force a person to do things, even things your doctor thinks is medically contraindicated, wrong, or harmful. And tonight, your 'yes' vote means you've denied them a remedial claim. They get nothing in a court of law. That is contrary to the legislative intent of our Right of Conscience Act. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Members, once again, an announcement. This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers the nose and mouth, except for when necessary for eating or drinking. Members may remove their face covering when speaking on the microphone at their desk. Again, please remember to wear a face covering as pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Davidsmeyer: "All right. We had a very long question and answer in committee. I'm going to run through a few of these, and I'm going to hope to get through them fairly quickly. So, you're saying... are you trying to clarify the law or are you actually changing the law to add COVID?"

Gabel: "First... first let me respond to the last speaker. I just want everyone to be very clear..."

Davidsmeyer: "No. No, no, no. This is my time. I asked you a question, please."

Gabel: "...that this Bill is not a vaccine mandate."

Davidsmeyer: "It..."

Gabel: "It does not change..."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Davidsmeyer: "...it just gives a mandate. So, I'm going to go to the Bill 'cause obviously I'm not going to get to... get these questions answered."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "So, this specifically uses the term COVID because it's trying to scare people into thinking that without this we can't encourage vaccines. They're saying that this could require the flu shot. It could require HPV. It could require hepatitis vaccine. It could require the AIDS vaccine. Because they're saying this does not apply to the individual decision. This only applies to a doctor making the decision for you or a pharmacist making the decision for you. And I hope people on that side are listening a little bit. I understand you probably already made up your decisions, but think about this. We're talking about individual decisions. Okay? So, I kind of want to go back to clarify that this is not a clarification of the law because, back when this law originally went through, Phil Rock in the Senate said that an individual can refuse treatment and this Act does not take this away. So, I want you to go back and review that because Phil Rock specifically said that this does not take away that individual decision. In... in committee, the Governor's people focused on a business liability. They weren't worried about the individual decision, the individual freedom. They were worried about a liability of a business if they force their employees to do this and something bad happens. They were worried... more worried about the business or the State of Illinois, for instance, than they were about the individual decision to make an individual health care choice. Now,

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

individuals have to be allowed to make their own health care decisions. They have to be given this opportunity. We have a vaccine that... I probably need a little more time. So..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, Representative Keicher gives you three minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Representative Keicher. You're the best. So, individual decision. We have a vaccine that has been in the... on the market for what? Maybe a year. It was approved under emergency decision by the FDA under political pressure. And then the Pfizer, which there's an argument whether that was actually approved or if it was a new vaccine. So, in America, is the Pfizer vaccine even approved by the FDA? I don't believe it is. I think it's the (unintelligible), or whatever it is, vaccine. So, we are going to force somebody to take a vaccine that hasn't been around very long. And let me clarify this for everybody... and I know not a lot of people are listening, but I'm going to get pretty loud because nobody's listening. I want you to know... I want you to know that people have come into my office and said they get the flu shot every year. They get the flu shot every year, but they are concerned about this vaccine 'cause it hasn't been around for very long. Right? We are going to force people to make a decision between their livelihood, between taking care of their families, and taking care of their individual health. This is absolutely insane. These are not anti-vaxxers. Now, are there some people out there that are anti-vaxxers? Certainly there are. But there are individuals who have come into my office who have said, 'I get the flu shot every single year.' And you said they're stupid. Right? They're stupid to

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

be worried about their own health care because they don't trust their government. Right? Government has made a lot of horrible decisions. Look past... look in the history of the United States. Have they ever forced people to take vaccines? Have they? Anybody? Yes, they have. Have they had adverse effect... results on those individuals? Yes, they have. You're forcing people to take a vaccine that they don't want to be forced to take. And I've gone to the... I have gone to the Governor's people and I have specifically said, 'Look, I will encourage my constituents to get this vaccine, but they have to be able to do it on their own timeline.' But your mandate is making them dig in their heels and say no. They have to be able to make this decision without being threatened. Right? Without being threatened with their livelihood. So, please, please think about individual decisions. I know you're worried about fear and all these things, but if you have the vaccine, you should be protected. We have to think about other people and their decisions. I know you want to force other people to do this, but I think they will. I think they will come along and I think they'll realize that the vaccine is safe. But they have to be allowed to do it in their own time. So, please, please allow these individuals to make this decision. And it shouldn't be the government's decision, first off. It should be an individual decision on what they do for their individual health care. With that, I want to encourage a 'no' vote, to vote for individual freedom, not for government mandates. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Representative Hammond." Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Hammond: "I firmly believe that the COVID-19 virus is real. It is absolutely real. I personally am also convinced of the source of this virus, but my opinion on that is not important in this discussion. I also believe that this vaccine did not appear overnight. In fact, I know for a fact, having spoken with a Dr. Peter Hotez from Texas Christian that this vaccine has been in the works since the SARS outbreak of 2003. And the reason for that is because, when SARS outbreak appeared in 2003, many people were firmly convinced that the source of this outbreak would continue with other outbreaks and, in fact, they were right because now we have COVID-19. In a year or 2, or 10, we may have something else. And I pray that those same scientists that have been working on this since 2003 are working on another vaccine that will help us in the future. For myself, personally, I am fully vaccinated. I will also get a booster shot when it's appropriate time. But that is my choice. I have made that decision. Many of my constituents do not share my belief, and I respect them for that. We talk about misinformation. This is not misinformation. Let's give people credit for having individual rights and deciding what they think is right for their body. This is not how this Act was intended. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a couple questions, please?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicated she'll yield."

McCombie: "Thank you. Representative, is the point of your Bill to protect the people of Illinois?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Gabel: "Yes."

McCombie: "For clarification, again, I think Representative Ugaste mentioned it, the effective date is June 1 of 2022. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Correct."

McCombie: "How many votes is required of passage of this Bill with that effective date?"

Gabel: "It's a parliamentarian question."

McCombie: "You don't know how many votes you need this evening?"

Gabel: "I believe it's 60."

McCombie: "Yes, thank you. How many votes would be required for the passage of this Bill if it was effective immediately?"

Gabel: "Seventy-one."

McCombie: "Thank you. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

McCombie: "If this Bill was truly about protecting the people of Illinois, we would be having an effective date immediately. We would not be waiting 7 months, 216 days from today, if this was really about protecting the people of Illinois. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Leader Wheeler."

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

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

Wheeler: "Leader Gabel, you and I had a discussion in committee yesterday. And I had asked you questions based on what one of the witnesses, Mr. Gilligan, had brought forth about the broadness of the language in this Bill. I want to just point out to you, again, that this message... or what's in the Bill specifically refers to, literally, any person or public

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

official for any public or private association, agency, corporation, entity, institution, or employer to take any measures or impose any requirements, including, but not limited to, any measures or requirements that involve the provision of services by a physician or health care personnel, again not limited to that, intended to prevent the contraction or transmission of COVID-19. Why is this written so broadly?"

Gabel: "It mirrors the language in the Health Care Right of Conscience Act."

Wheeler: "Okay. Well, where in the Health Care Right of Conscience does it give us any definitions about the prevention of contraction or... the contraction or for transmission of COVID-19?"

Gabel: "I know, but the beginning part does."

Wheeler: "That's in the beginning part of the Health Care Right of Conscience Act?"

Gabel: "It doesn't need a definition. It speaks for itself."

Wheeler: "I'm sorry. I can't understand what you're saying because you have a mask on."

Gabel: "It speaks for itself. It doesn't need a definition."

Wheeler: "Wow. That's amazing because I know doctors that disagree about how we could approach..."

Gabel: "Mitigation of COVID-19, they disagree?"

Wheeler: "About how it could be contracted, how we could prevent transmission."

Gabel: "Really?"

Wheeler: "I'm not a misinformation person. I know you know that, but I have had discussion with people that disagree, that are

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

reasonable people, about what we could or should do. Other countries disagree with our approach."

Gabel: "I thought that..."

Wheeler: "Other states disagree with our approach. We aren't absolutely perfect."

Gabel: "I thought the medical community is pretty clear about what we can do."

Wheeler: "I wish I could understand you more clearly."

Gabel: "I think the medical community is very clear about what we can do for mitigation."

Wheeler: "Well, I guess that could lead to the next part of my question. Since we're not putting any thresholds in here, anyone can interpret that any way they want to because we're not asking for medical personnel to be involved. Anyone can be making these decisions."

Gabel: "I'm not clear about your question."

Wheeler: "Okay. Well, again, you put a 'not limited to' clause in here. So, everything that I said means that anyone can interpret this any which way that they so choose and not be subject to Health Care Right of Conscience, with respect to any definition that they choose of COVID-19 transmission or contraction and any way that that can be prevented by intention. I mean, this is really broad."

Gabel: "I disagree. I don't think it's very broad at all. It's
 very specific."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader, Representative Luft will give you three minutes."

Wheeler: "Appreciate that. Thank you. Leader Gabel, we're going to move on because we had this discussion yesterday, and it's

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

about the same as it is right now. I want to talk to you about... you said that many times, both yesterday and today, that if someone has an objection to the vaccine for whatever reason, they can still use the Federal Law that applies, correct?"

Gabel: "If their... if their employer is requiring it, yes. This is not a mandate to anyone. Employers..."

Wheeler: "It's a restriction of a right."

Gabel: "No."

Wheeler: "Okay."

Gabel: "It's clarifying the intent of the Health Care Right of Conscience Act."

Wheeler: "Okay. Which also includes the patient, not just the provider. And we're talking about the patient in this case. The patient's choosing, for a reason of their own conscience, not to participate in a vaccine, correct?"

Gabel: "It clarifies when this Act can be..."

Wheeler: "That's what people are... the 50 thousand plus people who responded to your witness slips yesterday, that's their impression. That's their feeling about this."

Gabel: "That's their impression. Correct. But..."

Wheeler: "Not yours."

Gabel: "...they're... they're misrepresenting this law."

Wheeler: "Well, now I beg to differ. I really do. I guess my question was going to be, if Federal Law still applies, then what's the absolute need for this? Why is this so important?"

Gabel: "Because it's being improperly misused."

Wheeler: "So, because they have a conscience?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Gabel: "No, because it's being applied in the context of employers and employees. And this law, the intent of this law, was to be used in the health care setting between the providers and patients."

Wheeler: "Is a vaccine not a form of health care?"

Gabel: "It can be... but that... no. It's a... what was the question? Please restate your question."

Wheeler: "Is a vaccine not a form of health care?"

Gabel: "Yes, but employer and employees are not."

Wheeler: "Employers and employees are not subject to health care?

They don't get health... what are you saying?"

Gabel: "They are not... you know, the Bill, as I've stated a number of times, the Health Care Right of Conscience was established to protect health care providers who do not want to provide abortion or other reproductive care services."

Wheeler: "That was... okay. Is there a section in the Health Care
Right of Conscience Act that says that patients have a right
to object to treatment?"

Gabel: "I don't think so. I don't think so. It's not... it's for the... it's for the health care provider, not the patient. The patient is trying to get a service that the health care provider does not want to provide."

Wheeler: "I don't... I think that this is absolutely incorrect."

Gabel: "I disagree."

Wheeler: "Well, I'm going to read it to you here in a minute once we find it. So, you... to be crystal clear, you don't believe there's any part of the Health Care Right of Conscience Act that protects the patient? It is only meant to protect a health care provider?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meier, would you be willing to give the three minutes?"
- Gabel: "That's not what I said."
- Wheeler: "Okay. Then please restate what you said because that's how you answered the question I asked."
- Gabel: "The intention of this Bill was to clarify that the Health Care Right of Conscience Act was to apply for... to health care providers to... and allow them not to provide abortion or reproductive right care if they don't want to."
- Wheeler: "So, when I read this, it is the public policy of the State of Illinois to respect and protect the right of a conscience, of conscience, right of conscience, of all persons who refuse to obtain, receive, or accept, or are engaged in the... and arrangement for and payment of health care services. I believe that talks about a patient. They're refusing to obtain, receive, or accept treatment."
- Gabel: "Well, I believe people are using this as a loophole to get out of protections that their providers... that their employers are requiring."
- Wheeler: "Let's repeat the point here. Protect the right of conscience of all persons who refuse to obtain, receive, or accept. That's a patient issue. That's in the current Act."
- Gabel: "In relationship to reproductive health."
- Wheeler: "Really? What part of it is in there? 'Cause I'm looking at... 745 ILCS 70/2, blah, blah, blah, paragraph 2302. If you can point out to me where it says that in there, I'd be grateful. I don't see it."
- Gabel: "I believe that the original intent of that... of the Bill was not to apply in this type of setting."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Wheeler: "Well, I have some incredible news here. What we write in the Bill matters. Not what we say on the floor. That helps, but this is pretty clear. This is actually very clear that people expect a right. They have a right, right now. They have a right, and this Bill effectually changes that right when it comes to COVID-19. So, I'm going to move on here to the last thing I wanted to say. I asked you this yesterday, and I got no response. So, I'm going to ask it again. A young woman in my district went to her employer who was part of our government. She's a public servant. She's a young woman with a great future in front of her, beginning her career. She wants certainty about what she can expect from her job. We're telling her that she has to get vaccinated. She talks to her doctor. Her doctor says, well, I can't absolutely guarantee there'll be long-term side effects from the vaccine. So, she has a conscience issue. She wants to start a family. She wants to do other things in life, things that we can't absolutely quarantee. I wish we could. So, we're giving her, effectively, a choice 'cause we're taking this right, in effect, away. It's her choices. She can continue her employment and she can feed herself and her family or she has to take this vaccine. What am I supposed to tell her?"

Gabel: "We're not taking anyone's rights away."

Wheeler: "Okay, but..."

Gabel: "This is between her and her employer."

Wheeler: "You've got to read the whole Act. The Act has a right in it. I read it to you twice. It's a right, and you're negating that right with this Amendment to this Act. So, clearly, you don't have an answer for her question. Her

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

question's valid. She's a public servant. She's not spreading misinformation. She's not an anti-vaxxer. She has a real concern. Her conscience is heavy. I want to support her. I want to support her right. I'm going to go to the Bill."

Gabel: "If she has a religious objection, she can apply." Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Wheeler: "Ladies and Gentlemen, our job here is to protect the public, to promote public safety, while we protect people's rights. This Health Care Right of Conscience is real, it exists today, and it protects patients. What we're doing today negates part of that. We're creating fear in our state unnecessarily. I want people to realize this has more unintended consequences based on how broadly this Bill is drafted and what its intent is. And I have true concerns about the fact that this is a clarification of existing law, which means that they're going to say we're going to pass it with 60 votes. It won't go into effect until June. But since it's a clarification, hey, you know what, that counts for right now. I have real concerns about this. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Leader Welter."

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Welter: "We have continued to hear tonight from the Sponsor this is not about vaccine mandates. This is simply not true. We would not be here today discussing this Bill in this manner if that was not the case. I've had COVID. I've been fully vaccinated. When our community was looking for vaccinations, I reached out to the Governor's Office, coordinated with him and his administration, and we launched one of the largest

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

mass vaccination sites in our area. Prioritizing educators and frontline workers and assuring that our community was safe. But you know, at that time, the vaccine was optional for these workers. They weren't being forced or mandated, and we were encouraging them and we're getting a lot of people out there. I've sat with frontline workers. You know, the people that we recently held in such high regard as heroes during the beginning of this pandemic. But now, we're willing to take their livelihoods away from them. It just doesn't make sense to me. They're pleading with me to stand up for them. Stand up for their individual medical decisions that they want to make for themselves and their families. Some of these people have used this law to save their livelihoods, to provide for their family. These are good, honest people trying to make a living while exercising the rights that they hold so dear under Illinois law. Mothers, fathers, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, all people. You get my point. This Bill strips the rights that may afford them under the existing law. Let individuals make their own health care decisions without the threat of losing their livelihood, folks. I strongly urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Swanson."

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

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

Swanson: "Thank you. I see you now. So, I've got a question and I... a scenario that many of us probably have received phone calls from our constituents in our areas, and I'd like to know what responses I can give these constituents. And it's about the rights. We all, most likely, have reactions. We,

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

most likely, have constituents in our districts that have reactions to vaccines, or they have an immune system that's deficient and they cannot have a vaccine. What... how can they request an exemption. By putting... by closing these so-called loopholes... sometimes loopholes are good and protects some of these people..."

Gabel: "Well, under..."

Swanson: "...but what... what can I tell them?"

Gabel: "Under the American with Disabilities Act, they can apply for a medical exemption."

Swanson: "So, thank you for that answer, but let's talk about that... let's talk about that teacher or that other employer who those rights have stripped away too. But..."

Gabel: "Their rights are not stripped away."

Swanson: "Well, I don't know how many of you in your districts have had teachers and people quit their jobs because of the vaccine mandates, but several in my district have. Let's go back to my initial question. I just wanted to get that comment out there. So, the American Disabilities Act..."

Gabel: "Yes."

Swanson: "...will allow an exemption for those with an autoimmune deficiency. Is that what you're saying?"

Gabel: "Yes. Yes. They can apply under that... under that Act."

Swanson: "Does an employer have to take that? Are they... are they mandated to take that exemption?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Swanson: "Okay. So, we've got this on the record that I can show employers that I've been told that they can and should accept that?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Gabel: "Yes."

Swanson: "Okay. Anybody need 45 seconds? Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative

Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

"Representative, you've said very plainly that the Reick: legislative intent for this Bill was to protect the right of conscience of providers in cases of abortion. You said that, and you've admitted that on the floor. Now, my colleague over here has also proven, by reading the statute, that this also applies to patients, not just providers. The cases that have been cited... decided using this law as justification for finding for the plaintiffs are subject to appeal. Do you agree with... well, I can't ask you that ... are subject to appeal. And if what you're saying is that the intent of this Bill is plainly to protect the rights of conscience of those who provide abortion and contraceptive services, then these cases probably will be overturned on appeal based upon examination of that very same legislative intent. therefore, it undercuts the reason... that's one undercutting of the reason why we need this Bill to begin with. You also stated that now we're down to 60 votes. So, this Bill cannot go into effect until July 1 of 2022. If that's the case, why are we doing this instead of having a fresh Bill with its own Bill number under the exemptions code that we can put in there that deals specifically with COVID that could be enacted as early as January, if we come back here, put it through, ram it through the Senate, and then get the Governor to sign it?

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

To me, that's a much more expedient way of handling what you consider to be the emergency that has to be done in this Bill. But the biggest problem I see ... the biggest problem I see with this Bill is the fact that it sticks a camel's nose under the tent flap. If the right of conscience is as precious to you as you have indicated that it is, that that right of conscience is going to be protected throughout, regardless of whether COVID... and it's only because of COVID. What you're doing is you're sticking a camel's nose under the tent flap in the form of a precedent that, somewhere down the road, another reason could pop up for us to go into the right of conscience and find a way to erode, or prohibit, or restrict it. I think that what you're doing here is not so much trying to protect the health of... of the people of the State of Illinois as you are trying to further undercut the precious liberties that are embound up in the Right of Conscience Act. This is a special Act. This is a special Act. It's one that provides... whose underpinning is specifically based upon the right of conscience through religious and other deeply held beliefs. I think you're running a very big danger here of creating a precedent that someday may be used to permanently erode those precious gifts that we have from our founders and from God. You are creating a danger to a Bill that has a special place in our laws. You shouldn't be doing that. This Bill can be rectified in January. If there's still a problem with it, we can vote on it in January and we can move on. This is a Trojan horse. This is a Trojan horse. And I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

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

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

Caulkins: "Representative, you claim that this is a loophole in the law. Is it your interpretation, the Governor's interpretation, that people are using a loophole in this law, the Right of Conscience Act?"

Gabel: "That the Act is being used incorrectly."

Caulkins: "You've said it before, this is a loophole. This is being used by individuals as a loophole, using a loophole in this law."

Gabel: "Yes. It's being used as a loophole. It's being used as a loophole."

Caulkins: "Yes. So, if there's a question about this, shouldn't this be settled in the courts? Shouldn't... we have cases all over the State of Illinois challenging this law. Shouldn't the courts decide, is this a loophole? Is this the intent of the law? Or are you trying to circumvent these court cases, trying to protect the Governor's position on mandating vaccines?"

Gabel: "This will be settled in the courts. This is our attempt to make sure that the courts understand our intent."

Caulkins: "It's your intent."

Gabel: "Our intent, the Legislature."

Caulkins: "But it wasn't the intent of the people that drafted this Bill, originally."

Gabel: "Clearly it was."

Caulkins: "Well, we've... it's been..."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Gabel: "It's only been used... it's only ever been used around the issues of reproductive rights for health care providers and protection..."

Caulkins: "Well, Ma'am, maybe there's an unintended consequence back when they drafted and passed this Bill. Maybe there was something in this Bill that now we're faced with during this pandemic, that this unintended consequences that individuals could use this right of conscience to not be mandated to take a vaccine. And shouldn't this be left to the courts to decide?"

Gabel: "It will be decided by the courts."

Caulkins: "No, you're trying to decide it here tonight."

Gabel: "No, we're trying to clarify the intent."

Caulkins: "You're trying to... you're trying to force your version of what the intent of the original Bill was."

Gabel: "We're clarifying the intent."

Caulkins: "Were you here when they drafted and did the original Bill?"

Gabel: "No, I was not. You were not. None of us were, but..."

Caulkins: "Well, somebody was."

Gabel: "None of us were, but Mary... I don't know. I don't think Mary was there. But clearly, it's been... the way that it's been implemented over the last 40 years, the intent is clear."

Caulkins: "But this is an initiative of the Governor. This is an initiative of the Governor to respond to the uprising, as he calls it, to the charlatans or whatever, that people that don't want... that don't want to take this vaccine, they have a health related, I guess, belief that they shouldn't take

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- this vaccine. The Governor's not happy about it. He's not happy about being in court and he wants..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins... Representative Frese, would you give him three minutes? Representative Caulkins, you are the second to last speaker, then Representative Batinick. Please proceed."
- Caulkins: "Thank you. Thank you very much. So, isn't this a way to get around these court cases?"
- Gabel: "No. It's to clarify the intent of the..."
- Caulkins: "But isn't that what the courts are going to do, is to clarify the intent? The legal branch, the third branch of government that settles these disputes. Why aren't we letting them do their job and let the chips fall where they may? If this is such an emergency, if this is not what this Bill ever intended, why not let the courts settle this?"
- Gabel: "They're going to be clarifying the intent based on...
  they're going to be looking to us to see what we do as well."
  Caulkins: "So, you're trying to influence the court's decision?"
  Gabel: "We're trying to clarify the intent of this Act."
- Caulkins: "No. You're trying to pass a Bill to influence the decision of the Judicial Branch. You weren't here. We weren't here. This Bill was passed many, many years ago. And now, because of this, because of the court challenges and the interpretation of this Bill by so many people in this state, you want to change or impose your side's interpretation, 60 of you tonight, or however many, to change the interpretation of what this Bill is and circumvent the court."
- Gabel: "No. We're basing it on the 40 years of experience we have with this law."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Caulkins: "What... I'm sorry."

Gabel: "We're basing the clarification on the 40 years of experience we have had with the Health Care Right of Conscience Act."

Caulkins: "Well, we haven't had COVID for 40 years."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins..."

Caulkins: "Yes."

Speaker Hoffman: "...would you mind going to the Bill?"

Caulkins: "Yes, I do mind, but I will. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Caulkins: "This Bill is an attempt by the administration to circumvent the courts. We have many, many cases all around this state of people who have taken their right of conscience to a court to decide their fate. This is an end run around the Judicial Branch. We shouldn't be doing it. This isn't going to help things. It's not going to make anyone any safer. And all it's going to do is make people dig in their heels and be more resistant to taking this vaccine. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The final speaker, Leader Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Hey, Representative. I think I started the day when we took roll by saying today, October 27, is actually National Cranky Co-Worker Day. I think some of us are getting cranky here. But I wanted to clarify... clarify a couple of things you stated. I think you stated that the medical community is clear on these issues. Is that correct, earlier?"

Gabel: "On mitigations?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Batinick: "Yes."

Gabel: "Pretty clear."

Batinick: "Okay. What does the CDC recommend on masking? I might know a little bit about masking, by the way. I get lots of emails on it. Some of them aren't too happy with me. But what does the CDC recommend on masking?"

Gabel: "I..."

Batinick: "Ages two and up, right?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. What does the World Health Organization recommend on masking?"

Gabel: "I'm assuming the same."

Batinick: "No, they're not. It's 12 and up. Other countries, if you've had COVID, you get one shot. In our country, if you're 12, you get two shots. Other countries, for kids, they're doing one shot."

Gabel: "I don't know which vaccines they're using in other countries."

Batinick: "Well, they're using Pfizer. They're using... some of them... but the point is pretty clear. We can simply go back to the masks that... the medical community is anything but clear on this issue. Let me ask you another question. Do you think a six year old is better served by getting COVID naturally, when they're much less at risk at it, as opposed to getting a vaccine and not getting the full immunity for it that might affect them for the rest of their life? How do you feel on that?"

Gabel: "I'm not a doctor."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Batinick: "Right, and we're voting on this Bill. I'm going to go to the Bill. The medical community is anything but clear on this. This isn't about this Bill. There were 50 thousand witness slips filed because we haven't done our job for 20 month debating all these nuances. I talked about it in a press conference last week. My wife teaches a kindergartener that's forced to wear a mask that has autism, and it is not in the best interest for that child in that situation to be wearing that. But we have refused, for nearly two years, to do our jobs. Things aren't black and white, and people back home are hanging on to this Bill. They're hanging on to this Act because we're not acting. They can't come to us. You guys have to say the same thing. Well, it's the Governor's Executive Order. We're not debating it. That's what this is about. The people that are upset at school board meetings, the people that filed the witness slips, the people that are going into places that I wouldn't go would be less upset if their Legislators, the people whose office they can go into and talk to, were actually having very clear debate on these nuance situations. But we want to do a one-size-fits-all and this is the last hope they have. Let's not take the last hope that these people have and let's vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, before we go to the closing by the Sponsor, is Mr. Tarver on the roll? Representative Tarver."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Tarver present?"

Tarver: "I'm present."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver is present. Representative Tarver, could you go on video once more? And say you're present."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Tarver, please say you're present. Representative Tarver's present. Leader Gabel to close."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this Bill before us today simply clarifies the well-established legislative intent of the Health Care Right of Conscience Act. That is all. It is not a mandate. We are not mandating anything. We are not requiring anyone to do anything new. As the Bill itself says, it's merely a declaration of existing law and not a new enactment. It remains the case that the Bill enshrines all federal protections available to anyone, including any civil rights or religious protections. Very narrow, related to COVID-19, and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Members, Representative Ugaste has requested a verification. Please vote your own switches and remain in your seats. The questions is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1169 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Halbrook votes 'no'.

Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Morrison votes 'no'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Yes."

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question... Mr. Clerk, Mr. Ugaste has asked for a verification. Please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Andrade; Representative Avelar; Representative Buckner; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Collins; Representative Conroy; Representative Costa Representative Crespo; Representative Croke; Representative Davis; Representative Delgado; Representative Representative Evans; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Representative Gonzalez; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Representative Barbara Hernandez; Representative Lisa Hernandez; Representative Hirschauer; Representative Hoffman; Representative Jones; Representative LaPointe; Representative Lilly; Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Mason; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Moylan; Representative Representative Ness; Representative Nichols; Representative Representative Ramirez; Representative Representative Robinson; Representative Scherer; Slaughter; Representative Representative Smith;

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Stoneback; Representative Stuart; Representative Tarver; Representative Vella; Representative Walker; Representative Representative Representative West; Ann Representative Jawaharial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yang Rohr; Representative Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Gong-Gershowitz. Oh, there she is. Okay. And... is
Representative Ness present? There she is. Okay. All right,
withdrawn."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste has withdrawn his verification. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Concurrence, appears... appears House Bill 370, Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with House Bill 370, Senate Floor Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 370, also known as the Youth Health and Safety Act, does three important things. First, it reaffirms Illinois' commitment to the fundamental principle that every person has the right to make their own reproductive health care decisions, without interference. The Bill also creates a bipartisan working group focused on pregnant and parenting youth and youth who may become pregnant

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

or parents. It ... the working group will identify existing and needed resources for pregnant and parenting youth in the areas of education, housing, employment, trafficking, food access, and child care. It will also provide information and resources related to access for health care for minors and resources and tools that support and encourage healthy communication between young people and their parents and their support systems. Ten of the twenty-four working group members will be young people who can speak directly to the issues affecting them and provide expertise about how to engage their peers. The final... the final element of the legislation is that it repeals the dangerous force notification law that has been in place in Illinois since 1995 but has only been enforced since 2013. The reason for repeal is many. The vast majority of young people voluntarily tell a parent about an unplanned pregnancy. And those who cannot tell a parent, often involve other family members or trusted adults. The minority of young people who are not able to talk to their parents have serious reasons for not doing so, such as fear of physical or emotional abuse, loss of financial support or homelessness, fear of being forced to give birth against their will, or serious family problems such a as parent who is sick or in prison. Illinois law permits pregnant minors to make all other medical decisions without involving a parent or going to court. A pregnant minor can decide independently whether to continue the pregnancy and give birth, consent to medical care such as cesarean section, or place the child up for adoption. Every leading medical organization opposes forced parental involvement laws, including the American Medical

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Society for Adolescent Medicine, and the American Public Association. This... as mentioned before, the last element of this Bill, which is repeal of the Parental Notification Act, was originally passed in 1995 but has only been enforced since 2003... 13. Since then, over 500 young women have been forced to endure a traumatizing judicial bypass process in order to access reproductive health care in Illinois. And we know that that process creates an unfair and dangerous burden on these young women. We also know that the vast majority of young people who face an unwanted pregnancy involve a parent or trusted loved one. So, there is nothing in the existing law that encourages or supports or maintains a healthy family or parental involvement in a youth's life. The PNA is the last anti-abortion law that we have on our books in Illinois. Now is the time to repeal this law. Now is the time to pass the Youth Health and Safety Act to assure that we are protecting our most vulnerable young people in Illinois. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Leader Bourne."

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

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

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I know we've had a robust conversation about this is committee, but I actually had a question come up in between time that I haven't had the opportunity to ask. We did talk about the working group and the members on that, and you clarified with me that the youth

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

who will be represented on that task force would be under 18. Is that correct?"

Moeller: "Yes. They will be youth. Yes."

Bourne: "Will they be required to get parental consent or notification to serve on that task force?"

Moeller: "Not that I'm aware of. That's not part of the legislation."

Bourne: "Would it be similar to a field trip? I'm told other state agencies that have children under 18 on their task forces require parental consent."

Moeller: "I can find out the details on that, but I don't… I don't believe that that would require consent or notification or anything like that. I mean, right now, most of us are meeting virtually via Zoom and doesn't require travel to begin with. So, I would imagine this working group getting up and running will meet similarly via Zoom or some type of virtual format."

Bourne: "Okay. I think it's probably important to know that clarified before the end of the debate, if you could. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Bourne: "Thank you. It's a long-standing principle in this Body, and in our society, and in this state that parents have the basic right to know what's happening in their minor child's life. In Illinois, there's a curfew. A law on the books that says, if you have a child, the child cannot be out past midnight without the parent's consent because we believe, in this state, that parents deserve to know where their children are, especially after midnight. That's consent, by the way, not notification. It's more strenuous than to receive an

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

abortion if this Bill... without this Bill. We also have laws that you've heard about, you can't get a tattoo without consent. Can't get a piercing without consent. Can't have a Tylenol at school. We talk about health care. They can't go to their school nurse and get a Tylenol without consent of their parents. Can't go on a field trip. Can't be on a state task force without consent. In fact, this Body, just earlier this year, voted on House Bill 15, which was a good Bill. We all voted for it, 114 to 0. Twice. Voted for it the first time. Voted for it when it came back on Concurrence, unanimously. And the Sponsor of the Bill, succinctly, and I very well, described the Bill as, 'Parental notification would be required if a child at school is harmed or does harm to another student. And they would be required to be notified within 24 hours.' And every single person in this Body affirmed that. This is a basic case, not of parental control, which has been talked about by some on the other side of this issue, for me. But it's about parents having the basic right to know what is going on in their minor child's life. It's so common sense. It's so common sense. We have a poll, which you've likely heard of, reputable polling firm. Not a push poll. Not some of these bogus things people do on campaigns. A legitimate poll says 72 percent of Illinoisans... a majority of those polled, by the way, self-identified as pro-choice. Seventy-two percent of those Illinoisans said that parents or quardians should be notified if a minor girl, who's their daughter, is seeking an abortion. This isn't a partisan issue. It's not. It's not even down the lines of traditional pro-life and pro-choice lines. This is a basic,

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

basic commonsense way for parents to know what's going on in their minor daughter's life. In fact, it's so basic, I've got a list here. If you ask me what do these states have in common, Colorado, Delaware, Rhode Island, Virginia. You know what they all have in common? A few things. They all have a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic governor. And you know what they also have in common? Colorado, Delaware, Rhode Island, Virginia, along with 33 other states, require that a parent be notified or give consent before their minor daughter receives an abortion. Those aren't exactly these scary, crazy, Republican states that you guys like to talk about. That's how common sense this protection is. I'd also like to point out that parents obviously have a right to know when their child is undergoing a serious medical procedure. We talked about this briefly in committee. And I gave you the example, if my child broke their arm, needed to go get their arm set, I would want to know. And I would have the right to know. And it came up, one of the people testifying, a witness, offered that an abortion is so much more serious, so much different. To which I said, of course it is. Of course it is. A parent, obviously, if your child's having their tonsils taking out, setting a broken arm, ruptured appendix, of course the parent has the right to know what's happening. But an abortion has so much more an impact on a minor daughter's mental and physical health than a broken arm. If a parent deserves to know about a broken arm, then holy cow they deserve to know if their daughter's considering an abortion. And I also want to talk about the contention in committee that the only people who would oppose

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

this Bill must want there to be no abortions. Which the poll we've already talked about proves that's not the case. But I'll tell you what, for parents who've been notified that their minor daughter is considering an abortion and they support it, they support that decision, I want them to know. I want them to be able to drive their daughter to the abortion clinic. I want them to be there to care for that daughter afterwards. I want them to know just as much as I want a parent to know who may be pro-life, who may vehemently disagree with that decision. But I still want them to support their daughter in that decision. I want them to be there for them. That's what this Bill requires, that the parents have the opportunity to know what's happening in their daughter's life. There's been a lot of conversation, especially in committee, about how broken the PNA is, the Parental Notification of Abortion. It's a very short Bill. I would hope that everybody in this chamber has read this by now. But I wanted to point out a few things because it seems to be that the major point of contention with this Bill is with the judicial bypass. And there's been a lot of misinformation about what is required of a judicial bypass. So, I want to read it. Exemptions, exemptions to parental notification. So, in all of these cases, parental notification is waived. If the minor is accompanied by a person entitled to notice, the parent takes them to the clinic, no need to notify. 'Notice is waived in writing by a person who is entitled to notice.' The parent writes a note, says you don't need to notify me, I already know. Good to go. 'The attending physician certifies that the patient's medical record and that medical emergency

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

exist and there is insufficient time to provide the required notice.' This came up in committee today, that it could be that it's delayed so long through the bypass that they're unable to receive the abortion, or that it's an emergency. The plain text of the language says that's not the case. It would already be waived. 'The minor declares in writing that she is a victim of sexual abuse, neglect, physical abuse by an adult family member as defined in this Act. The attending physician must certify in the patient's medical record that he or she has received the written declaration of abuse or neglect.' And it goes on. So, for those who are experiencing the horrible, horrible situation that they have been abused, neglected, the whole list, they don't have to go through the judicial bypass and they don't have to notify their parents. And I'd like to add to that, they don't ever have to notify their parents. The body that does the notification is the clinic. It's not the daughter. We don't force the daughter to call the mom and tell them. We don't. This isn't ... what was described in committee as cruel. We're not being cruel. We're allowing parents basic knowledge of a serious medical procedure that their daughter is contemplating. And they don't have to tell their parents. It's the clinic that does it. I'd like to talk a bit about girls who aren't in this state. We obviously swear to uphold our State Constitution and serve our citizens of Illinois. But we have a much bigger responsibility in the Bill. Today, we heard from a clinic in the Metro East that said 50 percent of their minors come from out of state, most of which come from states with parental notification or parental consent. Meaning it's the will of

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

those states that parents have basic rights to know. If this Bill passes, I can only expect that that number will increase from 50 percent. Meaning that the Bill you're voting on today will mean that parents states away, potentially, have no opportunity or right to know that their minor daughter has come to Illinois for an abortion. And when I talk about minor daughters, I want to put this into context. Before the RHA, we got reports on the age. And this might sound actually pretty extreme to say, but we have examples of 12-year-olds receiving abortions in Illinois. Twelve-year-olds. We're not talking about 17-year-olds, exclusively, who are months away from being 18. We're talking about middle schoolers, potentially. Parents of middle schoolers not having the right to know that their daughter is going through this. And not having the full knowledge to know what happens afterwards. Right? She has that procedure, something goes wrong, she's depressed. They have no context, no knowledge of why that's happening. So, today all I'm asking for you is to be consistent. Be consistent with the votes... after votes that you've taken that have allowed parents basic knowledge and involvement in their minor children's life. That's all. Because for as much as you want to write a big political statement about what you did to support women, voting for this is failing girls and it's failing good parents. We've seen a lot, a lot of hyperpartisan talk in this country about parents' rights recently. I... I acknowledge that. But there is nothing more basic than a parent and child relationship where the parent has the right to know what's happening. Not to

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

control it, not to make the decision for the daughter, but to know. Please be consistent. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

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

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

Gong-Gershowitz: "I stand today in support of repealing the Parental Notification Act. I want to be very clear and dispel some of the misinformation about what this law does and who it will apply to. It's easy to paint a picture that teen girls want to avoid telling their parents about their sex life. But that's not reality. It's not true, and it's not who this law is intended to protect. The youth seeking to get around parental notification are not coming from the ideal healthy situations that we would hope for all of our children. They are in incredibly dangerous situations. By and large, we're talking about young women who are abused emotionally, physically, and sexually. This includes young women who are at risk of possibly losing their home, being kicked out, and relying on state services and homeless shelters. For some of them, their lives may be in danger with pregnancy. And to be clear, you should not have to be in a dire situation to be granted agency to make your own reproductive choices. We've heard several Members talk about how they would want to know if their child is making this type of decision. Of course we would. And we would hope and assume that most of our kids are in a functional, comfortable household where they would come to us. That's because we have healthy relationships. This law remove doesn't relationships parents have with their children. Again, this

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

law does not remove healthy relationships parents have with their children. In fact, no law we pass is going to suddenly compromise a healthy relationship between a young woman and her parents. We're talking about those who don't have the privilege of having a healthy relationship with their parent and that is their judgement to make. Prior to becoming a Legislator, I represented child trafficking victims, children who were sold by their parents, for whom home was not a safe place and parents were not trusted adults. Repealing PNA will help those who can't trust their parents receive the health care and reproductive health care they need and as is their right. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Representative Didech."

Didech: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Didech: "I rise in support of House Bill 370. I've received outreach from several constituents about this Bill, and I would like to take the opportunity to explain my position on this issue. I support a woman's right to choose. The decision of whether to terminate or carry a pregnancy to term is one of the most personal, emotional, and impactful decisions that any person will make in their entire life. My view is that the appropriate parties to make that decision is the woman herself, her health care provider, and trusted loved ones who the woman chooses to include in that decision-making process. It's a decision that should be made without the interference or the involvement of the governments or by politicians or judges who are hundreds or thousands of miles away. What the Parental Notice of Abortion Law does is it substitutes our

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

judgement in this room in Springfield in place of the judgement of the person who is about to make a life-altering decision. Now, we know most girls do choose to involve their parents in this decision. Before the PNA, over 85 percent of girls involved their parents. Right now, over 85 percent of girls are involving their parents. And after we repeal the PNA, over 85 percent of girls will still involve their parents. So, the question before us today is, what do we do with the, about, 15 percent of girls who fear that involving their parents will lead to or perpetuate emotional, financial, physical, or sexual abuse? Right now, we force those girls to navigate a complex judicial bureaucracy, maybe hire a lawyer, and convince a judge that she is telling the truth, that forcing her to involve her parents will put her in danger. I think we should handle it differently. I think when a girl tells us that she's in danger, we should just believe her. Abortion services are a legitimate component of reproductive health care and it's time for Illinois to treat it just like any other form of reproductive health care. With so many states moving backwards, now is the time for Illinois to move forward and repeal the PNA. This Bill makes it clear that, in Illinois, we trust women and that every single person in our state has the right to safe, legal, and affordable reproductive health care. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Representative Bos."

Bos: "I first request verification."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bos has requested a verification."

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

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

"I rise today not just as a concerned father, but as an advocate who's spent years fighting the epidemic of sex trafficking. Most recently, my advocacy was spent working with an organization in our very state that operates the only, one single house, one single safe house for minors, children... I know we keep hearing women being thrown around. We're talking about children when it comes to this Bill. These children who have been rescued from sexual exploitation, and trafficking. They've housed and helped girls as young as just 10 years old. Ten years old. If you're not aware, the average age of entry for a victim of sex trafficking in the U.S. is between 12 and 14 years. But for many, that abuse started well before they became victims of trafficking. And after drug dealing, human trafficking is the fastest growing criminal enterprise in the world. And I guarantee you that this is happening and impacts every single community that is represented here on this floor today. This Bill that is being presented, if it were to pass, would further advance that criminal enterprise by emboldening the pimps, the traffickers, those who rape and sexually assault and exploit these children. Because of parental notification, there are girls here in this state whose loved ones have been able to locate them, rescue them from their traffickers, and bring them home so they can find hope in healing. This is not hyperbole. This is fact. This is fact. I have looked into the eyes of one of these girls. I've seen a pain that you cannot know. But I've also seen healing that was able to happen after her rescue. A rescue that happened because her parents were

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

notified. I ask you, today, to stand with this brave girl and all the other victims. Stand with these girls. It is our responsibility as Legislators to pass laws that protect our most vulnerable children and not put them at greater risk. If this passes, you will be allowing those who victimized and abused children, not just here in Illinois, but from all over the U.S. to walk their victims into a clinic, force them to have an abortion, hide the evidence of their crime, and continue this cycle of violence. Do not further empower those pimps, those traffickers, those who rape, sexually abuse, and exploit these children for their own personal and selfish gains. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Further discussion? Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard some very interesting debate tonight. You know, I stood here in May of 2019 and had a lengthy debate, not unlike this, in which we described building a firewall around Illinois to protect reproductive health care and to protect access to this care. But that firewall has a gaping hole in it. And it's a gaping hole that puts our most vulnerable people, the folks that we are most charged with protecting, it puts them in danger. We have to plug that hole today by repealing PNA. Heard lots of folks over there talking about all of the things that you can't do without contacting a parent, piercings and whatnot that, frankly, trivialize what we're talking about here. But nobody over there wants to talk about the things you can do without contacting a parent. You can get pregnant. You can stay pregnant. You can give birth. You can have a C-section. You can give a child up for adoption all without ever having

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

anybody call your parent. So, to say that this is not about abortion, that this is some high-minded protection idea for y'all is a flat out lie. It is a complete lie. It is a fiction. It treats... it treats a pregnant minor seeking an abortion far differently than pregnant minors seeking other forms of health care. So, yes, my friends, it is absolutely about abortion. And we are seeing it all over the country. Antiabortion politicians all across the country are seeking to curb our access to abortion for anyone and everyone. They literally want to just force us all to keep every pregnancy to term, regardless of what's happening, regardless of the risks to our lives. Illinois is different, and it's going to stay different. And we're going to finish the work today by closing the loophole in our firewall. Feel like everybody over there is talking about this magical, mythical world. Like, did you all grow up in Lake Wobegon where all the women are strong, and the children are above average, and everybody's got a perfect family? 'Cause let me tell you what it's really like, folks. I left home at 16 to escape my father's drunken anger. And I thank God every day that I didn't face an unintended pregnancy at that time. Because not only would I put myself at risk by having to have my father find out, you know what else I would've been doing? I would've been putting my mother in danger, because when I left, she was the only one left behind to face his rage. That's what these families that we're trying to protect the children of are experiencing. I would've... I would have spoken to my mother. But I also would've known that in so doing, I was setting her up for another beating. The beatings that I ran

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

away from because I couldn't take it anymore. That's the reality on the ground, y'all. And these are the people that we should be doing everything we can to protect. Illinois is different. Illinois... in Illinois, we trust women to make decisions about their bodies. We trust people to control their reproductive health. And to make that mission complete, today I urge an 'aye' vote. Repeal PNA. Do it now. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Moeller to close."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard some very emotional and, quite frankly, misleading and hyperbolic rhetoric from the other side of the aisle. I am a mother of two teenage daughters. My relationship with Madeline, who's 18, and Eleanor, who is 16, is the most important relationship in my life. I have worked... it's tough to be a parent. It's tough to be a parent of teenage daughters. But I have worked since the day they were born to develop a relationship with them where they trust me, where they can come to me and talk to me about what is going on in their life. This Bill is not about them. This Bill is not about your children. This Bill is about the children in our state who live in such dangerous family situations that, over the last eight years, we've had over 500 young women go through a judicial bypass process in order to access health care that is constitutionally guaranteed for them because they can't go to their parents. And this is no easy, minor, bureaucratic process. This involves a young woman hiring an attorney on her own, setting up a court date, finding a way to get to court, standing in front of a judge in a courtroom that's generally a venue for criminal activities, explaining why she's pregnant, explaining why she

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

needs to have an abortion, and why she can't go to her parents to let them know about that. Imagine a 17-year-old young woman, already in a very vulnerable position, having to go through that process. We've had over 500 young women in this state since 2013, because this process was established in 1995 by people who want to restrict access to abortion and reproductive health care in our state. This has nothing to do with supporting young people. This has nothing to do with guaranteeing that parents were involved in their child's life. If they cared about those types of relationships, they wouldn't have required a 16, a 17-year-old to find a way to a judge to get permission and divulge incredibly sensitive, personal information to a complete stranger to get their permission to have access to health care. This law was put into place to prevent women from having access to reproductive health care, plain and simple. That was it. But now it's being wrapped in this misleading hyperbole about parents. It's a fiction, as my colleague from Chicago just said. We cannot force young people in this situation, in these terrible, traumatic situations to endure this process any longer. We trust women in Illinois. We support the most vulnerable in our state. This law is dangerous. It's harmful. It's harming young people in this state. Let's support our youth. Let's create a supportive and healthy environment for them. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Members, Representative Bos has requested a verification. Please vote your own switches and please remain in your seat. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 370?' All those in

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Halbrook votes 'no'. Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Morrison votes 'no'.

Representative Tarver. Representative Tarver."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, on this question, take the record.

On this question, Mr. Clerk, Representative Bos has requested a verification."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting is the affirmative. Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade; Representative Avelar; Representative Buckner; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Collins; Representative Conroy; Representative Costa Howard; Representative Croke; D'Amico; Representative Representative Delgado; Representative Didech; Representative Evans; Representative Flowers; 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 Jones; Representative Representative LaPointe; Representative Lilly;

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Mason; Representative Mayfield; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Mussman; Representative Ness; Representative Nichols; Representative Ortiz; Representative Ramirez; Representative Rita; Representative Robinson; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Stoneback; Representative Stuart; Representative Vella; Representative Walker; Representative West; Representative Ann Williams; Representative Jawaharial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yang Rohr; Representative Yingling; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bos."

Bos: "Forgive me. You know, being the freshman to make sure.

Trying to get... get faces and names. Andrade. Okay."

Speaker Hoffman: "In his seat."

Bos: "Ness. Oh, there..."

Speaker Hoffman: "She's in her seat."

Bos: "Okay. It's the different angles. Yang Rohr. Oh, see, I'm being blocked. Stava-Murray."

Speaker Hoffman: "In her seat."

Bos: "Stuart."

Speaker Hoffman: "In her seat."

Bos: "Hirschauer."

Speaker Hoffman: "In her seat."

Bos: "Vella and LaPointe. Oh, there you are. I withdraw."

Speaker Hoffman: "Motion to verify has been withdrawn. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

2 to House Bill 370. And this Bill has received a Constitutional Majority, and is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 1976, Representative DeLuca. Representative DeLuca."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate DeLuca: Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 1976. And this was previously Senate Bill 1588, which passed unanimously earlier this year. This is a trailer Bill to clean up a few items in the Bill. There was no opposition... there is no opposition, and it passed committee unanimously. And it seeks to correct an omission in the underlying law which takes effect on October 28, 2021, to allow accident and health insurance companies, in addition to property casualty companies, to continue to sell travel insurance related to accident and/or health related losses. And it also brings State Law into full alignment with the model travel insurance law. And, most importantly, the legislation will prevent disruption or loss of existing travel insurance products, like those purchased by employers to provide additional protections for employees who travel internationally for business. Ask for your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield. We'll be instituting a three-minute time limit."

Ford: "Won't take long. Representative, that's a nice year, 1976.

Were you born that year?"

DeLuca: "What year was I born in?"

Ford: "No. I mean, 1976 is your Bill number. Is that the year you were born?"

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

DeLuca: "It is not. What year were you born, Sir?"

DeLuca: "That's personal. That's personal information."

Ford: "That's okay. You don't have to answer that question."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1976?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Halbrook votes 'yes'.

Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Morrison votes 'yes'.

Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Yes."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received... the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1976. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 532, offered by Representative Wheeler. House Resolution 534, offered by Representative West. House Resolution 535, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 536, offered by Representative Yingling. House Resolution 538, offered by

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

- Representative Nichols. And House Resolution 539, offered by Representative Hammond."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Greenwood moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor vote... signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

  Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting tomorrow morning. At 9:30 in the morning, State Government Administration is meeting in Virtual Room 3, Human Services is meeting in Virtual Room 2, the Executive Committee is meeting in Virtual Room 1. At 10:00 in the morning, the Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee will meet in Virtual Room 2."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Greenwood moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, October 28, at the hour of 11 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 533, offered by Representative Ann Williams; and House Resolution 537, offered by Representative Nichols, are referred to the Rules Committee. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 658, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1041, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 145, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for

61st Legislative Day

10/27/2021

an Act concerning regulation. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4196, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4197, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4198, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4199, offered by Representative Robinson, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."