107th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "House will be in order. Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Representative Severin. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and please rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Representative Severin."
- "Thank you. Let's pray. Lord, I thank you for this day Severin: and I thank you for each one that is in this august Assembly this morning. I ask you that you would be with each one of us, help us to make the correct decisions that are the best for the State of Illinois. I pray that you would encourage each one of us to know that you have a plan for our lives, you have a will for us. And I pray that we would recognize that and be thankful that you care about us, you know about us. I pray for those that are visiting today, they would understand the importance of what goes on in this Capitol. And again, I pray today, if there's anyone in this building that is hurting today or that is having concerns and problems and challenges that they need your help, I pray they would call upon you and know that you care about them and you are the answer to all the problems in our lives. Again, I thank you for this day. Help us to be thankful, again, for all that you've blessed us with. And I'd also pray for Larry Walsh. Amen."
- Speaker Harris: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Leader Butler."
- Butler et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

107th Legislative Day

- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Severin, on behalf of the Democrats, we also support your prayer for Representative Walsh. Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Greenwood is... I'm sorry. Leader Gabel is recognized for any absences on the Democratic side of the aisle today."
- Gabel: "Speaker, let the record show that Representative Yingling
   is excused today."
- Speaker Harris: "And Leader Welter is recognized for any absences on the Republican side."
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representatives

  Meier and Sosnowski are excused for the day."
- Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 106 Members present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on December 1, 2022: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3823."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Gabel for a Motion."
- Gabel: "Speaker, I move that Representatives Ammons, Bennett,
  Didech, Harper, Jones, Mason, Ramirez, Robinson, and Reick be
  allowed to participate and cast their vote remotely."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Gabel has made a Motion that Representatives Ammons, Bennett, Didech, Harper, Jones, Mason, Ramirez, Robinson, and Reick be allowed to participate and cast their votes remotely. This is a roll call vote. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is

107th Legislative Day

- open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 71 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', and 14 voting 'present'. And the Resolution (sic-Motion) is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Ammons present? Is Representative Bennett present?"
- Bennett: "Representative Bennett is present and glad to be with you today."
- Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bennett is present. Is Representative Didech present?"
- Didech: "Didech is present."
- Clerk Hollman: "Representative Didech is present. Is

  Representative Harper present? Is Representative Jones

  present? Is Representative Mason present?"
- Mason: "Representative Mason is present."
- Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mason is present. Is

  Representative Ramirez present? Is Representative Reick

  present?"
- Reick: "Representative Reick is present."
- Clerk Hollman: "Representative Reick is present. Is Representative Robinson present?"
- Speaker Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to go to the Order of Second Readings. On page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1595, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

107th Legislative Day

- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hurley on Floor Amendment #2."
- Hurley: "I want to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1595."
- Speaker Harris: "Could you tell us briefly what the Amendment does?"
- Hurley: "Sure. It's a gut and replace Amendment. It's an omnibus

  Tax Increment Financing Bill that contains extensions for the

  City of Chicago, Pontiac, Robinson, McHenry, and the Villages

  of Valmeyer and Elkhart. And all letters of support have been
  received."
- Speaker Harris: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'
  All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, anything further?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Hurley on Senate Bill 1595."
- Hurley: "Hi. The Amendment is the Bill. I'm here for any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Harris: "Seeing no questions, the Motion is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1595'... oh, I'm sorry. There is a question. Representative Keicher."
- Keicher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I understand we've got a series of different localities that are seeking to extend the current TIF districts that they have in their communities and that we're giving them an offer to freely pass on that cost that's costing our school district significant revenues. There was an article posted this

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

morning from Illinois Answers Project talking specifically about the TIF renewals being sought by the City of Chicago and that there is currently somewhere near \$500 million sitting in the TIF coffers that have not yet been spent that would go a long way towards helping the issues financially that we see in CPS and other school districts throughout this state. It's my grave concern that I see some of these TIFs being extended to 47 and 35 years from the original guideline in there. I think we need to change the way we renew TIFs. I think we need to limit them to the first term. I think we need to support our school districts and thereby support a reduced property tax function by giving those dollars back to the highest taxing district in each of these communities. So, appreciate the commentary. I will be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hurley to close."

Hurley: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote, except from Representative Keicher."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1595 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Representative Bennett votes 'aye' for Senate Bill 1595.

Thank you."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Bennett votes 'aye'. Representative Didech."

Didech: "Didech votes 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Didech votes 'yes'. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Mason votes 'yes'."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Reick."
- Reick: "Representative Reick can no... cannot do anything but echo
  Representative Keicher's comments, but Representative Reick
  votes 'yes'."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Reick votes 'yes'."
- Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 93 voting 'yay', 11 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1595, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now moving to the Order of Concurrences. On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3823, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1, Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I present for concurrence House Bill 3823, Senate Floor Amendment #1. And what this does is some land swaps. One of those being here in Sangamon County to improve the situation with the high-speed rail that we've been working on for many years. I'd be happy to answer any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick for a question."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, we've been caucusing and talking about a whole bunch of Bills the last couple of days here. This was not one of them. So, I'm just going to ask you to just go into a little bit of the specifics of exactly what the Bill does. So, we're granting land from the state to the locals? Or what's exactly happening here?"

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Scherer: "Yes, we are... well, I can read it to you. 'Conveys a strip of land located in Sangamon County from the State of Illinois to the City of Springfield for the purposes of the Springfield High Speed Rail Corridor Improvement Project.' And then also, the CDB will do the work and there's also transfer of land... a small parcel of land on the Capitol Complex from the city to the Secretary of State. There's also, in there, a land transfer in Franklin County from DNR to Rend Lake Conservatory (sic-Conservancy) District."

Batinick: "All right. Thank you. No further questions. Appreciate it, Representative."

Scherer: "Thank you."

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

Scherer: "I would just appreciate an 'aye' vote and hope you enjoy riding on our new high-speed rail."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3823?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; all the opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Representative Bennett votes 'yes' on House Bill 3823, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Bennett votes 'yes'. Representative Didech."

Didech: "Didech votes 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Didech votes 'yes'. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Reick."

Reick: "Representative Reick votes 'yes'."

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

Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 99 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3823, and having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ness, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ness: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Ness: "Thank you. I just wanted to rise today, today is a very special day. It is my oldest daughter, Madi's, birthday. And I just wanted to say happy birthday to her from the House Floor and among all my colleagues. Quick little funny note here. Twenty-six years ago, when she was born on December 1 and not the day before, we would've had to... we wouldn't have been able to file and claim her on our taxes because it was November. But by being born in December, we didn't... we were able to claim here. And now she's studying to be an accountant, so I just think there's some destiny involved there. So, happy birthday, Madi, my little peanut. Love you. Thanks."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Jones present?"

Jones: "Yes, I'm present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jones is present."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

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

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

Speaker Harris: "State your point."

Halbrook: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, I would like to recognize a long-time friend of mine and many of us in this chamber that is up in the gallery to my left. He's a very distinguished individual from Crawford County. I met Jim Runyon over... almost 20 years ago. Jim has been party chairman and involved in local politics down there for well over 30 years. He graduated from Noble High School and Lincoln Trail College and attended Eastern Illinois University. And he has served honorably in different offices. Jim has helped countless candidates from county board to U.S. Congress running for office and reelection. No job was too big or too small for Jim. When he wasn't designing strategies and campaign plans to win races, he was... when he was massively outspent, he was always willing to spend a Friday night at an event, help film an ad in a tractor, or travel to the district with a candidate. Jim was willing to do whatever it took to win. For a long time, this chamber... I'm sorry. Getting ahead of myself. Mr. Runyon has helped many of us in this chamber and in the Senate get elected. Also at this time, when conservative principal leaders were rare in Southern and Eastern Illinois, Jim was a safe harbor for candidates and Legislators looking to advance freedom and liberty. If a tax hike... tax hike was being pushed, Jim would be the first one voicing his opposition and organizing a movement against it.

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Jim is in the final stages of ALS after a stroke several years ago. Jim's impact will be felt for generations through this chamber and for fearless freedom fighters he helped elect. Please join me in thanking Jim for his timeless and tireless work."

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

Buckner: "Point of personal privilege, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Buckner: "Much like Representative Ness, I'm rising today to talk about a special birthday in my family. A year ago today, my wife and I had our first child, Kastillo Elijah Buckner. He turns one today. And I got to get home to him, so let's not be here all day. Happy birthday, Kas."

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

Keicher: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Keicher: "So, I was joined by my... our fellow Representatives, Representative Ortiz and Representative Gong-Gershowitz, a number of weeks back. I think as many of you know, I'm the Republican spokesperson on the Immigration & Human Rights Committee. I had reached out to Taneka Jennings with the Governor's staff to take an opportunity to visit with the hundreds, and now thousands, of Venezuelan immigrants that have traveled to Illinois through a busing system from the State of Texas. Me, like many of you, our families came here and have a strong and proud immigrant tradition. I felt, as the spokesperson of the Immigration Committee, it would be

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

very important for committee Members to go visit with these Venezuelan refugees, talk to them and hear their story firsthand. So, working with the Governor's Office, established a time to travel to Rosemont and visit with the Venezuelan families. We had the opportunity to sit down and talk to them in a very diligent dialogue. And a couple of key notes I want to share with those of you in the chamber on both sides of the aisle. First and foremost, the stories of these travelers. One of them who walked for over two years to get to this great land. They faced murder. They faced robbery. They faced conditions that I would argue the most desperate in our society today don't even face. To a person, each one of them that we heard from spoke of why they came to this country. They are the same ideals that you and I all believe in. They want a better opportunity for their family. And each and every one of them had a growing sense of frustration that, while treated with excellent care and accommodations by the State of Illinois, every one of them asked, why are we forced to sit here in this hotel? We want to go find work. We want to get an apartment. We want to have a job. We don't want handouts. We came to this country because of the promises of the future for our generations that come after us. And because of the federal restrictions on immigration, we are taking immigrants who are here with a legal status and forcing them to sit in a hotel because of the process in place to process refugees. They're fleeing a socialist, communist regime in Venezuela. Our Federal Government should open our arms, open our doors, and allow them to help supplement our workforce so that they can give to their kids the same things that our

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

parents and grandparents came to this country to provide for us and which allows us to be in this chamber. What we're told is that the delay, because of the federal refugee program, they cannot go secure work for a year to 18 months on average or they lose their status and potentially face ejection from this country. So, imagine that. Come to America so we can force you not to work, not to provide for your family, not to provide a small business opportunity that will spread generations of wealth and prosperity in this amazing state. I hope that at some point in the following spring we can join in a Resolution asking the Federal Government to put a better, more expedient process to help these legal residents in our country attain the dreams that our families came here and established for us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Harris: "Leader Batinick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus. And before I do that, I'd like to excuse Marty McLaughlin for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Harris: "Republicans will go to an immediate caucus.

  Democrats will not caucus. I ask all Democrats to remain on the floor or near the floor because I think we will go back into Session immediately upon the Republicans return. House shall stand at ease to the call of the Chair. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on December 1, 2022: recommends be adopted,

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 1698."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on December 1, 2022: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 1095, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1859, and Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2406."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Harper present?"

Harper: "Representative Harper is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper is present."

Speaker Harris: "Under the Order of Second Readings, on page 2 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1698, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman on Floor Amendment 2."

Hoffman: "Yes, this is the unemployment insurance agreed Bill. I would ask that we adopt Floor Amendment #2, which is the substance of the agreed Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1698. All those in favor

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman on Floor Amendment #3."

Hoffman: "Yes, Floor Amendment #3 is a technical Amendment. And I ask it be adopted."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1698. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Hoffman on Senate Bill 1698."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As everyone knows, as a result of the COVID pandemic, there was historic amount of unemployment here in Illinois and the rest of the world. As a result, the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund went from a \$2 billion surplus, because of the high number of unemployment, to a \$4.7 billion... \$4.7 billion in... in arrears. So, ultimately, we had to figure out what we were going to do. And last April, we did an infusion of money into the... into the fund, which... in an amount of, I believe, \$2.7 billion. In addition, recently the fund paid back the Federal Government, which had borrowed the \$4.7 billion from, an additional \$450 billion. This left a hole of... an additional hole of \$1.36 billion that we owe the

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Federal Government. If we did not ... do not figure out how to pay this back and get the fund in the positive position, what will happen is we will be penalized as well as employers will be drastically taxed. And if we do nothing, benefits will be slashed. So, this Bill is an agreed Bill. I would like to thank Leader Evans, Representative Ugaste, Representative Marron, as well as the Governor's Office, and Andy Manar of the Governor's Office, and the Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats for their participation. As you know, the agreed Bill process is one between labor and business, where labor and business come together to determine whether they can agree as to how they can solve the problems with the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. This agreed Bill process goes back to 1984. It's unique in Illinois, and it was created to end the wild swings that use to occur in the system, either benefit increases or decreases or tax increases or decreases. So, we went about the agreed Bill process and really met for nearly a year and a half to two years. I would like to, again, thank the Republicans, Representative Ugaste, Representative Marron, and Leader Evans for their hard work in this process. This agreed Bill process has resulted in this Bill. This Bill would increase the target UI Trust Fund balance from 1 billion to 1.7 billion so that we can ensure that if there is... 1.75 billion so we can ensure that if there is a recession or another downturn that there will be a surplus that we can draw from and we would not have to borrow from the Federal Government and incur interest costs. In addition, it would increase the taxable wage base by two point four percent each year for five years. And it would go from 2023 to 2027 to

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

14,952 from a current wage base of 12,960 that was set way back in 2009. In addition, the target UI Trust Fund balance, which is currently at 1 billion, was set nearly 2 decades ago. It also would make an interest-free \$450 million loan to the UI Trust Fund to be paid back starting in 2024. And this would be paid back from the employer's adjusted state expenditure factor by 3 percent for each year and it would be paid back over a period of 10 years. Finally, it moves statutory speedbumps in the UI Act that would automatically raise taxes on employers and cut benefits for claimants for one year from taking effect on January 1, 2023... excuse me, for two years. January 1, 2023 to January 1, 2025. This is the substance of the Bill. We will, after the first of the year, be doing a supplemental appropriations whereby we will ensure that the \$1.36 billion payment to ensure that the... to the Federal Government to ensure that our debt to them is paid off. That will happen after the first of the year. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Thank you, Leader Hoffman, for your work on this as well as Leader Evans and Representative Ugaste. I have on occasion over the last few years stood up and been critical of some of the processes that we're involved in here and talked about how sometimes we don't do justice to the people of the State of Illinois in the way we do business. I'm proud today to stand on the floor and talk about being proud of being involved in a process that I think does justice to the people of the State of Illinois. Not very long ago we faced a historical deficit in

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

the UI Trust Fund, a deficit that we have never seen the likes of here in this state. And if we didn't do something to address that deficit, it was going to be balanced on the backs of businesses through extreme tax increases and the backs of workers with reduced benefits. And so, this process has not been easy. It's been a tough process. It's been a lengthy process. There's been times when all of us around the table wanted to throw up our hands and walk away. We've... we've had times when things have been trying, but we've stuck with the process. It's not been a perfect process. If I had it within my power to fix a solution to this problem, it might look a little bit different than the final product, as I'm sure everybody around the table could say the same thing. But the fact of the matter is, everybody stayed with it and they came up with a solution to a big problem. A solution that saves hundreds of millions of dollars in potential tax increases on business and protects workers at a time of economic uncertainty. I think we have done justice by the State of Illinois... by the people of the State of Illinois through this process. I appreciate being able to be involved in it. Thank you, once again, for all your work, Leader Hoffman. And I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Leader Hoffman, I... I want to point out something that dawned on me first thing this morning that hadn't occurred to me yet. This... actually, in the four years I've been here, two shortened by a pandemic, it's the third time we're advancing an agreed Bill together in the House of Representatives. And I think that has to be some sort of

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

record for how many go in a period of four years, if not total, two people working together across the aisle. And I appreciate all your work as well as the work of Leader Evans and Rep Marron in doing so. So, it's truly been a pleasure, and I look forward to working with you in this regard going forward. I will ask the Sponsor, though, to yield, if he will, 'cause I do just want to make a point or two of clarification."

Speaker Harris: "The Sponsor yields."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, someone on our side of the aisle indicated they thought they heard you mention a three percent increase in the taxable wage rate. I believe it's two point four percent a year over five years. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, that is correct. I apologize."

Ugaste: "Okay. Thank you. I... I'm not certain. I didn't catch it myself, but... but I just wanted to make certain we're on the same page. Also, there is an appropriation part to this Bill that's not contained in this. This is the structural part of the Bill, correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes. We have... we'll do a supplemental appropriation, what's anticipated in January."

Ugaste: "Okay. And that's going to pay back the debt as... of \$1.3 billion-plus, plus fund the \$450 million loan to the trust fund, correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, that's correct."

Ugaste: "Okay. And within this Bill, though, that we currently have before us, there's a structure in place to where if that does not occur by January 31, of 2023, that this Act is then repealed and everything reverts back to the way it was."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Hoffman: "Yes. And that was at your suggestion and we gladly put it in there. So, we intend to make sure that that supplemental does pass, pay off the Federal Government so that we don't have to continue to lose tax credits for our employers and see benefit reductions go into effect and have to pay interest."

Ugaste: "I have full faith we'll get it done. So, thank you. And I appreciate you putting that in. To the Bill. I... I want to, again, thank everyone for their hard work on this. There were a lot of Members, even outside this chamber, that did a lot of work. I'm going to make this pretty simple and short. I said this the other day, and I still believe this. This is good for labor, it's good for business, and it's good for the people of the State of Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Caulkins: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, one year ago, the last day of Veto Session, you and I had an exchange on this floor about putting the speedbump... moving the speedbump. You asked me, what's my solution? And my solution was to simply pay back the money we owe the feds. So, your solution was, we'll get to it in the spring. We didn't get to it in the spring, did we?"

Hoffman: "We didn't have an agreed Bill process... we didn't have an agreed Bill. So, this is an agreed Bill process. Labor and business came together and have agreed to this. Thirty-six organizations that represent business have all signed on as proponents of this Bill."

107th Legislative Day

- Caulkins: "I don't... I don't doubt that. My... my concern is, had we done the right thing, had we done the right thing this spring even, not even 18 months ago, we wouldn't have cost the taxpayers \$20 million in penalties, would we?"
- Hoffman: "I can't say that because simply paying back the loan, I can't tell you that the way that the trust fund balance was that it wouldn't just go right back into arrears. The importance of this Bill is we are increasing, by 75 percent, the goal of the trust fund balance from 1 billion to 1.75 billion. In addition, we're putting in an additional \$450 million through a no-interest loan into the trust fund so that, if we hit a recession, it doesn't go right back into a deficit."
- Caulkins: "But had we paid this Bill back, had we paid the feds back with the ARPA money that we've had... this isn't new ARPA money, is it?"
- Hoffman: "If we would've merely paid the Federal Government back, we would not have ensured the health and the sustainability of the fund. That's why business was willing to do what it's doing. That's why labor was willing to do what it's doing. To ensure the sustainability and the integrity of the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. Doing what you have proposed or what you indicated we should have done would not have done that."
- Caulkins: "If we'd have paid the Federal Government back, we would've saved \$20 million in penalties. We would've saved our job creators \$114 million in penalties had we done this in the spring or in the summer."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Hoffman: "Again, if we would've done what you proposed, there was no guarantee that we wouldn't have gone right back into a deficit because we would not be infusing additional dollars to ensure the integrity of the fund."
- Caulkins: "Couldn't we have used the ARPA funds to resupply the Unemployment Trust Fund, putting the million... the billion dollars back?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I guess we could've done a lot of things. This is an agreed Bill, supported by 36 business organizations and all of organized labor."
- Caulkins: "But it doesn't answer the question as why we didn't just pay this back with the money we had. We've had this money all along. We could've saved the taxpayers \$20 million. We could've saved the job creators \$114 million had we just paid the bill like almost every other state in this country. We're one of four states in this country that have not paid their bill. And it's cost us, the people of Illinois, \$134 million by dragging our feet. And I don't think that's worthy... praise worthy."

Hoffman: "That's not correct, but you can think that."

Caulkins: "What... what caused the deficit in the UI Trust Fund?"

Hoffman: "Historic unemployment, as a result of the pandemic."

Caulkins: "And that was caused by shutting businesses down in this state. By shutting down our business community, we created this issue in Illinois. We had to borrow 400... or \$4 billion-plus because we shut the economy down in this state. How much of that was fraud? How much of that money was paid out in fraud?"

Hoffman: "Is that a.m. are you asking me that question?"

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Caulkins: "Yes, Sir."

Hoffman: "I understand that there have been audits and there are currently audits that are going on. The fraud was in the, it's my understanding, the federal dollars, not the state dollars."

Caulkins: "It's all taxpayer money. To the Bill, please."

Speaker Harris: "To the Bill."

Caulkins: "This is a solution to a problem that was created. This is a typical government make a problem, create a problem, and then come up with a solution and take a victory lap for coming up to the solution to a problem that you all created. I don't disagree that this Bill has merit. I'm very disappointed that we didn't do the right thing when we had the time, when we had the opportunity, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Ammons present? Is Representative Ramirez present?"

Ramirez: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ramirez is present. Is Representative Ammons present?"

Speaker Harris: "Representative Welter."

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Randy Frese is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Harris: "The record shall so reflect. Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, is the appropriations Bill going to be a standalone Bill?"

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Hoffman: "I was told that the Senate is going to send us a standalone Bill, but I can't guarantee you that."

Batinick: "Was that part of the agreement..."

Hoffman: "No, it was not."

Batinick: "...in the negotiations? Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: House. I would just like to, once again, thank everyone who was involved in the agreed Bill process. I'd like to thank Deputy Governor Andy Manar as well as... for leading the process. I'd also like to thank Director Kristin Richards of the department for all of their hard work. They ran over a hundred models, I believe, to try and help us come to this solution. Also, representing labor were several members led by Pat Devaney of the AFL-CIO. And representing the employers was the head of the Retail Merchants, Mr. Rob Karr. They put in hours and hours of work to get to this point. I'm just going to read from the position statement from the employers. They indicate this agreement reduces employer taxes by \$913 million over the first 5 years. This agreement reduces employer taxes that would've been paid by \$913 million over the first 5 years. A 'no' vote means that you are voting for higher taxes on employers. That's from the position statement of these 36 employer organizations that support this Bill. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1698 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bennett."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Bennett: "Representative Bennett votes 'yes' on Senate Bill 1698.

And I appreciate everyone's tremendous work on this. It's a good step forward. We have more to do, but great step forward.

So, thank you."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bennett votes 'yes'.

Representative Didech."

Didech: "Didech votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Didech votes 'yes'. Representative Harper. Representative Jones. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Mason votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Ramirez votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'.

Representative Reick."

Reick: "Reick votes 'yes'."

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

Ammons: "Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Harris: "We..."

Ammons: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Ammons needs to be added to the roll."

Speaker Harris: "We are in the middle of a roll call vote, Representative Ammons. We will come back to you at its conclusion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 95 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1698, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, for an addition to the roll."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Ammons present?"

Ammons: "Representative Ammons is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons is present."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a point of clarification to Leader Batinick's question, I am told that the Senate has indeed passed a standalone appropriation Bill today."
- Speaker Harris: "On page 2 of the Calendar are Orders of Concurrences. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4285. Oh, I'm sorry. I beg... pardon. I read the... Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2406?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2406 is on the Order of Concurrence.

  The Motion has been filed to concur with Amendments 2, 3, and 4."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Stuart on the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2406. Would you prefer to do this in one Motion, all three Amendments?"
- Stuart: "Can I do it in one Motion, all three, please?"
- Speaker Harris: "So, this is... Members, this will be concurrence with Amendments 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2406. Representative Stuart."
- Stuart: "Thank you. So, the Amendments... this is just extending lots of extensions and sunsets and things in lots of different places. So, I can go through all of them or I can highlight just a few. But for example, the Community Emergency Services and Support Act extension of 9-1-1 mobile, mental, and behavioral health coordination deadline, just extending it from January to July; extending the Special Commission on Gynecologic Cancer from 20... 2023 to 2028; the diversion from

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

facility-based care pilot program, extending that for two years; extending the Restore Illinois Collaborative Commission for a year; and other extensions of that nature."

Speaker Harris: "The Motion is... so, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2406?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bennett votes 'yes'.

Representative Didech."

Didech: "Didech votes 'yes'."

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

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Jones. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'.

Representative Reick."

Reick: "Reick votes 'yes'."

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

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2406. And with 96 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Gabel for a Motion."
- Gabel: "Speaker, I move that Representatives Mayfield, Carroll, Evans, and Collins be allowed to participate and cast their vote remotely."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Gabel has made a Motion to allow Representatives Mayfield, Collins, Carroll, and Evans to participate and vote remotely. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Oh, I'm sorry. We need a roll call on this Motion. So, the question is, vote 'yes' on the Motion to allow Representative Mayfield, Collins, Carroll, or Evans to participate or 'no' on this Motion. Voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Yes, please. Thank you."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bennett votes 'yes'.

Representative Didech."

Didech: "Didech votes 'yes'."

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

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Harper: "Harper votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Harper votes 'yes'. Representative Jones. Representative Mason. Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'.

Representative Reick."

Reick: "Yes."

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

Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 65 voting 'yay', 39 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the Motion to allow remote participation by Mayfield, Collins, Carroll, and Evans is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Carroll present? Is Representative Collins present? Is Representative Evans present?"

Evans: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Evans, will you put your picture on, please, for us?"

Evans: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Evans is present. Is Representative Mayfield present? Is Representative Carroll present?"

Carroll: "Representative Carroll is here."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Carroll is present."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Collins present? Is Representative Mayfield present?"

Mayfield: "Representative Mayfield's present."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mayfield is present. Is Representative Collins present? Is Representative Robinson present?"

Robinson: "Representative Robinson is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Would you put your camera on for us, please?

Representative Robinson is present."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Collins present?"

Speaker Harris: "On the Order of Concurrences, on Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 1095. Mr. Clerk.

Representative Slaughter on the Motion."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do move to concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1095."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. First order of business, Mr. Speaker... and I would ask that this matter be placed on unlimited debate. When this Bill was brought to our attention a year and a half ago, there was no debate. And matter of fact, I was specifically cut off. So, I would hope that for this... for the purposes today that you allow our Members to speak freely."

Speaker Harris: "We will honor Members' requests to speak,

Representative."

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

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

Durkin: "Representative Slaughter, I know you've put a lot of time into this legislation and I've heard a lot of discussion and a lot of things in the press and also on the floor about how this grand process came to be."

107th Legislative Day

- Slaughter: "Leader, is this on the Amendments or what are we doing?"
- Speaker Harris: "This is the Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Slaughter: "Okay."
- Durkin: "So, there's been a lot of discussion about the process that went into place to create Amendment #1 and 2. Tell me, who was involved? Who was involved with that?"
- Slaughter: "It's an excellent question and one that we followed in a lot of our other trailer Bills. The stakeholders from across the public safety spectrum were at the table discussing this Bill, negotiating this Bill. From the law enforcement coalition, your normal players, the States Attorneys Association, the Chiefs of Police, the Sheriffs' Association, Fraternal Order of Police. On the other side of the spectrum, of course, there's a team led by the Cook County Public Defender's Office, as well as various pretrial services advocates in the network of advocates on that side of the argument."
- Durkin: "All right. Do you believe that we, as Republicans, who represent a significant amount of people throughout the State of Illinois, are stakeholders in public safety?"
- Slaughter: "I'm sorry. What was that?"
- Durkin: "The question I have is that the Republicans, my Members, who represent millions of Illinoisans, do you believe that we are stakeholders in the public safety of our citizens?"
- Slaughter: "Sure, you're Members of this Body. Yes."
- Durkin: "That's interesting. You talked about Members from the Senate and the House who have been involved with these

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

negotiations over the past few months, but the stakeholders on this side of the aisle never had a seat at the table. Isn't that correct?"

Slaughter: "Yes. And as the House Chair of Judiciary - Criminal Committee, not just my side of the aisle, your side of the aisle as well, knows what type of chairman I am. I have an open-door policy. We always can discuss these issues. Oftentimes, we do. I've discussed them with you. I've discussed them with other Members across the aisle. I think that question is disingenuous."

Durkin: "No, it's not disingenuous because it's true. Because I had to find out through the state's attorneys who were involved with these of when the next meeting was and what happened at the meetings because myself nor Pat Windhorst ever received any invitation to be part of this discussion. So, I would ask that you take back the word disingenuous, Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Okay. I'll take it back."

Durkin: "All right. All right, well, that's a good start. We're moving places. Don't you think... let me just say this. It was about a year ago, there was an issue which was very seriously undertaken in the State of Illinois, and it was the... and it came up the issue was prohibiting the use of deception in the interrogation of juvenile defendants. Recall the legislation, Representative Slaughter?"

Slaughter: "Yes, I do."

Durkin: "I specifically took the document, worked with you and all the advocates to put it in a good place, the best place it could be for purposes of process, procedure, and also the

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Constitution. That was a Bill that was unanimously passed by this chamber because we took a very difficult issue and we worked together on it. So, I'm quite surprised, after the experience and the history that you and I have had on very serious issues in the criminal justice system, that you never asked me about it or Pat Windhorst because both of us... both of us are practitioners. Both of us know the rules of procedure, knows the rules of evidence as well as anybody in this Body. No question. I'm just... but I think that we've actually... let me just say this. Don't you think we had a good experience working together on that Bill about a year and a half ago?"

Slaughter: "We did."

Durkin: "All right. Well, I'm just going to say... I'll get into the questions. I'm disappointed that we were not allowed that opportunity again. All right, here we go. So, this intent... the intent of this Bill is to make tweaks in the original SAFE-T Act that was passed a year and a half ago. Isn't that correct? Based on the stakeholders and all the collective thoughts, correct?"

Slaughter: "Leader, that's correct. However, in particular to this Bill, we're looking at the pretrial fairness component of the SAFE-T Act. And really confining what we did in this Bill to that component."

Durkin: "Well, there's more areas in this Amendment that are...
that are clearly... are being amended."

Slaughter: "That is true. That is true."

Durkin: "So, let's visit an issue that I think is really, extremely important. And I want to make sure that this Body

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

is very clear on what is going to be part of the law of Illinois starting January 1. Now, Section 50 ILCS 705/6.7 was amended. And I find this very interesting 'cause this was never brought up when we had the debate a year and a half ago because of the... we know what happened. We got cut off. It says, 'An individual has no property interest in law enforcement certification at the time of the initial certification or any time thereafter.' How the heck did that get into the law?"

Slaughter: "That's not in this Bill."

Durkin: "It isn't, but it needs to be tweaked. I'm telling you that this Bill still needs work. But you know what you did? When you said that they do not have a property interest in their job, what you're doing is that you're denying a law enforcement officer's ability to be afforded due process at a disciplinary proceeding. Our U.S. Supreme Court has been very clear. It's called the Loudermill case, that if you're a public employee and if you're not at will, you have a fundamental property right in interest in your employment. So, by putting this in here, which is now the law, which you still can change... I don't think this is very funny that you're denying these officers the ability to have the basic rights that they should in their job, which they have as a privacy interest, which has been protected by our U.S. Supreme Court, and we're just going to throw that out. Are you okay with that?"

Slaughter: "Yeah, yeah, Leader. I will agree to work with you on that. I do believe what you're referencing was agreed. I'll have to confirm that."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Durkin: "With who? With who?"

Slaughter: "The stakeholders that were at the table."

Durkin: "There were no stakeholders at the table a year and a half ago when this damned thing got passed. This is not agreed, and you know that."

Slaughter: "There was, Leader. There was."

Durkin: "Absolutely not. I can tell you that they agreed on it at 3:00 in the morning of the last day of lame duck Session. A year and a half ago, to this language, nobody knew what was in it. So, that's not true. That is just not true. I'd like to get into another Section right now that deals with detention in which it states that a person who is detained must be brought to trial within 90 days. And the only way that the tolling of the 90 days occurs is delay occasion by the defendant. Could you explain to me the changes that have been made regarding that specific Section in the SAFE-T Act that you're putting forward today?"

Slaughter: "Sure. And getting back to this being a Bill where all the stakeholders are neutral, the States Attorneys Association was at the table putting forth suggestions. With this, they're okay with the 90-day provision that you just referenced."

Durkin: "That doesn't make a difference to me. The state's attorneys can make their recommendations, but I want to find out exactly what you are doing to change the 90 days. Explain to me what's happening. The state's attorneys, as I... well, hold on. Are the state's attorneys... are they in support of this Amendment?"

Slaughter: "Is who in support? I'm sorry."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Durkin: "The question... you said the state's attorney's a stakeholder as I said they're okay. Are the States Attorneys of Illinois, the association, in favor of these two Amendments?"

Slaughter: "They slipped in neutral, Leader."

Durkin: "They're not..."

Slaughter: "They're not opposing... they're not opposing the provisions."

Durkin: "They're clearly not supporting it either."

Slaughter: "They're not opposing the... the provisions."

Durkin: "Okay. Well, we still have 60 lawsuits. Do you know if any of the lawsuits that have been filed... of the 60 lawsuits that have filed to consolidate it, have any of those state's attorneys withdrawn their lawsuit because of the filing of this Amendment?"

Slaughter: "And I'm not going to get into the pending litigation, Leader."

Durkin: "Nah, I'm going to get into it. The answer is no."

Slaughter: "You can. I won't."

Durkin: "The answer is no. And I know there's been four state's attorneys who've been making calls. I understand it. But we have approximately 95 elected Democrat and Republican state's attorneys who are proceeding with the lawsuit, who are not supportive of this Amendment. But let's get into detention again, the one said has been... the state's attorneys are okay with. Explain to me what exactly we're doing with the 90-day detention changes that you're making under the Amendment."

Slaughter: "So, someone was always detainable under the speedy trial."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Durkin: "This is not the Speedy Trial Act. This is the detention Section. Speedy trial, if you're in custody, if you were held for 120 days on delay occasion by the prosecution, charges must be dismissed."

Slaughter: "So..."

Durkin: "This is detention is..."

Slaughter: "Okay. So, I'm trying to get to the essence... essence of your question."

Durkin: "It's very simple. What are the changes you're making in..."

Slaughter: "The state's attorneys that were at the table are okay with this."

Durkin: "You didn't answer my question."

Slaughter: "The issue... hold on. The issue was not court clog or some process issue. One of the issues or bigger issues were... you know, willing to get DNA evidence back on some of these cases. Where you're going with this, I don't know. Get to it, Leader."

Durkin: "Sure, you got it. Explain to me what... explain to me again what changes have you made from the original Bill which states that a defendant who is detained must be... must be given trial within 90 days unless the delay is occasioned by the defendant. That was in the SAFE-T Act you passed a year and a half ago. Explain to me the changes specifically that you have in this Section."

Slaughter: "In this Section, if the person's detained pretrial, he must be brought to trial within 90 days, not counting additional time requested by the defense in allowing a continuance requested by the state for good cause."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Durkin: "Have there been any exemptions created for, let's say, forensic testing, which is necessary for the taking a case to trial on behalf of the prosecution?"

Slaughter: "Yeah. That would be good cause, Leader."

Durkin: "How many days are we now extending under the… 'cause there is a… under your law, it references a Section… another Section of the code which extends that date."

Slaughter: "It would be up to the court... up to the judge."

Durkin: "No. No. It says that what you're doing is at... is that if it's a case for... if you're looking for scientific evidence, you make a reference to a Section in the Speedy Trial Act that says it can go up to 120 days. Are you... agree or disagree?"

Slaughter: "What was the question?"

Durkin: "I'm telling you."

Slaughter: "Well, what..."

Durkin: "I'm... I'm giving you some thoughts. I'm just telling you, the question is, what changes..."

Slaughter: "Thanks."

Durkin: "You said it's with cause. But the problem is, you have referenced a Section under the Speedy Trial Act that deals with issues related to a delay because of timeliness of getting scientific evidence."

Slaughter: "The state's attorneys are comfortable with this, Leader."

Durkin: "You haven't answered my question. This is not about what the state's attorneys, four of them out... in the State of Illinois, think about. This is between... this is about the men and women in this chamber who want answers on a very serious

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

issue that you're asking our and everybody else's support for. Now, I take this serious. I wish you would take it as serious as well. But by just saying that the state's attorneys are okay with it is not acceptable for this chamber. What exactly... I've asked you, and I said that this Section references the state that the... the Speedy Trial Act in which it's... will you agree that that is what has been amended?"

Slaughter: "No. We'll agree to disagree. I answered your question."

Durkin: "But you're absolutely wrong. And here's the... you're absolutely wrong because it says that it continues... if it's by the state... you reference Section 103.5, which is the Speedy Trial Act, in which it says that there's 120-day exception in times when there is... when the state is seeking evidence and material to be tested to extend that 90 days. I'm trying to help you at least get to the... an answer on this. So, do you believe 120 days is acceptable on top of the 90 days in this situation where there is forensic testing that still needs to be brought to... to the prosecution?"

Slaughter: "Listen, I'm not a practicing, sitting..."

Durkin: "Then why are you presenting the Bill?"

Slaughter: "...state's attorney. But the state's attorneys are okay with this."

Durkin: "Goddamnit. Will you please answer the question? I don't care if they're... if they're okay with it. Will you answer the question, please?"

Slaughter: "I have."

Durkin: "No, you haven't. You have not answered the question other than stating, 'Well, the state's attorneys are okay with it.'

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

But here is a... let me just go on. I've got more questions. This Section says, as it was passed a year ago, you got 90 days to take a person who's detained, to take them to trial. The only way it gets told is by delay occasion by the defendant. You make reference to a Section under the Speedy Trial Act that says you're afforded another 120 days for the prosecution to work up a forensic case. But here's the problem with the 120 days. The typical... we passed a law a few years ago that says that rape kits must be analyzed within 180 days of charging, whether it's for a detained or nondetainable person. How are the prosecution and the prosecutors able to comply with this and get this done within 120 days when we have a statute that says it must be done with 180 days? It's completely inconsistent. And what happens if that 120 days comes and the state's attorney has not had a return on that forensic evidence? You obviously don't want to answer the question, but here's what's going to happen. That defendant has to be released from custody. And here's the other problem with this when we talk about forensic testing, and this hasn't even been touched upon, is that the State Police farms out a great deal of this testing to private labs in state and also out of state, further complicating of whether or not that 100-day... 20-day requirement will be fulfilled. Would you agree with that? This is not funny, Sir. This is not funny."

Slaughter: "No."

Durkin: "Could you speak in the mic, please?"

Slaughter: "No."

Durkin: "All right. Well, you know what? This was your language."

It's your Bill. I'm asking, will you agree with the language..."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Slaughter: "But, Leader, they... they get the extension for good cause and it's up to the courts."

Durkin: "No, it isn't. You specifically referenced the Speedy Trial Act, which gives 120-day exception under 103.5 in this Bill, which allows for 120-day extension on the 90-day detention for the workup of a rape kit or ballistics or scientific evidence. All right. You don't agree with that? It's your language. You wrote it, or somebody wrote it. Nothing else?"

Slaughter: "What's the question, Leader? Is there a question?"

Durkin: "I asked if... did I make the proper representation of the Bill that you have... are presenting on the 90-day detention requirement for the prosecution, but you've amended a Section under the Speedy Trial Act which gives 120 days on top of the 90? I'm asking you if you agree with that."

Slaughter: "Yes."

Durkin: "Yes?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Durkin: "And when we have a statute..."

Slaughter: "The Speedy... well, the Speedy Trial Act also has a good cause exemption as well."

Durkin: "But this is regarding detention. And the way that you have drafted the Bill, that you are using a detention Section, which is completely separate and distinguishable from the Speedy Trial Act. Because the detention Section, the only relief is a defendant will be released from custody. The Speedy Trial Act, if you do not meet those deadlines, charges are dismissed. Very distinct, apples and oranges. I'm not getting anywhere with you on this. I'm going to get into the

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

next line of questioning. In a Section that regards detention hearings, you've added the following. 'If the defense seeks to compel'... and you cut out and you crossed out the word 'call' ... 'the complaining witness to testify in its favor, the court shall state on the record the reasons for granting a defense request to compel the presence of the complaining witness.' For everybody in this chamber, understand a complaining witness is a crime victim. That is a crime victim. 'A complaining witness, only on the issue of the defendant's pretrial determination. The court shall state on the record the reason for granting the defense request to compel the presence of a complaining witness, 'a victim, 'and only grant the request if the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant will be material prejudice if the complaining witness does not appear.' Yeah. That sound familiar?"

- Slaughter: "It does, Leader. And please don't mislead this chamber."
- Durkin: "How... I'm reading the language that you guys put together."
- Slaughter: "Victims' advocate groups want this. This is their suggestion. This is their language, and it's agreed."
- Durkin: "Well, again, we're getting into the issue of nonresponsive responses. Where does it say in here that victims have the right to not be compelled to testify if their testimony would materially affect and intimidate that victim?"
- Slaughter: "So, the court has the discretion to compel a witness to appear, but this Bill limits such that that the witness

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

can only be compelled to testify on the issue of the defendant's pretrial detention."

Durkin: "What in the... what purpose would a victim bring to a, what was previously called a bail hearing, to now what will be called a detention hearing? What could they provide? What in the world could they provide?"

Slaughter: "That would be up to the judge to decide."

Durkin: "Okay. I want to go back a little bit in history and I want to talk about this Section. Some of us were around in 2014 and some of us octogenarians. We had passed a Resolution which put a question in amending the Crime Victims Rights Act before the citizens of Illinois. It's called Marsy's Law. It extends and enhances the rights of crime victims. It was passed in 2014 by a vote of 2.6 million to 700 thousand. That's... our Constitution was changed. And specifically, the Constitution was changed to state the following. 'Crime victims,' which we are ... are complaining witnesses, 'shall have the following rights. The right to be treated with fairness and respect for their dignity and privacy and to be free from harassment, intimidation, and abuse throughout the criminal justice process.' By saying that we are ... you changed the language and you added language last year to say that now the defendant can compel that victim to appear at a bond hearing, which for all practical purposes is done within 48 hours from the time a crime has been charged. And many of them are brutal, vicious crimes in which someone has been victimized to the extent they could never imagine. Whether it's the domestic violence victim, whether it's a sexual assault victim, that's what we're doing here. We're giving a

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

defendant the right to compel a victim to appear at a bail hearing when they've been gone through the worst... worst moment in their life. And we have a Constitution that says they must be free from intimidation and duress. Do you think that what you're doing here is consistent with Marsy's Law, which strictly prohibits harassment, intimidation, and abuse? And when you bring a crime victim in within days, if not hours, from the time that they are abused, how can that not be intimidation and abuse?"

Slaughter: "Yes, Leader. To that question, yes, Leader, it is consistent. This is why. The victim advocate organizations at the table support the Bill."

Durkin: "It doesn't make a difference. I'm asking you... I want you to ask... I want you to tell me... I don't care what the... I've been going back and forth with the victims' rights, asking them specifically, how does this change comply with Marsy's Law, the Constitutional Amendment?"

Slaughter: "Well, what... what was their answer?"

Durkin: "They have not responded."

Slaughter: "Oh, okay."

Durkin: "All right, go ahead. You know everything. Come on."

Slaughter: "I said it's consistent."

Durkin: "You're absolutely wrong. Bring in somebody at crime..."

Slaughter: "I just... you asked, and I said it was consistent.

You're asking me again."

Durkin: "Mr. Slaughter. Mr. Slaughter, as one who has practiced law..."

Slaughter: "This is why victims' advocate groups have called you out publicly."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Durkin: "They're absolutely wrong. But the fact is, if they think it's good to..."

Slaughter: "Because you are disrespecting... you are disrespecting..."

Durkin: "...drag in a victim of crime... all right."

Slaughter: "Yeah, you're disrespecting them."

Durkin: "If... if the advocacy groups and you believe that it is acceptable and it's good practice to drag a crime victim, against her will, into a detention hearing... for what purpose? If I've done one, I've done 10 thousand bail hearings in my life. I'm going to tell you this. If this goes into effect, that first victim who is going to be brought in unwillingly, you'll never see them again 'cause the trauma from the crime is still raw. It's intimidation. It's harassment. I'm not convinced, nor do I care what the advocacy groups say. This is your language and it is completely inconsistent with the constitutional change from a couple years ago."

Slaughter: "It's unfortunate that you disrespect..."

Durkin: "Who do I disrespect?"

Slaughter: "Victim... victim advocate groups."

Durkin: "No, you don't know what the heck you're talking about, Sir. I just told you specifically what this language that you are advocating, you're asking to be made part of the law of Illinois, and I'm telling you specifically what the Constitutional Amendment that the... that was completed in 2014 requires. It's not disrespect. The disrespect is going to be dragging these victims in who are going to be compelled, involuntarily, to appear at a bond hearing. That's wrong. You can take your position. I'm confident with my position. The

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

last thing I want to talk about, which I was not able to talk about a few years ago, is the issue of anonymous complaints to discipline a police officer. Here's the question. Do you believe, under the confrontation clause... go, Mr. Hartmann, you can probably whisper into his ear... that an individual has the right to be confronted by their accuser under the Sixth Amendment? That's what it says."

Slaughter: "Yeah, in criminal cases. But for the Body, so you should know, this is not in the Bill."

Durkin: "You're amending the Bill. I don't care. Sixth Amendment applies to the criminal cases. But what... in civil cases, Mr. Slaughter, an administrative hearing, which would be a disciplinary proceeding which an anonymous complaint would be the bases of, would be a civil hearing, a civil administrative hearing, correct?"

Slaughter: "I'm sorry. Can you... can you repeat that?"

Durkin: "Yeah, the… all right. Let's get… okay. When an anonymous complaint or a complaint is filed against a law enforcement officer, it leads to some type of disciplinary proceeding, correct? A complaint is a disciplinary proceeding."

Slaughter: "Yes."

Durkin: "And that is civil in nature, correct? Hartmann, go ahead.

It is."

Slaughter: "I guess it could be."

Durkin: "It's not criminal. It is. It is."

Slaughter: "Okay."

Durkin: "But the law has been very clear in Illinois and all throughout the country that, while we talk about the Sixth Amendment right to confrontation, a person who is being

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

deprived of their employment has an absolute constitutional right, under the due process clause and also the 14th Amendment, to be confronted by their accuser. But when you have an anonymous complaint filed, which could be the basis to have an officer decertified, placed on probation, we are getting it wrong again. Any thoughts on that?"

Slaughter: "No. We'll continue to work on that."

Durkin: "Oh, gosh."

Slaughter: "But that is not in the Bill."

Durkin: "All right."

Slaughter: "This Bill that's before this Body right now."

Durkin: "Well, if this is what you're asking... and this is what you guys have done to law enforcement officers, and it's an absolute shame. Let me just say this. I didn't get a chance to debate this Bill a year and a half ago. I had plenty of things to say. I understand this area of law very well. And I've heard comments about all the Republicans, when they raise a question about this, that we're fearmongers. And sometimes, I've heard things which are worse. I take great offense to that. And you should too because you and I both received an award called the Protectors of the Innocent last year. This isn't a guy who believes in locking them up and throwing away the key. I believe in fairness on both sides. I believe in fairness for the prosecution, police, the defense, and yes, the victims under our Constitution. When this Bill was passed a few years ago, I said it was misquided, confusing, scheme that will diminish public safety in all regions and streets throughout Illinois and I stand by that today."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Windhorst."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Windhorst: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill receive the constitutionally required number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Windhorst has requested a verification."

Windhorst: "To the Bill. Throughout this process, the proponents have claimed that the elimination of cash bail in the SAFE-T Act is an effort to give judges discretion to detain those who judges consider to be dangerous or likely to flee the jurisdiction. But that's not what the SAFE-T Act does and that's not what this Bill does. What we are doing is adding to a laundry list of potentially detainable offenses. We've created a detention net. That detention net still has holes. If we want judges to have discretion, give them discretion. Allow judges to hold individuals that they believe are dangerous or likely to flee the jurisdiction. Instead, we've chosen a different route. And what that means is we'll see those holes in the detention net and we'll be back in a year to try to patch the hole. And then we'll find another hole, be back in another year and try to patch that hole. Just give judges the discretion. Do what you claim you want this Bill to do. We have a 90-day trial provision in the detention statute which conflicts and is inconsistent with our longheld 120-day speedy trial provision. There was opportunity to fix this, but we didn't and we should've fixed it. But instead, we're creating scenarios where a 90-day clock may run when 120-day clock didn't run and it will be a problem for the court system. Also, there's a provision in this Bill which really hasn't gotten much discussion. But we have taken

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

certain mandatory consecutive sentences and made them discretionary. These mandatory consecutive sentences were for repeat offenders, people who committed crimes while on pretrial release or people who committed crimes while in detention. Crimes against correctional officers. Crimes against other inmates. Crimes against society when they were released. Instead of leaving those as mandatory consecutive sentences, we make it discretionary. So, when we talk about the pretrial fairness aspect of the Bill, we're lessening penalties for repeat offenders. That's not going to help public safety. And we still haven't addressed constitutional issues, probably because we can't. The Constitution envisions a cash bail system under Article 1, Section 9. We should let the court rule on that provision before we start doing anything with implementing this Act. That's the responsible thing to do. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill does not go far enough to protect public safety and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Collins present?"

Collins: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative, would you say that again with

your camera on?"

Collins: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Collins is present."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Vella."

Vella: "Thank you. I have two questions. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Vella: "Thank you. The first question is, it is my understanding there is some clarifying language regarding body cameras. Are both police groups and advocates okay with that language?"
- Slaughter: "Yes. It is agreed upon language simply clarifying intent... the intent of the Body-Worn Camera Act is to capture law enforcement encounters with members of the public."
- Vella: "Thank you. And the second question was, is it the intent of the Bill that administrative personnel don't need body cameras issued?"
- Slaughter: "Yes. The Act supports issuing body cameras to police department personnel engaged in law enforcement encounters or activities as defined in the Act and not intended to apply to administrative personnel and others not engaging in law enforcement encounters or activities."

Vella: "Perfect. Thank you very much."

Speaker Harris: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

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

McCombie: "Would my... just a little build up here. My 8-year-old niece is walking to school and she is picked up by 2 men about the age of 30, 35 years old, taken behind a building in the alley, brutally raped. They think she is dead, so they bury her in a shallow grave, but she digs her way out. Somebody finds her, take her to the local hospital. They find the men. Could a judge compel her to go to court at her... at the detention hearing?"

Slaughter: "Well, no. What we have... this Bill does actually not make that possible."

McCombie: "Pardon me?"

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Slaughter: "I said the Bill does not make what... does not make this possible."

McCombie: "Yes, it does. Show me in the Bill where it does not, please."

Slaughter: "It actually makes it more difficult for that to happen, actually."

McCombie: "Please find that in the Bill. Please. I'll wait."

Slaughter: "Okay. What we did initially in the SAFE-T Act is put forth those guardrails. Leader, I think we need to go back to not this Bill but the initial language in the SAFE-T Act, which did put those guardrails in, Leader."

McCombie: "So, in the original Bill, my niece would have to go before... a judge could compel my niece to go before a judge in front of these two animals. Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

McCombie: "In trailer 1, 2, 3, or 4 does not remove that."

Slaughter: "Well, that's... that's correct."

McCombie: "Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. But not because of this Bill, but that's correct. Yes."

McCombie: "Okay. So, there's still something that needs to be fixed because nobody in this chamber can think that that's appropriate. Is that correct? Nobody in this chamber can think that that is appropriate. Right?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

McCombie: "Do you think that's appropriate, Representative?"

Slaughter: "No. No. But we're... we have addressed that in other iterations of..."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- McCombie: "No, no, no. You just said that was in the original Bill and we did not fix it in 1, 2, 3, and this is 4, and that is not fixed. Is that correct, Sir?"
- Slaughter: "It was up to the judge before the SAFE-T Act. What we've done is made that more difficult."
- McCombie: "I said... the question was, can a judge still compel my 13-year-old niece to go to..."
- Slaughter: "Yes. Yes. Sorry about that. Yes."
- McCombie: "Yes. Yes, yes. Okay. And I said, nobody in this chamber thinks that is appropriate. And then now, my question to you, do you think that is appropriate?"
- Slaughter: "No, but the judge would have the option. It would be up to the judge."
- McCombie: "We're... we're writing the laws. If we don't think that's appropriate, why did we put it in the first Bill? We wrote the Bill. Why did we put it in the first one? And if we thought it was inappropriate, why didn't we fix it in #1, 2, 3, or 4? Back to Patrick Windhorst's, we're going to be coming back, and back, and back, and back. To the Bill. This Bill still has zero cash bail, still going to be in there. Fine. No appropriation to local communities, which will no doubt bring about a decrease in services to those in need, services that include mental health, social services, and public safety. Decreased penalties for repeat offenders, which we all apparently want. Officers can be terminated without due processes, which apparently, we want. We're going to go ahead and exploit victims, which we all just agreed that it's inappropriate. Our mothers, our children, our friends, our

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

neighbors. A 'yes' vote here, folks, is going to prioritize criminals over victims. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

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

Mazzochi: "Representative Slaughter, earlier you said that you would take back calling Leader Durkin disingenuous. Are you also willing to walk back your accusations that those on my side of the aisle who voted against the SAFE-T Act initially were racist for taking that vote?"

Slaughter: "What?"

Mazzochi: "Are you willing..."

Slaughter: "Am I going to take back what? What are you..."

Mazzochi: "The... do you recall making accusations that those of us who were opposed to the SAFE-T Act and those of us who were warning you about all of these problems that were going to result if the SAFE-T Act passed as is? Do you not recall referring to us as racist and saying that those suggestions that there were problems with the SAFE-T Act result... qualified as racist dog whistles? You gave a press conference on that."

Slaughter: "It had some racist undertones."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. Are you willing to take that back now that our predictions have actually demonstrated true, that there were problems with language in the SAFE-T Act, and that it did need to be changed, and that it wasn't a good Bill on a whole host of provisions?"

Slaughter: "Well, I mean, we're treating this like any other Bill.

I mean, you... we come back, we do trailer Bills, we work with stakeholders."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Mazzochi: "Oh, no. You accused..."

Slaughter: "This is what we do on trailer Bills and that's what we've done."

"...no, no, no. Let's be clear. You accused us of Mazzochi: objecting to this Bill in bad faith based on racism because we didn't understand what was happening in your communities, because we were concerned about only what was going to be happening to our communities. No, we can ... we care about the safety of everybody in our communities. No, you know what? We can't control who you decide to elect as your Cook County prosecutor, and we can't control who you decide to slate as your Cook County judges. We understand your political machine does that. So, you know what? You guys want to live with those consequences, that's up to you. But we did object to you taking bad, utopian legislation that historically has never worked and saying that somehow our practical, commonsense objections to legislative language that we knew was going to create problems for victims, for people in our own communities, throwing that down our throats statewide. And to say that our objections were based on racism was offensive. It was insulting. So, since you're taking back some language today, we'd like you to take back those accusations too."

Slaughter: "Representative, what have been the problems that you're referencing?"

Mazzochi: "Oh, many problems. Where do you want to start? I mean, you want to agree that thousands of... we warned you that police officers were going to start leaving the field in droves. Isn't it true that there have been thousands of early retirements because law enforcement does not want to have to

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

operate under the dictates of this legal system that you're going to impose on them starting January 1?"

Slaughter: "CPD had a spike in applications, Representative."

Mazzochi: "Yeah. How many officers? Is CPD operating at full force? Can they find enough qualified people to fill their ranks? No, they cannot. We're having difficulties even in the suburbs."

Slaughter: "So condescending. I mean, you talk about us defunding law enforcement. We put together a great crime package that totally funds law enforcement, and you all put 'no' votes on it."

Mazzochi: "Yeah, because it didn't..."

Slaughter: "That's offensive. Because what?"

Mazzochi: "...because it doesn't... it doesn't fund law enforcement. Because you know what? To try to say, oh, well, we're going to give you a few benefits, but we're also going to create the conditions where your entire career is going to be ruined based anonymous accusations. No. That's not supporting law enforcement. That's creating the conditions that you will not have good, honorable people wanting to join the ranks of law enforcement. Now, even if you want... here's another question. On page 283 to 284 of the Bill, why are you all of a sudden changing the rule that, for example, if you attack a correctional officer, oh, now you're going to serve that sentence consecutively... I'm sorry, not consecutively. It's going to be concurrent. Why are you changing that? How's that supportive of law enforcement?"

Slaughter: "Well, under these Amendments, judges retain the power to sentence people consecutively. They're just no longer

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

required to sentence people consecutively. So, now judges will have more discretion. This change was also already made in the original SAFE-T Act. And so, the issue is not new to this particular trailer Bill. The Amendments in the trailer Bill simply assure the law is consistent across all statutory sections."

- Mazzochi: "Well, one of the… isn't it true that if you're out of pretrial release for theft, under this new concurrent, as opposed to consecutive, standards, you know that… let's say you know you did it. You're looking at a two-to-five-year sentence. What's the downside to you committing more theft crimes? Because you're still going to get two to five years. They can all be served at the same time concurrently under this new language you're putting in here."
- Slaughter: "Well, the judge would be calculating all these things and it would be up to the judge to make these decisions."
- Mazzochi: "Yeah, well maybe you have... we don't... we certainly don't have confidence in Cook County judges being able to do that because, if they did, we wouldn't be in situations where..."

Slaughter: "Well, statewide, Leader."

- Mazzochi: "...people are engaging in repeat crimes over and over again and apparently not getting any jail time. When it comes to violent felonies, people who are in... who commit felonies while they're in detention, battery, sexual assault, murder. That's going to be another one, right, where those same... those new crimes that they commit in jail, they can just serve them now concurrently."
- Slaughter: "Yeah. The judge is going to take all that into account and make the decision."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Mazzochi: "Right. But previously, we, as a legislative Body, set as policy, we're going to make you serve those consecutively. Because we understood that there's not going to be any deterrence to committing new crimes if you're not getting any additional penalty at all. To the Bill. The SAFE-T Act was a bad Bill with bad provisions when you first enacted it. You've had to try to modify it multiple times. Now, we appreciate that a lot of our objections to the Bill finally, when they make them into the public domain, you hear from people and maybe you're now trying to actually respond to some of that. But you should be doing a lot more thoughtful policy on the frontend. You should be much more comprehensive in fixing all of these changes because we see it in our districts, we see it in our neighborhoods. We see crime is going up. A lot of that crime in my district is spillover crime from people in Cook County who have lengthy criminal records that your judges and your prosecutor refuse to actually hold accountable for the crimes that they committed. I know it's your goal to try to empty the Cook County jails, but you know what? This is not the way to do it. This is not good policy that's going to protect the people of Illinois. Once again, I appreciate you're trying to put lipstick on a pig, but it's still a pig."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Slaughter to close. Wait. One moment, I'm sorry. Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

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

Gordon-Booth: "Chairman Slaughter, a lot has been said this evening, and I'd like to reset the table for a moment. And if you could be very specific, I think that would be helpful for

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

this Body. As you pulled together this trailer that you committed to continuing to work on when you passed this legislation in January of 2021, you've done so in a manner in which... that brought people from all over this state, from both sides of the aisle, to the table. Would you be willing to share specifically who was at the table from the States Attorneys Association?"

- Slaughter: "Sure. And thank you, Leader. DuPage State's Attorney Bob Berlin was at the table, who we all know represents the other side of the aisle. We also had Jamie Mosser... State's Attorney Jamie Mosser from Kane County, as well as State's Attorney Julia Rietz from Champaign County."
- Gordon-Booth: "Was there always agreement, Chairman Slaughter, on the path forward? Or was there a compromise made along the way in order to bring this piece of legislation together?"
- Slaughter: "Well, what I'll say was there's extensive, robust discussions, extensive negotiations. And so, with the focus of balancing out both public safety as well as reforms, it was indeed a process. And we got there in regards to... to what we have here, dare I say a collaboration, but a product that does represent the wishes and the objectives of the advocacy on both ends of the public safety spectrum."
- Gordon-Booth: "Chairman Slaughter, there was a lot said about victims and the support of victims. Would you be willing to share, with the Body, specific victims' organizations, domestic violence organizations that are supportive of this policy?"
- Slaughter: "Sure, if you give me one second. The Bill's supported by the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence and the

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation. Both of these organizations at the table crafting their desires within a lot of these provisions, really, really supporting the notification aspect that they're going to get from the courts in regards to their issues. And then also, what we're doing is streamlining this process so that we are able to rework our court system to handle more of these serious, more violent offenses that, unfortunately, do occur as domestic violence."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you for that clarification, Chairman Slaughter. To the Bill. As you've heard from Chairman Slaughter, there's a lot of work that's been done on this

Slaughter. To the Bill. As you've heard from Chairman Slaughter, there's a lot of work that's been done on this policy that, contrary to popular belief, happened long before memes started floating around on social media. Chairman Slaughter stated in January of 2021 that he would continue to work on this legislation. And he made that promise, and he kept that promise. He has continued to bring folks from all sides of this issue, whether it be the advocate community, the law enforcement community, to have really important and at times very difficult conversations. And see, that's the thing about this Body. If you actually talk to people and work together in a collaborative manner, in a... I would even say in a bipartisan manner, you can get to a result that is actually going to do two things. That has the ability to keep our communities safer; have the ability to better protect victims of crime; to better protect victims of domestic violence; to better protect victims of sexual assault, which is why those victims' organizations are in support of this policy; at the same time, bringing more humanity to a process that desperately needed it. I want to thank the Chairman for

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

all of his work to protect victims of crime. Those of us out there, we see you working incredibly hard to bring true public safety to our communities that's actually investing in our communities, at the same time, investing in law enforcement. Because there is clearly a belief, certainly by this side of the aisle, that you can do both, that you can stand in the gap for humanity. You can bring a more humane process to all of those that are involved in the system and you can support law enforcement at the same time. The fact of the matter of it is, there is nothing that comes through this Body that is perfect. But what we always strive to do is bring progress to the people that we all serve. I want to thank Chairman Slaughter for all the work that you have been doing that you committed to do. I'd also like to thank Chairman Gong-Gershowitz, Representative Vella, Chairman Buckner, Leader Manley, and Representative Delgado for their steadfast work in supporting Chairman Slaughter in this process in this project that you are bringing forward today. It has been an honor to support your leadership and to work with you. I thank you for helping to usher in a space in a time that all of us should be able to be proud of. Thank you so much, Chairman Slaughter."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

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

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Before I ask a few clarifying questions,

Representative, I just think it's important to level set for
this Body why we're here and what we're talking about. When

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

we set out to do this work, the impetus behind it was a current system wherein somebody who has not yet been convicted of a crime... and let's all remember that on our constitutional system we are all entitled to a presumption of innocence. We are talking about a pretrial detention system wherein the accused has not yet had the opportunity, has not yet had the opportunity to have the state's evidence tested. And the reason why we have a constitutional guarantee in our system is it protects every single one of us. Every single one of us. Equal justice under law should mean something. We are here because a system wherein somebody's detention pretrial is determined not based on whether they are a threat to the community but whether or not they have enough cash to bail out of jail is one that has been deemed manifestly unjust. That's why we are here. So, as a level-set, let's remember where we started. We started to do the work to ensure that equal justice under law means exactly that, that you don't have somebody bond out because they have a wad of cash in their pocket or because they have enough money in their bank account while somebody else is in jail simply because they're poor. That's why we're here. And so, I just want to commend my colleagues who had the courage to do this work, who had the courage to challenge the status quo and say that we will not continue to support a system that is manifestly unjust. That's where we start. So, two years ago, we embarked on one of the most complicated pieces of legislation that this Body will undertake. And I am incredibly proud of the work of my colleagues to get it right over the last two years. We are now at a point where we have a Bill where both the proponents,

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

the advocates, and law enforcement are all neutral on the Bill. So, I just want to ask a couple clarifying questions with that spirit in mind. Representative, for those offenses, under the detention net, what would be the standard through which a judge would make a determination whether or not somebody is detained pretrial? What is... what is that standard?"

Slaughter: "Representative... and thank you for your leadership as well. One of the things that we really wanted to do was create a detention net, create an in-and-out system that would allow for more violent, high-level crimes to be eligible for detainment. This was also a recommendation of the commission. What we've seen in other states like New Jersey, which is really the only state that we can compare this to, is that we didn't want all offenses to be detainable 'cause we continue to see those race disparities in New Jersey. And when you look at those lower-level offenses, those race disparities were even more pronounced and more prevalent. And so, that's what we're doing in creating... creating a detention net. We also want to define a dangerousness standard in that someone could be a threat to a particular person as well as the community. In making sure that we did make that distinction, right, of those two elements, that you could be a threat to a person or to the community. One of the reasons we really wanted to do that is because we do actually make an exception for some of these higher-level nonviolent offenses. What I'm getting at are some of these drug offenses where we've created, with stakeholders' input, more so of a bifurcated dangerousness standard where how it will be applied will

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

depend on if the offense is violent in nature or not. With those nonviolent offenses, we would need to prove to a higher standard that that particular individual is actually a threat to an individual. But on those violent offenses, we'd be able to use a more generalized threat to community standard. And so, that's what we've been doing, crafting a well-defined dangerousness standard throughout this Bill."

- Gong-Gershowitz: "Would it be fair to say then that the judge has an opportunity, where somebody would be a threat to a person or the community, to detain that person pretrial, and that is the goal of this Bill and that's what we have accomplished in this trailer?"
- Slaughter: "That would be absolutely correct. It would be up to a judge's discretion as well as, in tandem, utilizing an assessment tool, for example, that we're also introducing into this starting January 1. And we are triaging into a system that would allow judges more discretion to make these decisions."
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you. To the Bill. To my colleagues, there are few opportunities that we have to make groundbreaking change, to live up to the words emblazoned on the United States Supreme Court, equal justice under law. This is one of those times. It's hard work. Sometimes it takes us going back and making sure that we make clarifications and improvements. And I am incredibly proud of the work that this Body has put in to making sure that we get exactly to that place. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Guzzardi."

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

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

Guzzardi: "First of all, Chairman Slaughter, I will echo the many congratulations and thanks you've heard already this evening on your terrific work in this process and your in... the inclusive nature of this process over the course of these past years. I want to just focus on one area that has been the subject of, I would say, considerable public consternation, perhaps, over the last couple of years around the question of trespass and misdemeanor citations. Is it correct to say that there are some who, in the public, have characterized the SAFE-T Act prior to this trailer as allowing people to persistently trespass without law enforcement being able to intervene?"

Slaughter: "Yeah, that would be true. Yes."

Guzzardi: "So... is it true that perhaps that characterization is not universally held amongst all parties who've read the legislation?"

Slaughter: "That would also be true, Representative."

Guzzardi: "So, I think I was one of the folks who might've had some questions about that characterization and perhaps suggest that maybe it was politically motivated or motivated by other considerations beyond just the text of the statute. But to your credit, you took those character... those questions very seriously, you all in the working group. Where some might've dismissed them as mere political rhetoric in an election cycle, you all took them seriously. So, maybe you can just walk the Body briefly through the changes that you proposed here in the Amendments on which we'll concur as pertaining to trespass and willful flight."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Slaughter: "Yeah, sure. One of the things we certainly wanted to do is look at the system and look at those areas where individuals are being pushed deeper into the system. One of the things the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices did was recommend that officers have the discretion to issue citations and tickets when you're talking about these low-level offenses. Now, one of those low-level offenses happens to be trespassing. And so, we... what we wanted to do was clarify that officers could indeed arrest the individual if the individual poses a threat and if the individual continues to trespass. We clarified that officers could indeed make that arrest. But, Representative, in cases where the individual's not posing a threat, we're requiring that officers do submit a citation before the arrest."
- Guzzardi: "And how do various parties of the negotiating table view that change that you all made?"
- Slaughter: "Again, a lot of extensive, robust conversations. But law enforcement is totally on board with this and agreed with the language and gave extensive input as to their suggestions on this."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Chairman. And to the Bill. Representative Gong-Gershowitz gave us a little bit of setting the table about why we're here. And I want to just return to that briefly and say that we are... we fundamentally, today, operate in a system whereby someone's liberty is dependent on the amount of money in their bank account. That is the basic premise of the cash bail system that we operate in here in the State of Illinois. And I'm... I genuinely believe that none of us... and we talk about what we can and can't stand for in

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

this chamber. None of us should, deep down in our hearts, believe that a system in which your liberty is dependent on your bank account is a fair and equitable system. I don't think anybody in this room believes that that's the system under which we should live. I think we all agree that someone should be detained prior to their trial if and only if they pose a risk when they get released. Right? It's not a matter of can they afford it or not. That system has corrupted our... the premises of our justice system in this country for too long. And just about two years ago, we took a historic step to end that corruption of our system and to make the transition from a system based on money to a system based on incredibly historic and powerful safety. That is an transition that we are making in the State of Illinois. And we have had the past two years to examine those efforts, to look carefully at the consequences of the changes that we proposed, to hear from folks across the spectrum about their views on those changes. And to the incredible credit of Chairman Slaughter, of Leader Gordon-Booth, of everyone who has worked on this for these past two years, they have listened to every party and done their level best to bring consensus around a set of changes that will make this transition smoother and more effective. I think that this piece of legislation is a vital measure to bring about a true system of justice in our State of Illinois, true public safety, not based on your wealth but based on justice. It's an incredibly important transition. This is needed to make that transition work. I commend the tremendous work that you all have done. I'm proud of the work that we've done as a

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

state. I look forward to January 1 when our system of justice will become more fair. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Delgado."

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

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

Delgado: "Chairman Slaughter, I have another clarifying question that I'd like to ask of you. I think there's been some discussion about the transition from the current state to the new state. Could you give us a little bit more detail about the work that you did to make it... to address some of the concerns that were out there on the transition from the current state to the new state?"

Slaughter: "Yes. Thanks, Representative. And thank you so much for your... your hard work on the Public Safety Working Group. As we look forward to the January 1, 2023 effective date, one of the more pressing questions about this initiative is what will happen to those individuals impacted by the old system. These are individuals that have been arrested and charged before January 1. This Bill, House Bill 1095, outlines the transition period that allows the state or defendant to have the option of moving individual cases to the new system. This provision also puts forth time parameters for when the hearings need to be held. With that being said, Representative, there certainly will not be any sort of purgelike event. In fact, quite the opposite. We're providing a very fair, legal process and protocol for the court system to handle this. In fact, if you're under the old system, you actually stay under the old system, but you have the option, right, to bring these cases back before the court."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Delgado: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The reason that I wanted to draw some attention to... one of... to that particular adjustment that we made in the legislation is because I feel that that was in response to some of the concerns that had been raised. One of the things that I am very proud about being a part of this... this working group was because we had the opportunity to sit for, I want to say nearly eight months, with different stakeholders who would bring concerns and we would try to figure out how to address them. When we started this process, a lot of the parties were very far apart. And we got to the end, and I think we were able to find compromise. And it's one of the things that I think all of us in this Body consistently strive to do is to bring compromise. And as a result, I think that we have a pretty good body of work that we can be proud of. And I thank my colleagues who worked very closely over the past several months, and I urge an 'aye' vote on this piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Harris: "Sponsor yields."

Cassidy: "Chairman Slaughter, I know that we've all shared our experience of how our constituents have reacted to some of the criticisms of this Bill. One of the things that my constituents reached about more often than almost anything else was the issue of trespass. So, I just... for those who are listening, can you please share how that was fixed and how that was clarified?"

Slaughter: "Yes. Again... and just to get back to the origination of why we were looking at this. Again, this was something

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

that the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices took a look at. One of those areas where we felt that individuals were being pushed more into the system, where we would allow officers the discretion to issue citations in lieu of arrests for low-level offenses. What we know is that one of those low-level offenses were... was trespass. So, we just clarified that if the individual is not a threat, then you can... you can provide... or the officer can issue that citation. Now, if the individual's posing a threat, the officer clearly can make that arrest. And so, we just clarified that. Personally, I thought it was already clear, but we came back and clarified that again."

Cassidy: "And I agree. It did seem to be already clear. But just to... let's be as abundantly clear as we can be. The folks in the condos along Sheridan Road who were concerned that they would not be able to remove people from their buildings, those concerns have been fully addressed. Is that correct?"

Slaughter: "They will be, yes. Once we pass this, yes."

Cassidy: "Thank you. In this. Thank you. To the Bill. I want to thank everyone that put in so much work on this. I've... Chairman Slaughter and I have shared the joy of carrying big Bills, both individually and together, and I know that there's always a lot of other folks involved. So, I want to thank all the folks on the... on the working group who took this on. I'm grateful to the advocates who reached out to give ideas. And I'm thankful to have been able to play a small part in helping get those ideas into the mix. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Slaughter to close."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Slaughter: "Yeah, thank you for such a robust discussion. I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1095, as amended, with Senate Bill... with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1095?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Yes. Representative Ammons votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Representative Bennett votes 'no', please."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bennett votes 'no'. Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Representative Carroll votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Carroll votes 'yes'.

Representative Collins."

Collins: "Representative Collins votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Collins votes 'yes'.

Representative Didech."

Didech: "Didech votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Didech votes 'yes'. Representative Evans."

Evans: "Representative Evans votes 'yes'."

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

Harper: "Rep Harper votes 'yes'."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

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

Jones: "Representative Jones votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jones votes 'yes'. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Rep Mason votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Representative Mayfield votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mayfield votes 'yes'.

Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ramirez votes 'yes'.

Representative Reick."

Reick: "Reick votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Reick votes 'no'. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Representative Robinson votes 'yes'."

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

Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.. have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There has been a request for a verification. Mr. Clerk."

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

Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade;

Representative Avelar; Representative Buckner;

Representative Burke; Representative Carroll; Representative

Cassidy; Representative Collins; Representative Conroy;

Representative Costa Howard; Representative Crespo;

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Representative Croke; Representative Davis; Representative Delgado; Representative DeLuca; Representative Representative Evans; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Representative Representative Gonzalez; Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guerrero-Cuellar; Guzzardi; Representative Representative Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Representative Hernandez; Representative Lisa Representative Hirschauer; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jones; Representative Kelly; Representative Kifowit; Representative LaPointe; Representative Lilly; Representative Mah; Representative Manley; Representative Mason; Representative Mayfield; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Moylan; Representative Representative Ness; Representative Mussman; Nichols; Representative Ortiz; Representative Ramirez; Representative Representative Robinson; Representative Rita; Scherer; Representative Slaughter; Representative Smith; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Representative Stuart; Representative Vella; Representative Representative Walsh; Representative Walker; Representative Ann Williams; Representative Jawaharial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yang Rohr; Representative Yednock; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Windhorst. Greenwood.

Representative Greenwood. She's in her chair."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Windhorst: "I'm sorry. I didn't see you. Representative Flowers."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Flowers is in the back waving."

Windhorst: "Representative Ness."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ness is in her seat waving."

Windhorst: "And Representative Mah."

Speaker Harris: "Mah also is in her seat two doors down from Representative Ness waving."

Windhorst: "Withdraw the verification."

Speaker Harris: "With... the verification has been withdrawn. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Amendments... Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1095. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Revenue & Finance will meet in Room 122B.

Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges will meet in Room 115."

Speaker Harris: "Members, may I have your attention for an announcement? It's our intention to go... Members. Members, it is our intention now to break for committees. Committees should be very brief. We will then return to the floor. If everyone comes back quickly, we should be here for a very short period. But we're asking people to go to committees, do the work of the committees as quickly as possible, return here, and then we should be here for a relatively short time. So, go to your committees, those who have them. We will stand at ease to the call of the Chair. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on December 1, 2022: recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 5189. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on December 1, 2022: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 5049."
- Speaker Harris: "On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 59, Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3, Representative Zalewski. Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm waiting to see the numbers of the Amendments. I wish to concur in House... in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 5189. This is a revenue omnibus Bill that contains several component pieces. Namely, legislation that improves and/or tweaks the REV tax credit to lure more electric vehicle manufactures to Illinois. I'd like to thank Representative Vella for his hard work on this. We changed the Cook County property tax deadline in the first installment one month so that the assessors can appropriately apply the exemptions. We add... extend the sunset for ABLE accounts, which are savings accounts for families who wish to save for a person with disability. We make... clarify that student loan forgiveness is not taxable income. I believe that... oh, and then we make a technical change to a live feed or tax credit. I wish to concur in these Amendments, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Speaker Harris: "Leader Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two points. I just want to excuse Representative Chesney, Bos, Wheeler, Hamilton, and Bennett for the remainder of the day. And then I would like to debate the Bill."
- Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."
- Batinick: "Representative, what are... there's five tax credits here. Can we just quickly just give the five? It's film. We're giving it... go ahead."
- Zalewski: "Two tax credits we deal with are the live theater, which makes a change... a technical change dealing with the amount. And the... the other tax credit is the REV tax incentive. I'm not sure the others are credits per se."
- Batinick: "Okay. But we have the... the student loan forgiveness is we're not providing..."
- Zalewski: "That's... that's saying that student loan forgiveness is not taxable income."
- Batinick: "Correct. Wanted to make that clear. Were there... what were the two other points addressed in the Bill?"
- Zalewski: "The Cook County deadline for the first installment is being moved one month because the nature of the tardiness of the December bills means that there's going to be Certificates of Error. We need the assessors to have one more month to apply those Certificates of Error and the proper exemptions, so we're going to move that one month. And then... I think that's it. I think that's it, Mark."
- Batinick: "There's four? I thought there was five issues addressed."
- Zalewski: "The ABLE sunset extension."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Batinick: "Okay."

Zalewski: "ABLE account sunset extension."

Batinick: "Okay. So, this... this is some moving of some dates and

some tax incentives. This is essentially..."

Zalewski: "Cleanup."

Batinick: "...cleanup."

Zalewski: "No... no new incentives here."

Batinick: "Right. Well, cleanup. Well, it's somewhat of a tax incentive to eliminate the tax if you get some debt relief,

correct?"

Zalewski: "Sure. Correct."

Batinick: "And then over in the Howlett, how do they vote on this Bill?"

Zalewski: "They all voted for it."

Batinick: "They all voted for it. Okay. Thank you for the clarifying questions."

Zalewski: "You're welcome."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Zalewski to close."

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

Speaker Harris: "The Motion is to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 5189. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Representative Carroll votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Carroll votes 'yes'.

Representative Collins. Representative Didech.

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Representative Evans. Representative Harper. Representative Jones. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Mayfield. Representative Ramirez. Representative Reick. Representative Robinson."

Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With a vote of 84 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the Motion to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 59 (sic-5189) has received the Constitutional Majority and hereby declared passed. This is final action. On Supplemental Calendar #2 appears a concurrence for House Bill 5049, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for concurrence on Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 5049. This is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. And what it does is, it... currently under Illinois law, people who are 75 or older must take the driver's license test every year. However, as a result of emergency order, that was extended and you did not have to take it every year. So, what this will do is it will extend that so they would have a driver's license till the age of... for 4 years, 79. You wouldn't have to take it every year. So, seniors wouldn't have to go and take the driver's license test every year. It'll extend that till October 1, 2023. In the meantime, the Secretary of State's going to conduct a study on these agerelated changes and will give the findings by October 1, 2023. In addition, it authorizes the issuance of a retired executive

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

branch constitutional officer license plate. I ask for a favorable roll call."

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

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that

Tom Morrison will be gone for the remainder of the day and is

excused."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Marron."

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

Speaker Harris: "Indicates he'll yield."

Marron: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, just a point of clarification.

This... the study is intended to see if we can raise the age limit, correct? The intention is not to lower the age requirement?"

Hoffman: "There is no intention to lower the age, and that was a concern, I believe, of AARP. They now have... we have indicated to them we have no intention of lowering it, and I'll do a trailer Bill saying you won't be able to lower it. We would like say that if you're between 75, you don't have to take the test every year. And the state that's nearest us requires multiple testing at 79. So, I think what we'll do is, hopefully, this will extend for 10 months the fact that they don't have to take the test every year. And then we'll extend it further after that study."

Marron: "Thank you for the clarification. I had the opportunity to speak with a representative from AARP and they are... are confident and feel good about moving forward. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman to close."

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

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 5049?' 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 Hollman: "Representative Ammons. Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Representative Carroll votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Carroll votes 'yes'.

Representative Collins."

Ammons: "I'm sorry. Representative Ammons is a 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Didech. Representative Evans. Representative Harper. Representative Jones. Representative Mason."

Mason: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Mason votes 'yes'. Representative Mayfield. Representative Ramirez. Representative Reick."

Reick: "As one who's approaching those age limits rather rapidly,

I vote 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Reick votes 'yes'. Representative Robinson."

Speaker Harris: "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 80 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 5049. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Costa Howard, for what reason do you

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

seek recognition? Representative Spain, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of recognition, please."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Spain: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as we know... and I know it's been a long final day to Veto Session and beg your indulgence for just a few more minutes so we can share some important recognition to a few Members that will not be returning with us here when we return in January prior to the swearing in. And so, tonight I rise to recognize a very good friend of mine. Someone who, sometimes to my frustration, has indulged his status also as a native Peorian and would always remind me of his Peoria bona fides throughout his years of experience. I'm talking about someone who's riding off on the rails in just a few short weeks, and that's our friend Tim Butler. Tim Butler has served as the Leader for the 87th District for the last seven years. He's served with great distinction. Of course, I came to know Tim Butler. He's the Member of this General Assembly that I've known the longest because I served as an intern in the office of Congressman Ray LaHood where Tim Butler was the communication's director and, ultimately, chief of staff. He also served as chief of staff for Congressman Rodney Davis. His service Springfield and the bipartisanship that he has brought forward, the enthusiasm for this job really has been second to none. His legislative accolades and achievements are really too numerous to go through, having been recognized by the Farm Bureau, the Illinois Chamber, the NFIB, I believe the Legislator of the Year for ABATE, on and on and on. The

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

list of accomplishments that Representative Butler has been able to deliver on behalf of his constituents and in service to this General Assembly are truly incredible. I think if we are looking back on the service of Tim Butler, and I know that this has been just the best job that he has put his heart and love into. And if you know anything about Tim, it's his love for the City of Springfield and his passion for the history and importance of the State of Illinois, what the state has meant to our nation, what the legacy of Springfield has delivered. And I know that he could not be more proud to have served for these many years as a Representative of many counties here in Central Illinois, but especially here in the City of Springfield. So, as he travels on the rails or maybe on Route 66 on occasion going forward, I would invite us all to raise our Calendar and give a tribute to the defender of our good Capital Township, friend, Tim Butler. Congratulations, my friend."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Speaker, a point of recognition. Tim Butler. I've known Tim going back in the '90s and more so in 2002 when I ran in that most unforgettable race against Dick Durbin. And, Tim, thank you for the during guidance during that losing cycle. One other thing we forgot to mention about Tim is some... all of the great accolades that he has earned over the years, one thing that he forgot to mention, or Ryan did, is that he received the Capital Township Lawmaker Who Makes a Difference Award this past year too. So, Tim, when you have this opportunity, could you explain to me what the hell Capital Township does? Who are they? Is it just a myth? But I've spent

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

more time hearing about Capital Township over the past five years, I think it would be time for you to explain why this is a worthwhile entity and branch of government. But all seriousness, I remember when Tim was sworn in. It was... he filled up the chamber. It was really something to see. It was a proud day for Springfield. It was a proud day for a boy from the neighborhood. It was... you could see, with his family, his friends, the elation, but more so how proud they were of him reaching this pivotal... this position in government. So, Tim, you walked in with great energy and incredible integrity. You leave with great energy and incredible integrity. It's been a pleasure serving with you, my friend, and Godspeed."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In March of 2015, this new kid walked up to my desk and informed me we were going to be friends. He was absolutely right. I wasn't sure why at the time, but this kind of nerdy, wonky policy dude with a love of history and flags, which I find a little odd but entertaining, how do ... wormed his way into my heart, I guess. We discovered that we were both the youngest of seven children and, along with former Member Grant Wehrli, we formed the Lucky Seven Caucus. Our love of the Cubs, of road trips, of live music all came about because someone made the effort to make a connection across the aisle, and I will be forever grateful. I know I get teased for some of my friendships in this... in this chamber because I love each and every one of you in such bizarre and wonderful ways. But I'm going to miss you, Tim. Thank you for the tone you set, except that one time. Thank you for your friendship. Thank you for being the

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

little brother I never knew I needed, or the big brother I never knew I needed, or the twin brother I never knew I needed, but here you are. I wish you all the best as you move on. The railroad is very lucky to have you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative... Representative Davis."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was going to be the one to add some bipartisanship to this farewell, but apparently I'm not the only one. And that's... that's a good thing. So, to my friend, Tim... and I can think back a few years ago where maybe we got off to a little tumultuous start in terms of our relationship as Legislators, but we got passed that and we have become good friends. Appreciate you serving as cochair of the Taiwan Friendship Caucus with me. I just informed Justin that you weren't coming back and he freaked out a little bit. So, you're going to have to find one of your colleagues on that side to replace you. But thank you very much. I've served on a couple of committees with you. Always appreciate your reasonness, your compassion about the issue. I know I can go off the rail sometimes and that wasn't quite who you were. You know, you're always calm and always... you had that voice and... but you always knew what you wanted to say and we appreciate that which you added to those conversations. So, again, knowing that this is your last day and I just found out earlier, when we embraced earlier, sad to see you go. Certainly going to miss this relationship that we've had, but certainly wish you well. As Ryan indicated, you're riding off on the rail, so those rails will probably bring you back here on occasion too. So, we look forward to

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

seeing you back in this space, around this building in the future. Godspeed to you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Nichols."

Nichols: "Yeah, I know y'all wasn't expecting this one. Hey. So, real quick story. Tim showed up in my district about a, what, a month ago? It was rainy, we was under a tent, and I was like, what you doing here? And we had the greatest conversation. And then we was somewhere else and we was arguing about Lincoln College and we had the greatest conversation. I would just like to say, man, you are ... you're a class act. You really are, man. Like, the conversations we had in the short time I've been here, I really respect you just for being honest. And we won't get a lot of that. But just for being honest and being able to be... and talk. And he even gave me some pointers, and I appreciate that, man. And we're going to the Sox game, by the way. So, we agreed to go to the Sox game, so we going. And we don't want it to be a Sox and Cubs game either. We going to Cardinals. So, thank you, man, for just being cool with me. You know, thank you a lot. Appreciate it."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Leader Harris. And, obviously, I knew this day was coming and I tried to do my best to not get emotional, but it's hard when you hear that stuff. I have to say, there's a lot of thank-yous, and I know you all want to get out of here, it's 6:21. But this place, this place does not run without our staff. You guys down there. I've been privileged to have some great people working for me. Rachel Schmoke is my chief of staff. Courtney Ausmus, who's my legislative

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

assistant who just left for the Senate. Why she'd want to leave for the Senate, I don't know. Renee Martin, who's worked in my office. Jennifer Anderson's worked in my office. Emily Hartney works in my office as an LA. Dani Juilfs was my first LA. Mat Butcher, who's worked and run my champaign side. Other folks on the other side, Suzy Brown, Emma Werden, Sara Vaubel, Abby Walsh, Jayme Siemer, they've helped me get where I'm at today. Our House Republican staff, I want to name you all, but I can't 'cause we'd be here all night. Our staff does such a wonderful job. Nathan Mansfield's drafted my goofy legislation from the day I walked in the door. He's never questioned once all the stupid ideas I've had to change the state seal or put a flag on top of the dome or something like that. He staffed my committees. Dan Weber staffed our Redistricting Committee. Dane Thull staffed the Capital Committee when I was a spokesperson on that. Mike Mahoney, Elleni, Andrew, everybody on our staff, you're great people. Joel Sikes has done a great job as my communications person. There's just so many good people on our staffs that I can't thank enough. Leader Durkin, I said this last night at... for those who don't know, we had a nice roast last night and it was a lot of fun. I would not be here without Jim Durkin. And he's been a good friend, and as I said last night, I will always have his back. He's a great man. So, thank you, Leader. Wayne Padget, I put you on my list. Everybody loves Wayne Padget. Make him the Doorkeeper, please. He needs to be. My ... I've had some really good seatmates. But one I want to really mention is Randy Frese that I've sat next to, or one seat away, the entire time I've been here and I'm... too bad he's on

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

his way back to Adams County. For those of you who know the Stag Caucus, Frese gets the Stag light. He's the new chairman of the Stag Caucus moving forward. So, we're going to have a ceremony where he gets the Stag light from the office. The light only comes on when we're in Session. So, I told Frese that he... he is going to be chairman of the Stag Caucus. I want to thank the media. You guys have a tough job. You guys have a really tough job and your ranks have been withered over the years. I've worked in this place for a long time before I was in here. The State Journal-Register used to have three full-time reporters that reported just on the Capitol. Keep doing what you're doing. Keep holding all these people responsible. I know you get a lot of grief, but you need... you have a very important job of shining light on government and doing good work. So, keep doing what you're doing. I appreciate the work you do, even when I get bad stories written about me. But you guys have a really important role to play here. I want to thank all the Members, everybody who's ever served here. You're all friends. We may disagree, we may agree, but only in this institution can I have Tom Morrison, who's not here, as a good friend and Kelly Cassidy as a good friend as well. That's what this place does. Two people from diametrically opposed opinions on most issues that you're good friends with and that's the beauty of this place. As many of you know and have realized, I'm an institutionalist. I don't like remote voting. I don't like not being here. I get happy when y'all come back to town and spend money. But please, as you move forward, protect this institution. Legislators are the basis of this country and we do good

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

things across the country in our Legislatures. And it's your responsibility to keep that going. Make friends on other sides. And it's difficult sometimes, especially with these super majority numbers, super minority numbers. You might not want to walk over to this side. You might not want to walk over to that side. But to protect this institution, you have to make friends. So, please do that and protect the institution. And the last person I need to thank is the person that's put up with me for over a quarter century and scratched her head when I wanted to do this job, Wendy Butler, my wife, many of you know. I wouldn't certainly be in this job without her. She's the love of my life and she looks forward to riding the rails as well, I guess, once I get out of here. So, thank you all. This is a beautiful institution. And thank you all for your friendship."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. A point of recognition."

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Stuart: "Thank you. I'm a little ill-prepared. I don't know if you saw earlier that Representative Costa Howard had a little trouble getting it together and she still is. So, this will be brief, but I couldn't not recognize my history-making friend from BluePage, I mean DuPage County, who has just made history as the first woman to be elected as chair of DuPage County. Which is such a wonderful thing, but sad for those of us here that are going to miss you. We're all so proud... we're all so proud of Representative Conroy, and I'm going to keep calling you Representative Conroy as long as I can. And I know your... your boys are proud of you, your mom is proud of

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

you, everyone... everyone back home is proud of you. But I had to take this minute to recognize my roomy here and just thank you for all the work you've done. It meant so much to me that very first week that I was here and you came over and invited me out to a dinner and made sure that I got introduced to people that were going to be here and helped me understand how to do this job better and how you vote your district and the importance of that and what this job is all about. And I'll never forget that advice. We all come here with really unique stories and experiences. And I learned that, like, this amazing woman is also ... she's a living organ donor. And ... which is just such an incredible gift of sacrifice. And she's always taken that with her work to improve our donor registry here in the State of Illinois and to advocate for living donors and the medical expenses and needs that they have. She takes that passion working for mental health, for elderly that are in nursing homes, and every one of the most vulnerable here in Illinois. And it's a model we should all follow. She was a founding Member and the first chair of the Illinois House Democratic Women's Caucus, was a great leader. She's... she's one of those quiet leaders. She's always available for questions. She gives great advice. She helps you learn who to reach out to and how to get what you need done. But most of all, she's just a tremendous friend. I'm going to miss her like crazy, but I'm so proud of her and I can't wait to see all the great things that she does up there in DuPage. So, congratulations, Deb."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

"Thank you. I, too, would like to wish my fellow DuPage Legislator... and we often joked on that. We came in together in 2012 and she would say she was the first DuPage Legislator. And I'm like, wait a minute, I have part of DuPage too. But she does have all of DuPage in her district. I'm so proud of everything that she has done over her 10 years here. The service that she has done, not only for DuPage, but for the entire State of Illinois. And as Katie took most of the highlight's points on it. Her passion for mental health has never wavered, and I am so excited about what I will see her doing for mental health in DuPage County. I think that will be wonderful for our home county on that. All of the hard work that she has done with the Women's Caucus, the years that she spent with other Members trying to put that together and having our voice heard as a caucus cannot go unnoticed. Her years of working with the Secretary of State on donor... organ donation and living that and showing how important it is when she was willing to give an organ. I think it was just phenomenal on that. That's not something that you hear about from many people. Her reaching across the aisle working with other people too has been phenomenal, what she has taught many of us. And also how she has often said, 'Sometimes you have to be that lone voice to be able to be heard.' And that's what I've seen from my friend, Deb Conroy. So, I wish her nothing but the best. I am looking forward to seeing a future of having... seeing her grow even more. And I know that we'll see her in a different capacity as she advocates for DuPage County and all of the great things that we see there. So, wish you the best, Deb. Thanks."

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Speaker Harris: "Representative Demmer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Conroy, I just want to add some bipartisan tribute to you. We came in together 10 years ago to the House with a big freshman class. Got a chance to spend a lot of time talking about a wide variety of mental health issues, of telehealth issues, of issues that just showed your determination and dedication to increasing access for people all across the State of Illinois. I've really appreciated your approach to legislating here. We've had a lot of conversations in committee in public, but also sidebar conversations, and you were always committed to finding a reasonable solution that could attract support and buy-in from stakeholders all across the state. That's very much appreciated. The legacy that you leave with both mental health and telehealth will live on in every community in Illinois for many, many years. I wish you the very best in the new endeavor you have for the people of DuPage County. And I know everybody here in the House of Representatives and across the state will continue to look for great things out you and your commitment to public service. congratulations and God bless."

Speaker Harris: "Chairman Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. I'm not... tried all week not to cry. This is really hard for me. This has been 10 years of my life that I will forever be grateful for and have to... there is one person here that is responsible for getting me here. We've grown up together in this business, and I wouldn't be here without her, and that's Tiffany Moy. I have friendships here that I will never, ever forget. The things I have learned,

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

the way I have grown. I wish I could keep up like Tim, but I can't. I am incredibly proud today to leave with an amazing friend like Tim Butler and... I'm sorry, I just... thank you. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "I didn't get a chance... I wanted to add a few words, Deb. So, too late, I'm going to speak. But we've known each other for a long time. We've had some interesting debates on the floor. But you know what? I am a partisan. The election didn't go the way that I... I had hoped, but here's what I'm going to tell you. I'm very proud of you. You ran a great race. Even though I'm a partisan, I'm a bigger fan of good government and that's what I will see from you in DuPage County. And that is something that I'm looking forward to, to continue on with that. And I know that you will deliver that. So, with that respect, I give you so much congratulations and so much hope for the future because I know the type of person you are and you're a good person. So, let me also just ... I'm going to wrap up with this. That, Deb, you and I have exchanged some jokes over the years about our heritage. So, feel free to take ownership of them. Okay? And you know exactly the ones I'm talking about. 'Cause you're a Southsider. I'm a Westsider. And there are very great distinctions between the two. And I'll let you discuss that in private of how those ... what that distinction is. But more importantly, Deb, just think about this. You will have moments in DuPage County at that county board meeting where you're going to have incredible conflict and you will have to make a decision. And I just want you to think of one thing. I want you to stand in

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

the shoes of my dear friend, Sean, who pushes a broom at the Brookfield Zoo, and ask him, what would he do in this situation? You know what I'm talking about. But anyway, that was my type of humor which is... sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't. Representative Williams understands what I'm talking about. But in any event, we have a lot of great staff. We're all proud of everything that they do for us day in and day out all year round. But I could not leave tonight without mentioning a person who will be leaving us after 14 and a half years starting tomorrow, and that's my dear friend Mike Mahoney. Mike. Mike is probably one of the ... very interesting gentleman. Brilliant. Knows his way around this building and this process like no one I have ever worked with in my life. He has done more to help Members of not only this side of the aisle, but the other side of the aisle, for so many years. And more importantly, he refuses to take credit for it. He's an extremely humble individual. I've gotten to know Mike so well. He's been by deputy chief of staff for so many years. And I'd like to say I love him like a brother, but I've got too many brothers. I've got seven of them, and I don't need another one. But I will say this, I love Mike like a friend and we will continue to be friends for the rest of our life. But I just want to thank you, Mike, for what you've done for this institution for ... over these years. And God bless you in the future."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1015, offered by Representative Rita. House Resolution 1016, offered by Representative Jawaharial Williams. House

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

- Resolution 1018, offered by Representative Hamilton. And House Resolution 1019, offered by Representative Jacobs."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Gabel moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "Adjournment Resolution. Senate Joint Resolution #63, offered by Representative Harris.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDRED SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 1, 2022, the Senate stands adjourned until the call of the President; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until the call of the Speaker."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Gabel moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Gabel moves the House stand adjourned to the call of the Speaker. 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 and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1622, offered by Representative Gong-Gershowitz, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Senate Bill 2801, offered by

107th Legislative Day

12/1/2022

Speaker Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2953, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5855, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. First Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."