76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Father Stefano Del Bove, who is with Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois. Father Del Bove is the guest of Representative David Harris. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cells phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Father Del Bove."

Father Del Bove: "Almighty and eternal God, we pray for all souls and condition of people. For all would faithfully toil day in and day out at their industry jobs that they may enjoy the rewards of their labor, that they may not to be defrauded of their due and that they may never cease to be mindful of our debt to them for making our life tolerable. For those in authority who have power over others, that they may not use it for selfish advantage but to be guided to do justice and to love mercy. For those who have been worsted in the battle of life, whether by the humanity of others, their own limitation, or the freakiness of fortune that they may contend against injustice without bitterness and learn how to accept what cannot be altered with patience. For the rulers of nations, that they may promote peace among the peoples and establish justice in our common life. For the teachers and pastors, for artist, scientist, and interpreters of the spiritual life that they may not corrupt the truth to which they are committed. Oh God, who has bound us together in this bundle of life, give us the grace to understand our lives depend upon one another and our responsibilities to You. Today, here in Springfield, let's begin this Session of legislative work in humble spirit, bringing before You, God

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

of wisdom and mercy, the joys and the hopes, the grieves and the anxiety of people of Illinois and of the United States of America. May each of us draw as near to You as You are near to each of us, Amen."

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Father. We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Meier."
- Meier et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Jakobsson is excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Fortner is excused today, and he actually is excused today. The last... last time he showed up, but he is gone today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 116 present. We do have a quorum and ready to do our business. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee... Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 10. Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 209. Representative Daniel Burke,

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3656, Senate Bill 116; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 66, Senate Bill 1523, Senate Bill 2196. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 644, offered by Representative Manley. House Resolution 649, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 651, offered by Representative Hays. House Resolution 653, offered by Representative Drury. House Resolution 664, offered by Representative Osmond. And House Joint Resolution 62, offered by Mayfield. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Moffitt: "Well, you know, here in the back row I have the privilege of sitting between two bachelors, but I have an announcement to make about one of them. I sit between Representative Meier and Representative Demmer. And over the weekend there's the first step to that status of being a bachelor is moving toward changing. And I know you... it's probably difficult to figure out which one it is, but today... today I'd like to announce that my seatmate to my left, Representative Tom Demmer, became engaged to Rebecca Bach and will get married probably this summer or fall. Congratulations."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Representative. We'll all look forward to the invitation to join you. Mr. Moffitt."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker, I have no further announcements to make for my other seatmate, Representative Charlie Meier."
- Speaker Lang: "For which I'm sure he's grateful. Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like a Republican Caucus immediately, if we can please, in Room 118."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in recess to the hour of 1 p.m. And the Republicans are going to Room 118. The Democrats, have a nice afternoon. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 10.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Greg Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to this Bill does two simple things. First, it changes and removes the immediate effective date. And second, it reconfirms existing provisions already in State Law in the Human Rights Act that would provide a complete exemption for private religious institutions from having to celebrate, sanctify, or hold ceremonies for same-sex marriages which were not within their faith or tradition. And the examples of these would be Knights of Columbus, Knights of Malta, and establishments of that nature."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Morrison."
- Morrison: "Would request a Roll Call vote on this."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Speaker Lang: "Your request shall be acknowledged. Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor... Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reis: "Representative, we just kind of barely seen language on this and it's our understanding that this refers back to something in the Civil Unions Code."

Harris, G.: "No."

Reis: "Can you explain to us how that one or two sentences gives exemptions to Knights of Columbuses, and expand or whatever as to where these..."

Harris, G.: "Sure. It is not in reference to the Civil Unions Law, Representative. It is a reference to existing statutory language that has existed in the..."

Reis: "Human Rights."

Harris, G.: "...Human Rights Act."

Reis: "But does it really grant total exemption to Knights of Columbus?"

Harris, G.: "Yes. For those who… who remain a private organization, they may accept or deny these ceremonies or anything else that does not fall within their faith or tradition."

Reis: "I guess a procedural question. Is it the intention of the Sponsor to call this on Third Reading or is this something we can check out tonight."

Harris, G.: "I... I would be happy to answer your questions now, Representative."

Reis: "So, you're going to call it today? Okay. I want to take a look at the Amendment and if someone needs to grant me time I'll... I'll take that."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Speaker Lang: "There being no one further wishing to speak, a Roll Call vote has been requested on this Amendment. Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mitchell, Pritchard, Schmitz, Smith, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 59 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act concerning civil

law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Every time I walk into this building, I am struck with the history recorded here in the artwork which recalls some of the great advances and the great leaders who have changed the course of history and made Illinois a better, fairer state. We see the first woman Legislator, the first African-American Legislator. We see tributes to those who have given their lives that the words 'conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal' are renewed and honored in our law, proud moments and difficult decisions that have brought honor upon the people and the State of Illinois, and we find ourselves at another one of those moments today. Since we left this chamber on the 31st of May, many things have changed, but many things remain the same. When we left some

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

of you asked if civil unions, which our state has had for several years, offer... which offer all the protections and obligations of the marriage which the state can give, and with federal obligations denied to couples from states even where civil marriage are extended to all families, haven't we done everything legally, as a state, we could do? And at that time, the answer was yes. Even though civil union families were routinely denied the dignity and respect that all families deserve, the legal answer to that legal question was yes. But in June, the Supreme Court of the United States issued a landmark decision that altered the entire legal landscape for all Americans, and particularly for the residents of the State of Illinois. Since we left in May and returned to our districts, the decision was made at the Supreme Court to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, and extend the protections of Federal Law to legally married same-sex couples. And I repeat, legally married samesex couples, those families whose civil marriages are recognized by the laws of their home state. Justice Roberts, writing for the Court said: 'By creating two contradictory marriage res... marriage regimes within the same state, DOMA forces same-sex couples to live as married for the purpose of State Law but unmarried for the purpose of Federal Law, thus diminishing the stability and predictability of basic personal relations the state has found it proper acknowledge and protect. This places same-sex couples in an unstable position of being in a second-tier marriage.' The court went on to say: 'Under DOMA, same-sex marriage couples have their lives burdened, by reason of government decree, in

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

visible and public ways. By its great reach, DOMA touches many aspects of married and family life, from the mundane to the profound. It prevents same-sex marriage couples from obtaining government health care benefits otherwise receive. It deprives them of the Bankruptcy Code's special protections for domestic support obligations. It forces them to follow a complicated procedure to file their state and federal taxes jointly. It prohibits them from being buried together in veterans' cemeteries.' Since the ruling of the Supreme Court... and I close the quotation... since the ruling of the Supreme Court, civil union couples in Illinois were suddenly moved from a second-class status to a third-class status, denied over 1 thousand federal protections for their families that legally married folks take for granted. It's true that families that have the luxury of being able to afford to take time away from their jobs and travel to other states can sometimes get married there, but then when they return to reside in Illinois, they lose many of those rights including veterans' benefits and Social Security. They are in a different but still unequal status. Less well-off families who do not have jobs that will give them the time off or cannot afford to travel to other states to get married, now find themselves left behind totally. Inequality, unfair burden and harms added layer by layer to people simply because they live in the State of Illinois. Today, we can change this. To treat all our citizens equally in the eyes of the law, we must change this. Since we left here in May, 14 states and the District of Columbia now extend marriage equality to all their citizens and most recently New Jersey, added themselves

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

to our neighbor states of Minnesota and Iowa. The major newspapers of our state have called upon us to do the right thing and to do it today. From the Belleville News-Democrat, to the Southtown Star, to the Quad City Times, to the Lake County News-Sun, to the Chicago Sun-Times, to the Springfield Journal-Register, to the Chicago Tribune, to the Daily Illini, to the Saint Louis Post Dispatch, to the Daily Herald, editorial voices are calling upon us to vote for equality and fairness today. Many things still remain the same, however, since May. The language of the Bill, SB10, still does two simple but very important things. First, it treats all citizens equally in the eyes of the law by extending the benefits and protections of civil marriage to all Illinois families; and two, it protects religious freedom as practiced by our state's many faiths and quarantees that each may practice according to their own faith and tradition. A Chicago Tribune editorial said and I quote, 'Allowing same-sex couples to wed under this law would affirm and sustain such unions. Marriage provostes... promotes stable families, safeguards the interests of children and rewards committed relationships. Recognizing same-sex marriages demonstrates respect for personal freedoms and government out of the intimate affairs of its citizens.' And Ladies and Gentlemen, that is exactly what this legislation provides. 'For purposes of civil marriage as performed by the state, loving, same-sex couples will be able to publicly affirm their commitment to each other and join their friends and neighbors in being treated equally in the eyes of the law.' In Illinois, we tried civil unions, and that separate

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

status has time and time again proved to fall short. It is not an understood or legally recognized status. Particularly in times of emergency and crisis, families have been kept apart. Parents have not been allowed to be with their children in the emergency rooms or intensive care units. The legal status of relationships and families have not been preserved. Civil unions have proved to be separate and unequal and without the passage of this law, Illinois families, businesses, and governments will continue to have to deal with multiple tiers of separate and unequal status. For businesses there will be benefits, management, tax and other legal compliance problems, as HR and legal departments have to try to understand and implement a halfway status. The businesses who we are trying to desperately attract to our state will have increasing problems attracting talent simply because they are located here. It's going to get harder for them to attract and retain employees. Firms that are already here will find yet another tangle of regulatory, legal burdens and competitive disadvantages imposed upon them simply because they are in the State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, dozens of Illinois CEOs representing corporations like manufacturing giant Navistar, to investment giant Morningstar, from our financial secse... firms such as BMO Harris Bank, CNA Financial, Aon, Grosvenor Capital, JP Morgan, and Mesirow, to our Internet giants such as Groupon, Google and Digitas stated in a letter sent to each Members of the General Assembly: 'To be competitive a state must create an equitable, fair and respectful environment for all its citizens. For this reason, among others, it is vitally

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

important that Illinois lawmakers enact marriage equality soon. The American people are increasingly supportive of marriage equality and a majority believe same-sex couples should be allowed to marry. We agree with them. Illinois simply cannot afford to be less competitive than other states.' Marriage equality is not only a fairness issue, a family issue, an equality issue or a business issue, it's also an issue with broad bipartisan support. And I want to acknowledge some of the folks who have given this strong support: first and foremost, the Speaker of the House Illinois, Mike Madigan who has been a strong supporter of this Bill. Both of our Senators, Mark Kirk and Dick Durbin, are strong proponents, as are our Governor, Pat Quinn, our Secretary of State, Jesse White, our Attorney General, Lisa Madigan, our Comptroller, Judy Baar Topinka, along with Mayor Rahm Emanuel, President Obama and elec... elected officials throughout our state. While one key provision of this law quarantees equal protection under the law to all families in Illinois, the other key provision extends and reaffirms protections for religious freedoms in Illinois. Some churches and denominations wish to perform same-sex marriages within their faith and tradition, which is their right. Others, also, do not want to perform same-sex marriages in traditions within their faith, and that is their absolute right. This legislation respects both points of view, while treating all equally under the eyes of the law. Today there are couples who cannot get married in a church for reasons such as a prior divorce or marriage outside the faith. That's up to each church to decide within its tradition. However, when that

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

couple goes to the County Clerk, they are able to receive a marriage license and be civilly married. That is the way our law is now. That is the way it ought to be. Concerns were raised about ministers being required to solemnize consecrate marriages against their faith. This law expressly exempts them from any such requirement and immunizes them from any complaint, claim or cause of action for doing so. Concerns were also raised about the use of religious facilities for marriage ceremonies or celebrations of marriage ceremonies that were outside the faith and tradition of a church. This law contains ironclad languages that provides absolute categorical explanations for churches, parish halls, fellowship halls and other similar facilities and with the Amendment we enacted today, also, makes it clear that private clubs, such as the Knights of Columbus, with a religious orientation are also exempt. Again, there is immunity from complaint, claim or cause of action based on refusal to make those facilities available. Ladies and Gentlemen, what same-sex couples in Illinois want for their families is just what you want for your family. They want to work hard and be successful. They want to volunteer in their community, their school, their church, their synagogue. They want to raise their children in safety and guarantee them a better future. They want the freedom to protect the ones they love through the security of marriage. This Bill will give them a better future; it will help families to show their love and commitment to each other, and give all families a chance to live as fully equal citizens in the greatest country on the face of the Earth. I just want to close by quoting an

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

editorial from the <u>Daily Herald</u>: 'Now, the task facing lawmakers, and specifically the House of Representatives, is to summon the conscience, the courage, and the political will to do what is right and move Illinois into the growing number of states that have taken a stand on same-sex marriage in the interest of advancing human rights.' Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand ready to answer your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I've had the privilege of serving this Body for seven years, and I can tell you that this Body has taken on some major social issues during that time frame. We just dealt with conceal carry, the abolition of the death penalty a few years back, civil unions, medical marijuana, parental notification, extremely weighty issues. I think one of the things that... no matter what happens with this particular piece of legislation, is that we respect one another in the process, we respect one another's position, and that we move forward together as a Body because we must have mutual respect for one another, for this chamber, for our visitors here and for our state. And I think that is important to set that forward because we've had some pretty contentious debates here and there are people passionate on both sides of the issue, not only in this Body, but across the state. And each of us has an opportunity to speak about it because of our First Amendment rights, if we choose to exercise them, and we've seen those rights exercised here just a few weeks back. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would end

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

my remarks and thank the Body for its time and attention and for a mutual respect of one another on this issue."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Sullivan: Gentlemen, I rise in support of fairness and marriage equality. I understand this will be a very difficult vote for many. For me, I know, overall, many in my district favor marriage equality. I also know that many in my next and immediate election do not. I think in the end we must all rely on our life experiences and do what we personally think is in the best interest of the district. I was born and raised in the Catholic faith. I went to Catholic grade school, Catholic high school. My wife and I are active in our church. My children go to the Catholic schools. I certainly understand the position of the Catholic Church and, indeed, I've had reflective conversations with my pastor. In a speech, while running for the Presidency, then Senator Kennedy spoke of his Catholic faith. In an address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association on September 12, 1960 then Senator Kennedy said and I quote, 'I want a Chief Executive whose public acts are responsible to all groups and obligated to none, who can attend any ceremony, service, or dinner his office may appropriately require of him and whose fulfillment of his Presidential Oath is not limited or conditioned by any religious oath, ritual, or obligation.' Now I do not compare myself to President Kennedy, but his words ring true today. Then Senator Kennedy was trying to calm the nerves of the American people in regards to his Catholic faith. I use those words today to say I must be inclusive of all faiths, not

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

just my own. With permission, I'm going to talk about my family and my decision to support marriage equality. Many have said that I should not support this Bill because I have family members that are gay. By that premise, how do we get anything done in this chamber? We are guided every day in dealing with legislation that affects our family, our friends, our constituents. This is how life works. This is what guides us. Five years ago, my... my grandmother Sullivan passed away. Grandma was the matriarch of our family. She was the heart and soul of our family. The youngest of eight... of grandma's eight children is my Uncle Tim. Tim is gay and has lived with his partner for as long as I can remember. The day we said goodbye to grandma, I remember it being especially difficult for Tim. Tim was very close to my grandma and he was almost inconsolable the day that we said goodbye. There are some that say that being gay or lesbian is a life-style choice. I submit to you that the love and support that Mike, Tim's partner, showed him that day is no different than the love and support my wife showed me that same day. Some people believe that the passage of this Bill will be harmful to children. When I hear this, I think of my wife. By now many people in this chamber have come to know that my mother-inlaw is a lesbian. Let me tell you something about my wife. My wife put herself through graduate school to become a nurse practitioner. She has helped heal thousands of people, and literally has saved many lives. While I'm down here, she works in her profession, teaches the next generation of NPs and is practically a single mom to our two children half the year. I'm probably pretty biased but I think she's a pretty special

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

person and has done just fine. My wife also had a difficult time telling me when we were dating about her mother. The difficulty was not that she was embarrassed by her mother being a lesbian, but what my reaction would be to her because of her mother. Her fear was that I would reject her because of her mother. Who should have to go through that? There is a little boy age four, named Finn and a little girl age five, named Kaileigh. These are my children. When I think of marriage equality, I mostly think about them. You see, I believe in voting for marriage equality is the right thing to do. If I vote against this Bill, a Bill I believe in, I beli... that I believe is the right thing to do, how do I face my children? How do I tell them that there's something wrong with their grandmother? Well, I can't and I won't. Ladies and Gentlemen, please vote for the freedom of two people to share their lives together and their love together. Please vote for marriage equality. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Zalewski: "Representative Harris, what rights does Senate Bill 10 grant to same-sex couples?"

Harris, G.: "I believe we're speaking for purposes of legislative intent."

Zalewski: "For purposes of legislative intent. I'm sorry, Greq."

Harris, G.: "For purposes of legislative intent, the intention of this law is to provide same-sex couples and their children equal access to the status, benefits, protections, rights, and responsibilities of civil marriage."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- Zalewski: "How does Senate Bill 10 protect the freedom of religion?"
- Harris, G.: "Nothing in this law changes any provisions of the Human Rights Act or the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Therefore, this Bill does not change the status of an entity that is currently subject to or exempt from the requirements of the Human Rights Act, other than in the very limited circumstances of reli... religious denomination that refuses to provide religious facilities, religious services, or religious goods for the solemnization ceremony or celebration associated with the solemnization of a marriage. Again, this Bill does not hinder the protection of religious exercise under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and would not prevent an individual entity from pursuing a claim or defense pursuant to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act."
- Zalewski: "Representative, is it... isn't it correct that the intention of this law is to recognize and maintain the right of freedom of religion guaranteed by the U.S. and Illinois Constitutions, as well as the Illinois Religious Freedom Restoration Act?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Zalewski: "Representative, will a religious denomination be forced to solemnize a same-sex marriage?"
- Harris, G.: "No. The intent of this law is to recognize and preserve the rights of freedom of religion guaranteed in the U.S. and Illinois Constitution and to ensure that nothing in the Bill interferes with or regulates the religious practice of any religious denomination or Indian Nation or Tribe or Nation or Native Group. This Bill expressly states that no

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

religious denomination, minister, clergy, or officiant acting as a representative of a religious denomination will be required to solemnize any marriage and they are free to choose which marriages to solemnize. If a religious denomination refuses to perform a marriage, it will not be liable for any civil, administrative, or criminal penalty, claim, or cause of action. At the same time, any religious denomination that allows same-sex marriage is free to solemnize such marriage."

- Zalewski: "Representative, will a church hall or other religious facility be forced to be used for the solemnization or celebration of a same-sex marriage?"
- Harris, G.: "No. We worked closely with members of both sides of the aisle to address previous concerns about the use of religious facilities and carefully crafted language to ensure that the freedom of religious... religion is protected in this regard. No religious denomination will be required to provide religious facilities, religious services, or religious goods for the solemnization ceremony or celebration associated with the solemnize... solemnization ceremony of a marriage. The Bill also contains language that protects religious denominations from litigation based on their decision to refuse the use of their facilities for solemnization ceremonies or celebration associated with the solemnization ceremony of a marriage."
- Zalewski: "Representative, can an individual or business refuse to provide facilities, goods or services for the celebration of a same-sex marriage?"
- Harris, G.: "The term religious denomination is intended to apply to churches, mosques, synagogues, temples and other religious entities whose principle purpose is the study, practice, or

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

advancement of religion. While the Bill carves out a specific exemption for religious denominations that provide religious facilities, religious services, and religious goods, it is not the intent of the Bill to provide any exemptions for individuals or businesses that have placed their facilities, goods, and services in the stream of commerce or that have opened up their facilities, goods and services to the general public. The Bill preserves the nondiscrimination provisions of the Human Rights Act, including the prohibition of unlawful discrimination based on sexual orientation. Accordingly, any entity that does not qualify under the religious denomination exemption provision provided in SB10 is subject to the nondiscrimination requirements of the current Human Rights Act. However, the Bill preserves the freedom of religious exercise as provided by the First Amendment and the Illinois Religious Freedom Restoration Act; therefore, this Bill does not disturb any freedom of conscious rights an individual or business would have under the First Amendment or under the Illinois Religious Freedom Restoration Act."

- Zalewski: "Representative, how does Senate Bill 10 change current human rights and religious freedoms in relation of public accommodations, housing, and employment?"
- Harris, G.: "Again, nothing in this law changes any provision of the Human Rights Act or the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Therefore, this Bill does not change the status of an entity that is currently subject to or exempt from the requirements of the Human Rights Act, other than in the very limited circumstances of rel... of a religious denomination that refuses to provide religious facilities, religious

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

services, or religious goods for the solemnization ceremony or celebrations of... celebration associated with the solemnization ceremony of a marriage. This Bill also does not hinder the protections of religious exercise under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and would not prevent an individual entity from pursing a claim or defense pursuant to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act."

Zalewski: "And finally, Representative, does this legislation create a cause of action with respect to a distribution from an estate or trust, or other fiduciary decision made in the administration of an estate or trust, that was made before the effective date of this Act in reliance on the law as it existed at the time the distribution or decision was made?"

Harris, G.: "No."

Zalewski: "To the Bill. I was born and raised a Catholic. I attended Catholic grade school; Catholic high school. I raise my children Catholic. If there were anything in this legislation that prevented people from exercising their faith, I wouldn't support it and I think I speak for others in saying that as well. And if that's the case and this Bill does nothing to prevent people from exercising their faith, then the Bill's time has come and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise today in support of natural marriage and urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on this measure. This is an extremely emotional issue. However, we need to examine it objectively, factually, and not just with feelings. This issue is not just about two adults and their emotional, relational, or financial

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

commitment to each other. Redefining marriage has farreaching implications for our society. And while some children in nonnuclear parent homes do okay, the risks increase for children when they're raised apart from both biological parents. A recent study from the University of Texas bears this out showing that children raised by their married mom and dad, do better in virtually every category of social well-being. And so, since marriage is so important, since it's so foundational to society, we've got to reason this out and resolve together to vote 'no'. Why is the state concerned with personal relationships anyway? Why has natural marriage always been singled out as the one relationship among the many worthy of special status? Here's why. It's because real marriage is the building block for human civilization. Up until the year 2000, marriage has been recognized as one man and one woman as husband and wife to be father and mother to any children that their union produces. You see, marriage has four distinguishing features: two people, of opposite sex, not of close relation, and above the age of consent. Four simple guidelines. This is not arbitrary discrimination because if opposite sex unions are discriminatory, then a limit to two people is as well. And those who support polyamory or polygamy are taking note. Jasmine Walton of the Unitarian Universalists for Polyam... Polyamory Awareness says and I quote, 'Today we are where the gay rights movement was 30 years ago.' In other words, she's saying we're next; we want this too. So a 'no' vote today simply preserves the current social order, which has served us well for thousands of years. And while we have heard many stories about wonderful

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

people who support this Bill, this is not a vote about people but about policy. It's not about individuals or even groups of people. It's not about those who are homosexual or straight. 'Cause not even all gays support this Bill. There's a blog out there it's called 'Gays against Gay Marriage'. They claim that gay marriage would be a threat to sexual freedom. So, whether you're gay or you're straight, whether this matters to you deeply and personally or not, this is a measure that we've got to discuss, not on the basis of personality, but as policy. A 'no' vote today does not mean that you are a bigot. It does not mean that you're homophobic. A 'no' vote does nothing to change the ability of individuals or groups of people to live and to love as they choose. You may be fully supportive of a person's lifestyle choice and still reject this measure in order to maintain a stable public policy. Again, that's what we're talking about here, policy. Individuals will still be able to live with members of the same sex or opposite or multiple members of either sex. Everyone is free to live how they wish, and this state has no interest in interfering with that. But the state does not have an obligation to sanction every form of living arrangement that is demanding a sanction. If marriage evolves into this area, it must continue to evolve into something else down the road on a social continuum. Lesbian and samesex marriage advocate Masha Gessen calls it a lie to say that this will not change the institution of marriage. She goes on to describe that she sees this issue as a first step in a grand transition toward a much broader definition of what marriage is. She talks about multiple parents for children.

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

So, we pass Bills down here all the time and we... we argue for the sake of the children. Friends, if there is ever an issue involving children, this is the one. I'm concerned about the diminishing role of fathers in the lives of their children, and the breakdown of the family. And guess what, someone agrees with me, lots of people agrees with me, but someone very prominent, President Barack Obama. Last spring he spoke Chicago very passionately about the crisis fatherlessness. He was talking about the violence in the City of Chicago and he tied it to the instability of the family. Our President said we need to encourage fathers to be involved with their children, and I think he's personally setting a wonderful example for all of us. Those in this Body who have fought tirelessly for the rights of adoptees, you know what I'm talking about. There's a deep longing within the human soul to have a relationship with one's biological parents. And so we need to have as our first priority, as a state, the protection and care of children. And the best father with the best of intentions is not a mother, and the best mother with the best of intentions is not a father. Finally, as this issue has been discussed and debated for approaching a year now, we've heard so much about polls. I don't know the veracity of those polls, but my question is, why don't we have a nonbinding referendum? Why don't we hear what the people of Illinois believe about this issue? Why is there such a rush to embrace a concept that's so fundamentally changes the structure of our society, especially when there are so many real and potential policy flaws here? A 'no' vote today doesn't ban anything. A 'no' vote does not ... does nothing to

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

alter the ability of individuals to love and live with anyone they choose. A 'no' vote simply says that the state will continue to protect children and ensure that children will have the opportunity to experience the love of both a mother and a father, something our state should be encouraging. I urge you to consider the weight of every generation that has ever lived in voting with me to protect the institution of marriage as the foundation of our society, and as one of our most cherished and beloved institutions, and we can do this proudly and without compromise. We need to strengthen and protect real marriage, and not undermine it. And so, today, I plead with you, I urge you, vote 'no' or vote 'present'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few weeks ago, I received hundreds and hundreds of postcards from constituents in support of marriage equality. On the cards, there was a line for them to say why they supported marriage equality. Most responded with just one word, love. We don't talk much about love on the floor of the Illinois House. In fact, I don't think the word even appears anywhere in the Illinois compiled statutes. But for the people filling out the cards, and for so many, love means the freedom to marry. In our society, for many, love equals marriage. It is a public and formal way of recognizing your love for another person. In our society, it means sharing your life with someone through good times and bad, making a commitment to spend your lives together, and in some cases, building a family. But under current law, not everyone can express their love through marriage. One of the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

greatest love stories I have ever heard played out right here, under our beautiful dome. But it was a secret. Why? Because it happened over 20 years ago, involved a State Senator, the late Penny Severns, and one of my dearest friends, a woman named Terry Mutchler, at the time, an AP reporter here at the Capitol. Penny served in the Senate from 1986 until her tragic and untimely death from breast cancer in 1998. For much of that time, there were no openly gay Members of either chamber. So the relationship between Penny and Terry remained pretty much a secret until after Penny's death. In fact... Oh, I'm sorry. Though I never met Penny, Terry has told me they considered themselves married. They had a relationship, they shared a home, they were with each other through good times and bad. They were committed to each other as if they were married, but not in the laws of society. In fact, Penny's Death Resolution didn't even mention her loving partner Terry. Can you imagine that? How heartbreaking. I won't tell you the rest of the story though, because Terry actually has a book deal, so you'll have to read the book to find out the rest. But Penny and Terry just wanted what so many people want, to express their love through marriage. I believe that today, their relationship would have played out much differently. Twenty years later, we view things differently. Society looks at same-sex relationships much differently, but the law lags woefully behind. In the late 1990s, I was a staffer here in the Illinois House and I was on the floor at the time the late Representative Larry McKeon presented his human rights ordinance to prohibit discrimination against people based on sexual orientation. Today, it's hard to

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

believe that it would be controversial to say you can't fire someone because they're gay, but it was. You could hear a pin drop during that debate. I remember thinking, wow, they're doing something really important and significant during that debate, and they were. Today, too, we're doing something very important and groundbreaking. We're breaking down one of the last barriers to equality for the LGBT community, but it feels different to me. It feels important and groundbreaking certainly, but it also feels kind of obvious. I mean, why wouldn't we treat everyone the same and grant all Illinois families the same rights and benefits under the law? Why should some of us not have the same rights as the rest of us? We're not supposed to take things personally here in the General Assembly, but how can we not? We're talking about colleagues, friends, family members, our neighbors. We're talking about Kelly, Sam, and Greg. None of us should be satisfied if any of us don't have equal rights under the law. I believe this will be the most important vote I take as a Member of the Illinois General Assembly. I cannot wait to press that green button. Please join me."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This country was built on freedom of religion, not freedom from religion. And history is actually on the side of traditional marriage. And what most concerns me about this Bill is really the lack of freedom of religion that's not afforded to all member in Illinois. For example, a former Georgetown University law professor and current member of the EEOC, lesbian Chai Feldblum, has written that when same-sex marriage is legalized, conservative people

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

of faith will lose religious rights. She wrote that this is a zero sum gain. A gain for one side is a loss for the other. All states that have legalized same-sex marriage have religious liberty protections, SB10 has almost none. There is no protection for individuals who make their living by providing goods and services for weddings, such as bakers, florists, caterers, photographers, and wedding venue owners. The New Mexico Supreme Court recently upheld a \$7 thousand fine against a young Christian wedding photographer who, because of her deeply held religious beliefs, refused to photograph a same-sex couple's commitment ceremony. A baker in Colorado is being sued for refusing to make a wedding cake for a same-sex celebration because doing so would violate his religious beliefs. He said if gays come in and want to order birthday cakes or any cakes for any occasions, graduations or whatever, I have no prejudice on that whatsoever. He explained that he has no problem with gay people, but his Christian beliefs do not allow him to support same-sex marriage. Religious organizations such as Knights of Columbus and independent Christian schools have no protection under SB10. If SB10 becomes law, doctors, lawyers, counselors, judges, county clerks, and their staffs could lose their licenses or positions for refusing to participate in matters related to same-sex marriage. Additionally, there's been several articles and research done writing and pointing out that SB10 is the worst in the U.S. in terms of protecting religious liberty. Even liberal states like Connecticut, Maryland, New York, and the District of Columbia that allow same-sex marriage have laws that protect people, churches, synagogues,

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

and mosques from being sued for refusing to participate in same-sex marriages. These states and others expressly protect religious objectors from private suit; SB10 does not. These states and others expressly protect religious objectors, including religiously affiliated non-profit organizations from being penalized. In other words, loss of government grants; SB10 does not. Other such states expressly protect religious organizations from the promotion of same-sex marriage through religious programs, counseling, courses, or retreats that is in violation of their religious society's SB10 does not. Other states expressly religious affiliated fraternal organizations like the Knights of Columbus to limit insurance coverage to spouses in heterosexual marriages; SB10 does not. And other such states expressly allow a religiously affiliated adoption or foster care agency to place children only with heterosexual married; SB10 does not. And, of course, we know that we lost that privilege when the Civil Union Bill was passed. A Bill, which on the floor debate, they promised that that protection would remain in place and it did not. So, they can talk about protecting religious liberty, but the fact is is that this Bill is the worst in the U.S. for protecting religious liberty. In fact, let's go on a little bit further. A florist in Washington State is being sued by the state attorney general for her refusal to provide flowers for a same-sex wedding. And where we do know how s... how same-sex marriage has worked, the longest history of that which is about a decade, that would be in Massachusetts, we know that there have been many mixed... mixed outcomes. Just to read a little

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

bit about what's been happening in Massachusetts, there was a schoolwide assembly shortly after the same-sex marriage passed there and it was to celebrate same-sex marriage. It featured an array of speakers, including teachers at the school who announced that they would be marrying their samesex partners and starting families either through adoption or artificial insemination. Literature on same-sex marriage, how it is now a normal part of society, was handed out to the students. An eighth-grade teacher in Massachusetts, told National Public Radio that marriage ruling had opened up the door for teaching homosexuality. In my mind, I know that if okay, this is legal now. If somebody wants to challenge me, I'll say give me a break, it's legal now, she told NPR. She added that she now discusses gay sex with her students as explicitly as she desires. I won't go on to read exactly what she does and teaches them. By the following year, it was in elementary school curricula with hostility toward parents who disagreed. Kindergarteners in Lexington, Massachusetts, were given copies of a picture book, Who's in a Family telling them that same-sex couples are just another kind of family just like their own parents. When David Parker, parent of a kindergartener, calmly refused to leave a school meeting unless officials agreed to notify him... simply notify him when discussing hem... homosexuality or transgenderisum with his son, the school had him arrested and jailed overnight. The next year, second graders at the same school were read a book, King and King about two men who fall in love and marry each other, ending with a picture of them kissing. When parents Rob and Robin Worthland complained,

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

they were told that the school had no obligation to notify them or allow them to opt their child out. And I could go on and on about examples, and this is Massachusetts, which has had if for a decade and a decade's not very long. We have thousands of years of traditional marriage where we know it is best for a child to be with both the natural mother and natural father. And if that can't be the place, to at least have a mother and a father figure in their lives. The biggest concern here, again, is that this Bill is not ready for a vote. It does not have the religious protections that all of... most of us would agree should happen. Nobody should be able to be forced into providing services for which they fundamentally have a religious objection to. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. A long time ago, 1958, a woman named Mildred, a man named Richard, left their home state of Virginia to travel to Washington D.C. They made the trip in order to get married. Marry, they did. They were not allowed to be married in the State of Virginia. Mildred was a woman of color, Richard was white. It was against the law in Virginia for people of different races to marry one another. They did marry in Washington. Marriage certificate in hand, Mr. and Mrs. Loving retuned to Virginia. They were arrested. They were charged with the crime of interracial marriage. They were convicted. They fought the conviction all the way to the United States Supreme Court and that court, in 1967, unanimously held that laws like these were unconstitutional. The court said the freedom to marry has long been recognized as one of the vital, personal rights

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

essential to the ordinary... orderly pursuit of happiness, a basic civil right. In 2007, Mildred Loving had this to say: 'Not a day goes by that I don't think of Richard', by then, himself dead, 'and our love, our right to marry, and how much it meant to me to have that freedom to marry the person precious to me even if others thought he was the wrong kind of person for me to marry. I believe all Americans, no matter their race, no matter their sex, no matter their sexual orientation, should have that same freedom to marry. Government has no business imposing some people's religious beliefs over others. I support the freedom to marry for all; that's what loving is all about.' I urge you to support Mildred Loving and join me in voting 'yes' on Senate Bill 10."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, everyone is ahead of me today. They had prepared statements and they had a lot of data and statistics and I don't have that. And for that very reason I probably should not say anything, but I'm... I'm going to anyway because I think everyone has convictions and they ought to stick by them and it doesn't make any difference which side of the aisle you're on. And I think, as Representative Reboletti said, respecting each other is an important thing and I do that today, but I've heard some things that concern me. As an example, I heard a... a colloquy earlier between two Representatives which very finely laid out the legal aspects of what this Bill was going to be and the simple truth is, you don't know that. You don't know that. And I think that was unfortunate, because when you make

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

statements of that essence that are that profound and that clear, when you don't know, is not right. That's simply not right. The other thing I didn't hear today was the fact that this nation was built on the scriptures and then came the Constitution. Is that not right? I think it is. Constitution has always looked to the scriptures for its quidance and its columns and its foundations and its leadings, underpins and yet, I've heard nothing today about the scriptures. The only thing I've heard is about human rights. So, I guess we have walked away... we've backed away from our heritage in this nation, which we seem to do quite regularly, for the expediency of what we wish to do at the moment and, Ladies and Gentlemen, that's pride. That's a belief that you're better than the very foundations of this nature which we find in the scriptures. Pride's a dangerous thing if you look at the scriptures. Pride of man caused a lot of problems for mankind and heaven forbid that I cite any of these examples because I'd probably be cited in a number of newspapers, one of which is right here. But those aren't fictional stories, those are real stories. Those are things that happened to men and women and cities and governments who failed to recognize the scriptures. And so, I say to you today that in our, and I'm not saying haste, but I guess in our desire to move forward today, thinking that we know all the facts, we have put forth some bad information and as I said before and what I thought was a pretty well-staged colloquy, to make us believe that it's right. But yet, if we were to have the same colloquy between two Members, whether it be on this side of the aisle or the other, having to do with a Q&A

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

with respect to what the scripture says about this issue, we'd have an entirely different answer, but we'd have right answers. So, let me just say today in closing, there's a lot of other things that could be said, but I would say this to you, that whatever has been said today, you shouldn't deny your own experience or your own conviction. My conviction happens to be that this is wrong, but my conviction is that the scripture is right. And whatever you do with wrong, I think we all know since we were children, that you can't change it. You can't paint it. You can't put glitter on it. You can't dress it up. In fact, you can't do anything to something that's wrong and make it right. And Ladies and Gentlemen, that's what we learn from the scriptures and that's what we haven't talked about today. And Mr. Speaker, that's why I'm saying that we should not be voting in favor of this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very, very happy and proud that this Bill is up for a vote. I'm very excited to see Members taking this discussion, this debate, this history that we're about to make, hopefully, we'll make and being in probably in one of the more progressive states here in this country. You know, not long ago, and I'm in my forties, not long ago... Yeah, I know. Not in my twenties, Ladies and Gentlemen. Not long ago, many folk who look like me simply were outlawed and illegal to do certain things. Representative Currie mentioned the marriage discrimination. Other Members have talked about some of the issues that black folk faced in this country for centuries, legally. And here

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

it is today, in 2013, we're having a discussion of whether two people who love each other, who are committed to one another, want to commit to themselves for the rest of their lives, that there is an issue. And people are mentioning or referencing God, Christianity. If you know the history of Jesus and I'm no Bible expert in any sense, Jesus loved everyone. He hung out with the prostitutions... prostitutes, hung out with the common worker, the vagabond, the people who were sick, wealthy individuals. He loved everybody. So, there is nothing in the Bible or the Koran that I believe that speaks towards the opposite of that love. And here we are as a state poised to do simple, simple legislation of giving people, affording folk, the opportunity to have equal protection and equal rights under the law. That's it. There's nothing unique about that. We do it for everyone else. You did it for myself and my wife and for many of your spouses. So, what's the issue? When you go to any synagogue, any church, any Buddhist temple, any Mosque, you will find a lesbian, a homosexual couple or someone there who's in love with their particular significant other. You can't deny that it exists in our society. So, what's the issue here in taking things to the next level of them committing for the rest of their lives in holy, in loving, in a lifetime of matrimony? I don't see the issue here. You can't reference the Bible. You can't reference, sort of, what... just what you believe. Just do what's right for the citizens here in this state that you know is the right thing to do legally. So, let's go back about 50 years, 60 years when black people couldn't eat in the same restaurant. Legislative Members here couldn't even

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

sleep in the same hotels as other Senators and other Representatives, not long ago. And I'm sure people probably had religious reasons for why they did not want to dine or their daughters or their sons to marry someone of another race. I'm sure they can talk from time memorial 'til right now on why that was wrong back then. And so in 2013, we're having a very similar question or conversation of should people, all people, have the right to love one another legally. I'm befuddled that we're having this level of discussion. Equal protection. Equal access to love someone under the law, here in the State of Illinois, that's it. So, if you're a good lawmaker or if you're a responsible lawmaker and you believe that everyone in this state, in particular, and the country for that matter, should be treated fairly with respect and not discriminated against when they go buy a house, when they buy a car, when they want to have their kids go to a particular school anywhere in this state, you should support this legislation. It's as simple as that. Representative Sullivan stood up and was very, very courageous to discuss his mother-in-law. His mother-in-law. And he talked about how he, nor his children, can even remotely come close to discriminating against them or hating them or disliking them. That's a powerful statement. Well, at least it should resonate with a lot of us here in this chamber 'cause you know they exist in our lives, our brothers and our sisters, our aunts and our parents. So, why deny them the same opportunity that I have with my wife. Things are not perfect for us all, but you know and I know that this is the right thing to do. You know as well as I know that this is a

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

state that all of us want to be proud of. There's no excuses for us having legislation... having laws that protect every citizen here, that gives every single citizen the right to marry. No excuse. Let's do the right thing. Let's continue to love these people in our families. Let's give them the same right as many of us have. Let's see this Bill, Senate Bill 10, successfully pass. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Looking at you, Greg, and I'm smiling. I know you've waited a long day... time for this. I've done a lot of research on this and studied. In 1964, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said that, 'The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.' Abolitionist Theodore Parker first wrote those words more than 150 years ago, but they still hold true today. And when we consider the history of our great nation, the movement towards equality before the law for all is the defining characteristic of our American experience. We heard about Representative Currie talking about the evolution and it can seem inevitable, but when she talked about Loving v. Virginia, the Supreme Court case that banned interracial marriage, that was only decided in 1967, less than 50 years ago. Alabama did not formally remove from its State Constitution the text of a ban on interracial marriage until 2000. It's also easy to forget that 93 years ago today... from today, more than 40 Members of this Body could not have served your communities as Representatives, much less cast a vote for yourself, simply because you are women. Now, we still have a ways to go, but this is not abstract stuff. When I cochaired Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Illinois, I did so, in part, because I wanted to help break down another barrier to equality. I wanted to make sure that every little girl knew that she could grow up to be President if she wanted to. Now, despite the fact that Hillary lost the Primary, this state and our nation shattered another glass ceiling that year and we elected our first Afr... African-American President. Now, whatever your thoughts about President Obama's politics, we can all agree that his two elections to the highest office in the world have demonstrated to all that discrimination cannot, shall not, and will not endure. Notwithstanding these advances, the continued fight for equality remains absolutely vital to our state. average, nationally, women earn less... 30 percent less than men for the same work. African-American unemployment is nearly twice the national rate. Now, everyone in this room, we do our part to help change these inequities. We may not how... agree in how to affect these changes, but I know that everyone here believes that whether you're black or white, female or male, Latino, Asian, Jewish, Christian, Hindu, Muslim, that you should at least all start at the same place as everybody else. It's in that spirit that I stand today in support of Senate Bill 10. Now, I voted to pass our state's Civil Union Bill to ensure that couples have the same legal rights. And I believe that the provisions of our civil union legislation would make everyone in Illinois equal before the law, but unfortunately, that wasn't the case. I have talked extensively with constituents, Republicans and Democrats, conservatives, liberals, independents and they predominately support the right of all people to a civil marriage recognized

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

by the State of Illinois. And I stress the words civil marriage because I don't believe that anyone who understands our system of government would support a law that requires any religious institution to recognize a same-sex marriage if it elects not to. Now, while the civil union legislation that we passed was truly a noble effort to bring about long overdue equality, activists and legal experts have made it clear to me that it has not fully equalized our gay neighbors and friends. Ninety-five percent is not equal. Ninety-nine point nine percent is not equal. If your partner is sick or injured in an emergency room and you are not their husband or wife, and you're not carrying a durable power of attorney in your pocket, you do not have the same rights as my wife and I if I was sick in the hospital. Now, how many of you here have a durable power of attorney in your pocket with you? I bet you none of them... none of you do. And I don't, because I don't need one. And no one, no one should need to bring a copy of a contract to a hospital when their partner is sick because of a distinction that we choose to make here in the General Assembly. Now, if being gay requires anyone to jump through extra legal hoops for any reason, then we have legally sanctioned the existence of a class of people with fewer rights than everyone else. This is by definition unequal and unjust, and the price of inequity falls squarely on all of us. Now, during the struggle against apartheid, LGBT activists in South Africa were instrumental in securing freedom for all in the new nation. The African National Congress, the party of Nelson Mandela, endorsed same-sex marriage as a policy in 1993, and the democratic Constitution

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

of the new nation was the first in the world to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and South Africa then legalized same-sex marriage in 2006. I refuse to accept that a developing nation, less than 20 years after its founding as a democracy, can be a greater guarantor of the fundamental liberty of its citizens than the home state of Abraham Lincoln. South Africa chose to accept its people as they are and now they're a thriving, democratic state, responsive to the will of its citizens and protective of its minorities. And my final thought is a very basic one. I've been married to my wife for more than 20 years and we have two wonderful sons and we're truly blessed. And after much study, conversation and reflection, I can't think of a single way that granting same-sex couples the right to marry diminishes my love for my wife, our marriage or our family. In my experience, activists fighting for marriage equality generally highlight the enormous hypocrisy of a system in which the state recognizes civil marriages, but discriminates with respect to who can be so recognized simply based on religious dogma. Those who are against marriage equality almost always base their arguments on fear; fear of the unknown, fear of divine retribution or fear of a bad outcome in the next election. Time and again, those fears have proven to be unfounded. When we pass Senate Bill 10 today, we will not be the first state to make marriage equality the law of the land. We won't even be the 10th; we will be the 15th. This is not the time to be timid. Passage of this Bill will say to every gay child and teenager, you are not less than you could or should be. You are exactly who you should be,

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

and you are loved for who you are. Passage of this Bill will send a message to... to all women making 70 cents for every dollar their male coworker earns. And to the children living in poverty, that equality before the law is not just a vague promise on a 220-year-old piece of parchment sitting in Washington. It's a sacred trust that men and women have worked, fought and died for, and it's still worth fighting for. Above the entrance to my law office is inscribed a quote from Deuteronomy. 'Justice, Justice, shall thou pursue.' Throughout my professional life, I've always tried to live up to these words. When any of us is disadvantaged by a law, we're all harmed. Those waiting have waited long enough. 'Justice, Justice, shall thou pursue.'

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

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: recommends be adopted referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill 209."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I guess, it's been nearly two years now, I voted in favor of civil unions. I voted in favor of civil unions because I believed at the time that, as a matter of law, we should allow same-sex couples to make health care decisions together, end of death decisions, inherit property without having to hire a lawyer. And at that time, I... in the press I raised concerns about whether or not we in Illinois should take it a step further to marriage. Subsequently, as the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Sponsor of the Bill pointed out, the Supreme Court issued a landmark decision which denied same-sex couples here in Illinois, but not in 14 other states, nearly 1 thousand federal rights, 1 thousand federal rights under the law. I've listened to both sides. I've looked at all of the research that's been put before me and I've read the Constitution. And I th... really believe it's fairly clear. This is a matter of fairness, it's a matter of equal rights, it's a matter of ensuring those same-sex couple... couples are able to garner those 1 thousand federal rights. For that reason, I'll be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, and to the Bill. You know, I want to focus my remarks today on something that's kind of getting lost today and that's about individual... individual religious rights. You know, we suddenly are quoting the Constitution. Well, why are our constitutional rights only granted to priests and pastors and rabbis? It's been said by both sides of the issue that that's who exemptions are granted to. Our Constitution is about all the people. Where are the religious rights for those of us and those of the people of Illinois who think that this is wrong? I think it's been asked several times over the last year. Where are those rights? So, I want to put aside that this is not about racial rights, this is not about equality pay, this is not about interracial marriage. My wife's Hispanic. It's not an issue. We're not talking about that. This is about individual religious rights. So, for a few of you that are new here, two things happened. I stood here on the floor and predicted in my

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

remarks, during the civil unions debate that supporters of that Bill were really voting for gay marriage. That it was just a stepping stone for same-sex marriage either by the courts or through legislation. So, here we legislation two years later. Also, the other thing that happened in his closing remarks, the Sponsor of the Bill, which is our good friend Representative Harris, the same Sponsor of this Bill, assured us that he was not seeking to redefine marriage. And I quote, 'to tell you what this Bill does and doesn't do. This Bill creates a separate chapter in the Civil Code entitled civil unions. This law would establish civil unions which would be ... would offer the same basic benefits and obligations and responsibilities of marriage under State Law.' He also quoted that, 'major benefits would include hospital visitations, health care decision making, disposition of deceased loved ones remains, and probate rights.' And finally, the Representative quoted saying that 'civil unions would be dissolved in the same matter as divorce.' So, again, regardless of which side of this issue you're on, I think you would agree that both of us made accurate comments. But I quess you have to ask yourself, if all those rights were granted, then why are we here today? So, it's been said that earlier in the year that the Sponsor and the supporters of this Bill wanted six things. We were always told that five of them were granted in civil unions and that the sixth one, Social Security benefits, was a federal issue and needed to be addressed at the federal level. Well, this summer the U.S. Supreme Court decision on DOMA fixed that. Other facts that are out there, what are other

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

states doing? Yes, 14 states have enacted, either through legislation or through the courts, same-sex marriage. Well, that leaves 36 states that don't. Thirty-one of these states have Constitutional Amendments passed by their voters banning same-sex marriages, 31 states. Supporters of Senate Bill 10 say this is all about fairness and about love. Well, we reestablished that civil unions granted fairness and, you know, we don't need a state statute to define love. We all love our parents. We love our siblings. We love our relations. We don't need marriage for that. Love is a feeling between two people. But most importantly, regardless of which side you're on, again, I want to focus on this individual and personal freedoms that are not in this Bill, and I even find it ironic that included in the title of this Bill is religious freedoms. There are no individual freedoms in this Bill other than for pastors, priests, and rabbis. And if it's not religious freedom then it's religious persecution. So, let's start with who would sanctify these marriages. Sure, there's priests and pastors and rabbis, they're going to be exempt, but what about judges? I've had three judges in my district call up and say, David, there is not a facility in your district that's going to perform these ceremonies. They're going to call me. Where's my religious individual freedoms? They're not in here. If you talk about church facilities, it's very, very carefully worded. Church halls, cafeterias, gyms, classrooms, and parish centers, not exempt. So, just imagine a... a same-sex couple went to the door of Saint Ignatius prep school, where the Speaker went to school, and asked to use Tully Hall or the Grand Gallery for a wedding

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

ceremony, same-sex wedding ceremony. Under the language of this Bill, they will have to be obliged or risk being sued. social What about service providers, places Misericordia? What do you think Sister Rosemary Connelly's going to say when someone comes and says, I would like to have a wedding reception here? And don't say that can't happen. Look at what happened after the civil unions Bill passed. And within weeks, our government said Catholic Charities cannot provide... place foster children in a... you have to place a same... or a foster child in a same-sex couple or lose your funding. That wasn't the intent of that Bill, but that's what happens in this town. That's not religious freedom. The Sponsor of the Bill, and we're still looking at the language, said that there's exemptions now for private clubs. Knights of Columbus halls are a direct extension to the Catholic Church. They are... were set up to protect the priests. And, you know, as recently as the 1920s, in Mexico, what happened? It was the Knights of Columbus that helped end that religious persecution down there. I would want to make sure that that language was ironclad that Knights of Columbus halls are exempt. It's... It was also mentioned earlier today about county clerks being forced to issue marriage license against the tenance of their faith, and this is happening in other states. In New York, Governor Cuomo said either issue these licenses or resign. There are county clerks in New York, upstate New York, that are resigning. And I guess the supporters of the Bill will say, okay, resign. We'll eventually get all county clerks that agree with us and life will go on. Bed and breakfasts, photographies, cakes, they

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

all have individual religious rights too. Regardless if they believe in it or not, they should have the right to say I don't want to pu... involve myself in a ceremony. I'm still going to serve them cake, I'm still going to take their picture otherwise, but I just don't want to do it for that ceremony. What about our teachers who will be forced to teach their student that it's okay to marry someone of the samesex, that it's normal in society to want to do this, all the while it goes against their faith. And I remember the debate in the Senate when the Senate Sponsor rolled her eyes when this was being up, and I know the questions weren't asked properly, but don't kid yourself for one minute that we won't ... our teachers won't be forced to teach that this is all right in our schools. Sure, it's not contained in this Bill, but it will be a part of their curriculum. And what happens to our kids when they come home and say, dad, my teacher says it's okay, but I go to church on Sunday and I say it's not. Putting this into our schools is not right. It goes against the individual religious freedoms of the families and those students. You know, and one other example of this is earlier this spring, a House Resolution 202 was introduced, before this Bill even passed, which requires students to take a vow of silence to being attentive to gay and lesbian, bisexual and transgender name- calling, bullying, and harassment. Couldn't even wait for this Bill to pass and now we're trying to change our education. And I hope I ... I hope I bring light that this Bill isn't protective of all religious freedoms and all individual rights. You know, I... I represent a very conservative part of the state, a very Christian part of the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

state, and Leader Currie brought up a story; well, I have a story too. It's about Nicholas and Margaret who, in the 1850s, packed up and left everything they had in Germany, got on a boat, Nicholas's brother came with him. Nicholas died ... or Nicholas's brother died on a boat. They came to America because of political unrest and religious persecution. Carved a spot out on a hill. Name of that place is St. Marie, my hometown. Margaret and Nicholas was my great-grandpa and great... great-great-grandpa and great-great-grandma. So, here we are 175 years later, we just celebrated our celebration last year, talking about the same thing. That isn't America. And I don't care what people do in their personal lives. I consider Representative Harris a great friend. We've worked together on a lot of Bills. What he does and other people do is their business, but don't make us... don't make people who feel that this is wrong, don't make our students say that it's okay. Don't make us live by a different set of the rules during the week than what we live by on the weekend and that's exactly what this Bill does. You already have civil unions. You admitted two years ago that's all you wanted. Let's just leave it at that and honor the most basic tenant of our State and Federal Constitution, religious freedom, not just for priests and pastors and rabbis but for everyone. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. To the Bill. I rise today to speak on the Illinois Religious Freedom and Marriage Fairness Act. As a military officer, a veteran and as a Legislator of the greatest state, I've raised my hand to two Oaths of Office,

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

the oath of the Constitution of Illinois and the Constitution of the United States. And in both times it was to promise to promote justice for all, not just some people, but justice for all people, regardless of their ethnicity, religious or sexual persuasion. As a Catholic follower of Jesus with a Pope... Pope Francis, I am clear our Catholic Religious Doctrine has at its core love, compassion, and justice for all people. So, rising to speak today is both very easy for me and extremely difficult. With that said, I hold in my right hand two marriage certificates representing the myriad of two... I'm sorry... two marriage certificates and another in my other, left hand, a letter signed by 326-plus religious leaders who support Marriage Fairness: Episcopal, Presbyterian, Catholic, Lutheran, Mennonites, United and Evangelical, Unitarian, Methodist, and the United Church of Christ. And many other Christian leaders in my 83rd District of Aurora and North Aurora have come to my office and make it very clear that now, right now, the government is blocking their religious freedom to marry people within their religious doctrine. Now, in my right hand, that I held up earlier, I have my own marriage certificate and a marriage license of a former colleague of this exte... esteemed Body Representatives, now the City Clerk of Chicago, Susana Mendoza Szostak. And so you see, there are two things that dawned on me when I looked at both of these documents. These pieces of paper were made and printed on ink that... and paper that were paid for by using taxpayers money. Yet, not all taxpayers have an equal right to purchase these papers from government. And secondly, it dawned on me that my certificate

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

reads religious ceremony, but Susana's reads a ceremony pre... was done by Supreme Court Justice Anne Burke. And in fact, religious leaders are not, not the only ones who can officiate a marriage in the State of Illinois. In Illinois a marriage can be officiated by a judge, retired judge, associate judge, Circuit Magistrate, or even a Tribal Leader in the Indian Nation and even Cook County Clerk of ... the Clerk of Cook County. There are three states, Florida, Maine, and South Carolina that allow a Notary Public to officiate. So, clearly, the religious community does not have a monopoly on marriage. Finally, let me say, many religious leaders in the 83rd District understand the challenge of my Catholic faith in content to constitutional public policy. I represent all people. And while I'm sad that an estimated two-thirds, that's two out of three people in Kane County, are unchurched, and while I believe strongly in biblical John 17 Unity, it is not the job of a Legislator to bring about that unity. That is the work of religious leaders, and that is a hardy task ahead of them. This Bill strengthens religious freedom. So, for these considerations, I stand today in support of the Illinois Religious Freedom and Marriage Fairness Act. God bless the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My thoughts on this issue have been heavily influenced by my own experience as an African-American woman living in downstate Illinois. Obviously, a generation or two ago, I would not have had the opportunity to serve my community in the General Assembly if it weren't for people's thoughts and ideas about what was

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

acceptable having evolved. And I thank God for that. I thank God that people's ideas about what is acceptable, they evolved beyond what my mother's ideal would be, for her unborn daughter when she sat at lunch counters that read whites only. She didn't do that so that her daughter, that she did not have at that time, would one day be able to serve in the Illinois General Assembly. She did it because it was the right thing to do. I'm voting for marriage equality today because it's the right thing to do. I am voting with a strong sense of confidence because I know that enhancing the civil rights of others does not diminish the civil rights of anyone in this room or anyone in this state. The thoughts and opinions of others, I respect highly, even though they may not agree with me, but I am simply of the... simply of the feeling and I'm convicted today that separate but equal in Illinois and in this land is un-American. And that is why I will be voting for marriage equality today."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you. I rise today in support of marriage equality. I want to touch a bit on how today's vote can have a positive impact on our youth. I'm privileged to be on the board of an organization called Links-North Shore Youth Health Service. Links works to meet many needs in our community. One of the programs we offer is a youth Pride program. Every year, it serves about 200 gay and lesbian youth in the north and northwest suburbs. Our Pride kids struggle with feelings of isolation. They think no one understands what they're going through or how they're feeling. These feelings are only exacerbated by the knowledge that many laws such as marriage

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

equality do not support the idea that being LGBT is okay. When relationships are not recognized or when we are not protected from other forms of discrimination, it's a strong cultural message to our kids that the LGBT community is not really part of the fabric of our country, that they are other or they are less. With these cultural messages that LGBT youth experience, is it any wonder that they struggle? One of the goals of our Pride Youth Program is to help our participants feel more connected to the community. We want them to see that there are others who have come through some of the same challenges that they have and have emerged as healthy, happy adults who contribute to our society through work, volunteer service, and community engagement. We also work with our youth to support them in imagining a positive future for themselves. Imagine how much stronger that image of the future might be if they know that if they are lucky enough to find a life partner that their marriage will be recognized and legitimate under the law. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in strong support of this legislation, and it's one of the honors of my life to be a chief cosponsor, along with the amazing Sponsor, Greg Harris. There's been a lot of talk about religion today and... and I grew up in the church. So, go to church every Sunday, so as not to get yelled at by my mother and it... my faith is deeply important to me. And a lot of people have cited the scripture today, and while I appreciate that, my concern is that we're leaving some things out that are indeed in the Bible. Swear not at all, neither by Heaven,

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

for it is God's throne, nor by earth, for it is His footstool. Forsake not the assembly. These are all commandments in the New Testament of our good book. Divorce is forbidden except in the case of adultery. And I say all of these things to say that we are not a theocracy. That for those of us who have cited our founding fathers, I would note that it was Thomas Jefferson who said that we ought to separate church from state; that that was a fundamental expression of religious freedom was that we would not have a national religion, but that, in fact, every man and woman would be free to do so. And to be clear, this Bill protects that. This Bill says that if you want to evangelize, however you will, that you can do This maintains that fundamental right because, ultimately, this Bill is about commitment. This is about the right and freedom of two people, in a democratic republic, to have a marriage recognized as civil matrimony. fundamentally, what this is about. There's been a lot of conversation about families today, as well and ... and I grew up the only child of a single mother, so I know how much I wish that I'd had a father who had been there. And I know so many go through that, especially, in... in my community. And I don't disagree that the family is, in some ways, under attack and has been for some time, even since the 1070s. But the families under attack by poverty and unemployment, by low wage jobs that don't pay enough to raise a family, while raising one, is under attack by poverty, urban and rural. And there is not a single advantage to any of those factors by denying the right of two people who want to be recognized in civil matrimony. There is not a single disadvantage to any of those

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

factors. That won't ... by ... by somehow preventing same-sex couples from marrying, we will not bring one job back from overseas; we will not bring one father back to the home; we will not protect one more family farm. None of things will be true. And some might say... I've ... I've heard today that... that civil unions are enough. And I think Representative Gordon highlighted the fact that we've tried separate but equal in this country and it did not work, that we, in fact, must continue to expand the cathedral of democracy. That's what this Bill is about. I've heard push back that somehow this shouldn't be equated to the African-American Civil Rights Movement. And I don't dispute that on its face, but what I would say is that there are real consequences to people being unequal. That to say that our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters have not been beaten, or shot, or lynched, forgets the memory of Matthew Shepard and so many who have suffered LGBT violence in the State of Illinois and other places. To say that our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters have not struggled for all of us, forgets about the folks that Representative Franks mentioned in South Africa, forgets about the fact that the March on Washington, which is the only reason I can stand here today, was organized by Bayard Rustin, who was a black same-gender loving man. That's our history. That's fundamentally who we are. And so, the idea that we would stand in the... the archway of the church, from which so much of this authority, this morale authority, was derived for women's suffrage, for civil rights, for everything that's ever moved our country forward and blocked the path to equality for others, is insane to me. And just to

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

bring this home, our President has been cited a couple times today, as well, and what I would note, Representative Currie mentioned the Loving case. When Barack Obama was born, there were still seven states in which his mother and father consummating their marriage was illegal. That's not so long ago. I cite our history, not because I'm trying to make us feel ashamed of it, but it's a note, as someone has said before, that we evolve. We get better. Every single generation, we get better. And the challenge we have before us today is will we continue perfecting our union. As Abraham Lincoln, the great... the great son of Illinois once said, are we going to be larger and freer and more loving. Are we going understand that religious freedom carries responsibility? Continue to evangelize those things believe in, but understand that it's not the function of the state to do it for us? That's what's at stake today. This Bill is ultimately about commitment, and about love, and about making sure that those who have had to live and to love in the shadows, can finally have their day of equality in the sun. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you also for your tolerance from the clock. This is a major Bill and deserves the debate that it's had, and I appreciate that. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. You know, the arts can teach us a lot about human nature and about the human condition. And I'd like to reference a play that many of us in this room have probably seen, Fiddler on the Roof. And if you haven't seen it, let me set the opening scene for you.

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

It's a story about a Jewish dairyman back in Czarist, Russia, who has five daughters. And in the opening scene, he's... he's shown with a fiddler on the roof, and he recounts, in the opening scene, all of the travails, and all of the worries that he has in Czarist, Russia, as a Jew and what faces him. And he concludes by saying, you may wonder how we keep our balance in this village of Anatevka. And he says, I can tell you that... I can answer that in one word, and that word is tradition. Now, there are some traditions that are elemental, in my mind at least, to society. I will tell you I'm the first person to say that traditions can change. And I referenced ... I referenced Tevye and his five daughters. And those of you who know this story know that there were traditions that impacted four of those daughters, which he said he would change, and did change, but there was one on which he would not budge. And I think, my friends, I think that's what marriage is in society. It is a fundamental concept that we hold dear, and to change that concept is, indeed, a major societal change. Now, we have all received hundreds, if not thousands, of postcards or phone calls, letters, mail, other contacts on this issue. There appears to be no middle ground. Seems that civil unions were not enough. There's compromised position. And the discussion on the issue has been harsh. For example, I had a discussion with a woman of the cloth, who was one of my constituents, who, because I disagreed with her on this issue, called me homophobic. Now, to be fair, during the course of the conversation, she apologized for using that term, but it shows the tenor of the debate. There are those opposed to this legislation who have

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

been referred to as right-wingers, who don't care about social justice or inequality. I reject that characterization. They say they're not compassionate. Is Francis Cardinal George not compassionate? I think not. There are those who oppose this legislation who have been called small-minded bigots. They don't care about equality, who don't care about civil rights. Are those black ministers, who represent so many African-American congregations around the states... around the state, are they bigots who don't care about civil rights? I think not. As a matter of fact, I venture to say that many of them have experienced bigotry firsthand, but they don't support this Bill. You know, one of the things though I especially reject, in the characterization of this Bill, is what was written by Mr. Zorn in the Chicago Tribune back in May when we were talking about this Bill, who put in his article, in terms of what the GOP should do about gay rights. And he wrote that we should stop obsessing about what goes on in the bedroom. My friends, I don't care if you're homosexual, heterosexual, asexual, or bisexual. I don't care what goes on in the bedroom as long as no one gets hurt. That is not the issue. Now, it's said that the Sponsor of this legislation would not bring the Bill to the floor unless he has 60 votes. Now, he's a pretty smart quy, so maybe he's got the 60 votes. And maybe, Senate Bill 10 is before us today because, indeed, he has those votes. But you know, if this Bill passes, I hope that the supporters of the Bill will remember that there are many people in this great state who do not think that this is the right way to go. There are many people in this state who believe in the fundamental, traditional definition of

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

marriage between a man and woman. Those people are not homophobic, they are not bigoted, they are not biased. They are simply ordinary folks who hold values that they hold dearly. I stand today to represent them and urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I really try to sit and be very quiet about this legislation, and I've told so many reporters that this was not my issue. My issues was about the children. I wanted to make sure that the children of the State of Illinois, specifically, my district, where the schools are closing, I... I wanted to make sure that they had a good education. That's my issue. As far as health care, I told them, this is not my issue. My issue was about people having access to health care. I had a meeting not too long ago on the Affordable Care Act, and this lady, who was a double amputee, came to the meeting and she said, Representative, I have a problem. I have a problem, and I need your help. What can I help you with? She says, I'm a double amputee. I'm on dialysis and I need treatment, but they said I can't get my dialysis treatment until I get dental care. And I can't get dental care because you all cut it out. And so, therefore, I'm going to die. I told the lady, not on my watch. This is not the issue that I came down here to debate because as Representative Harris and others have so eloquently said, what you do and who you love is your business. It's your business. I really don't care. I know about discrimination. I know all about it. And I do know what the Constitution says. I've said to Representative Harris on numerous of occasion, show me in the U.S.

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Constitution where you are prohibited from getting any type of services. I've asked him and he told me about DOMA. I said, this is a federal issue. You have a problem, you want Social Security, you want benefits because here in the State of Illinois, we have given you everything. Everything. Quite frankly, this is a joke. This debate is a joke, here, in the State of Illinois, because what you want is up to the Federal Government to give it to you, not the State of Illinois. So, in closing, respectfully, I want to say to those who injected race, race... those who injected race... see, when I was discriminated against, it wasn't because of who I love. It was because of the color of my skin. That's why the ... we were sold into slavery. That's the reason why we're still discriminated today. That's the reason why our supposedly... that's the reason why we don't have access to That's the reason why there's health care. opportunity for jobs, education, everything else, because of race. But nobody ever asks. And if you don't ask and don't tell, no one will care about who you sleep with. That's your business, and it should continue to be that way. But I just want to say that homosexuality has nothing to do with race, and I really did not appreciate race being injected into this conversation. And since the Bible was quoted, I just want to read something that I thought was rather fascinating, written by Jim Burns. And he said, marriage was instituted by God as a relationship between a man and woman. Therefore... the Bible says, therefore, a man leave his father and his mother and cleave to his wife, and they become one flesh. That's in Genesis 2 and 24. The church... the church does not have the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

power or the authority to change this, and nor does the secular society. Even if the legal definition of the word marriage was changed to include homosexual couples, those couples will not be, ever, ever, truly married in God's eyes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support marriage equality. I support marriage equality because I believe you have to stand for something, otherwise, you'll fall for anything. Senate Bill 10 stands for more than something. It stands for love, equality and fairness. This Bill does not restrict religious liberty. If you actually read it, it protects religious liberty. Two people who love each other should have the right to marry each other. I love my wife. My wife loves me, and we had that right. Why shouldn't two samesex people have that same right? That's what's fair. This is about love and equality. I understand that a number of pastors disagree with what I'm saying here, but there are also pastors who disagree with them. On this position, in my district, there have been people who have said, if you vote for this, we're voting you out. In my district, there's been people who said, if you vote against it, we're voting you out. So, what I decided to do was do the right thing and stand for what I believe is right. Stand for what is fair. Stand for what is just. That's love, equality and fairness. Someone once said that first they came for the socialist and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a socialist. Then, they came for the trade unionist and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then, they came for the Jews and I didn't speak out

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

because I wasn't a Jew. Then, they came for me, and there was no one left to speak for me. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we must speak up today. We must use our voice and our vote to stand against oppression of any kind when we're given the opportunity. Here is our opportunity to vote for love, to vote for fairness, to vote for equality. Today, I feel like the Mahatma, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, fighting against oppression. Today, I feel like Dr. King, fighting against inequality. Today, I feel like our President, Barack Obama. The Illinois House of Representatives is making history. Speak up today, Members. Speak up for love. Speak up for fairness. Speak up for equality and vote for Senate Bill 10."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to acknowledge four of our colleagues today. Representative Greg Harris, former Representative and Alderman now, Kelly Cassidy and Sam Yingling. To stand before your colleagues and ask for a measure of equality that the overwhelming majority of us already enjoy, takes a great deal of strength. Your courage to stand tall on such a personal issue in such a public way is inspiring, and I want to say thank you. Today I pray that you and other loving families, who for years have heard harsh words, felt discrimination and been disrespected, will indeed today get the equality that this House is in a position to deliver. Throughout our history, each and every generation has expanded upon the freedoms won by our forefathers. We are at our best when we work to remove barriers and expand the possibilities for more of our citizens to achieve the American dream. The next great barrier that we're standing in front of

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

today in our generation is the prohibition on marriage for same-sex couples. When things are unequal we feel it. Inequality is life out of balance. Inequality is an offense to the very foundation of our country. Equality is something we must stand up for and today, we must stand on the right side of history and make Illinois more equal for all of our citizens. We can no longer say to one couple that their love is deserving of marriage and to another couple that their love should only be called the partnership. Separate but equal is never equal. Children of same sex couples should not grow up wondering why their family is treated differently from other families. Over the years, people have said to those of us who have always supportive marriage equality that we're brave. Brave? Brave for being openly supportive of gay marriage and gay adoption. With all due respect, I humbly dissent. We aren't being brave; we are being smart because we know that love is a human experience, not a political statement. I have several friends whose marriages have clearly outlasted mine. They are raising wonderful children together. Many have been together for over three decades. Recently, one of those couples, Lee and David Neubecker were down here in Springfield with their daughter Braiden. I'm sure many of you remember Braiden. She took a day off of school and came down here with her dads to stand in solidarity, and she went from office to office, handing a letter that she wrote to many of you, and I'd like to share parts of her letter. It was entitled, 'Why my dads should be married'. It began, love is important. My two dads should be able to marry and have the same rights as everybody. How would

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

you feel if you couldn't marry someone just because the government said you weren't allowed to? If I loved someone and wasn't allowed to marry them, I'd be pretty upset. My family taught me that even if you don't agree with someone, you should still be kind and respectful. The government should be respectful too. Also, my church tells me that you should treat other people how you want to be treated. My dads are very unique. We do lots of silly things, like drink hot cocoa every time it snows. Every time we go to the same place in Florida with one of my dad's whole family, our family knows how to have fun. We do lots of road trips. One of my favorite things to do with my family is game night. I love this family and every single thing we do as a family. Before I lived with my two dads, my life was horrible. My old family never treated me well. They wouldn't stand up for me. If my foster sister would fight with me, my old mom would just sit there and watch me get hurt. I'd have to fight back even if I didn't want to. Each time I was at a foster home, they promised me they'd treat me and my brother equally. They always broke their promise. I left five times until I found my two dads. They promised they would keep me safe and equal. Now, I'm 10, and they still keep their promises. They do so much for me; they never hurt me or my brothers. I feel so safe. I believe now that I can do anything with my two dads. Braiden closed her letter will... asking, will you let my dads be married? drew two little boxes at the bottom, one for a check for 'yes' and one, a check for 'no'. For the love of family, I'm checking 'yes' for Braiden, for Michael and Cody and their dads. Join me, say 'yes' for dignity, 'yes' for respect and

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

'yes' for families all over Illinois and vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

"While I sit up here, Greg, congratulations, this has Yingling: been a long time... long time in the making. While I... I'm... I can't believe that we're here at this point, and for nearly a year I have envisioned this moment wondering what words I would say or what statement I would give. I drafted many speeches in my mind and on paper, but I've torn up and disregarded each one. At this monumental moment, what would I say? How could I ever put to words what exists in my heart? And then suddenly I realized, this is not a complicated issue. This is not an issue that needs to be spoken about in numbers or mathematical equations; this is a very simple issue. This issue is simply about family and family values. It's about your family and it's about my family. Unfortunately, I'm not able to be joined today by my amazing family; my partner Lowell and our three outstanding kids, Mattie, Drew and Max. Lowell and I feel pain when our kids feel pain. We celebrate our kids' accomplishments and rejoice in their achievements. We strive to make sure that they have every opportunity that your kids have. But we are a family that is treated differently under the eyes of the law. We are a family that does not have the same protections that your family has. This debate is truly about family and the issue is very clear. There have been many arguments made that this Bill does not protect institutions from religious freedom, and to that I say, religious institutions have been granted vast protections under this Bill, and no religious institution is

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

mandated by law to adhere to the contents of this Bill. I do not promote my faith, because my faith with God is deeply personal. I am a Catholic. Let me repeat that, I am a Catholic. I was raised in the Catholic faith and the key point of that faith is family values. I pray to an amazing God who has stood with me during the lowest valleys of my life and the highest mountain tops. My God stands with me and my family today as we are all created in His image and He never turns his back on His children. I know that my God transcends the directives of human interpretation of His will because God is love, God is commitment, and God is strength. He stands with me and my family at this very moment, and we stand with Him. As a result, there is no one in this chamber that can hide behind the argument that religious institutions will somehow become compelled to do something against their beliefs. So this boils down, again, to a very simple prospect. If you believe that all families across this great state deserve the same legal protections enjoyed by your family, then press the green button. If you believe that certain families, such as my family, should be treated inequitably under the law, then you press the red button. My generation, the new generation of leaders, and unlike Representative Dunkin, I'm not in my 40s, the... my generation, the new generation of leaders is befuddled by all the fuss surrounding this issue. We believe in fairness; we believe in equal opportunity for our families. My generation understands that a healthy and stabile society is built upon the strength of a family regardless of its makeup. We know that the strength of any society is gauged by the security felt by its people. I was sent here by a hundred

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

and eight thousand people in the 62nd District. They sent me here to do what is just and to do what is right to protect all the families of not only the 62nd District but of our state. They did not send me here to do what is politically expedient, but to do what is right. They sent me here not only to represent their interest but also take into the account the interest of all families across the state. LGBT families live in every county of Illinois, not just the City of Chicago. I and my family are proof of that. I know many of you are afraid. I know many of you are concerned about your reelections, but I share this with you. Courage is not the absence of fear, but rather the recognition that there is something far more important than that fear. Do not let yourself succumb to fear of politics but rather embrace the magnitude of the greatness of all the families in the state. The great people of the 62nd District believe that all families deserve the same legal protection under the law. On behalf of the great people of the 62nd District, my family and I encourage you to join us on behalf of all the families in the state, stand with us and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy. Mr. Turner in the Chair." Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. To the Bill. This is no ordinary Bill we're debating here. When I first came to Springfield, one of the most common pieces of advice I got was don't take anything personally, and usually that's incredibly sound advice. I can't do that with this Bill as this Bill could not be more personal. This Bill goes directly to how I am defined, how my family is defined by the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

state. Whether Kelley and I can care for each other when we're sick, whether our family can be considered real. Whether we are as valued as members of this community as any other, that's what we're debating here today. You've met my boys. Josh, Daniel and Ethan are watching today. They face those questions about our family, not just on the playground where you might expect it but, here, in this very building, this cathedral of justice. We spend a lot of time here together during Session. Inevitably, we end up talking about our families and as we've shared our stories and talked about parent/teacher conferences and soccer schedules and recitals and the things and the people that we miss when we're not here... when we're not there, these have been very simply shared experiences of our families; and I never got the sense from any of you, in those conversations, that you thought of our family as somehow less than. Our experiences are the same except for how we are protected and valued by the state. And we are treated as less than by this state that all of us in this room love enough to serve. Last year, I got the call that we all dread. My partner Kelley was being rushed to the hospital in excruciating pain and I left here at the crack of dawn in a hurry to get home to her. On the way home, in addition to the thoughts that we all would have under the circumstances, will I get there in time, what's wrong, that it... what her condition might be. I also worried that I wouldn't be allowed in to see her when I got there, and wondered if I should take the extra time to go all the way home and find that durable power of attorney for health care. I was weighing the risks of going straight to her side or

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

spending another hour in transit to get a piece of paper to prove that we were real. The worries about making it to her on time are worries we would all share, but there are only a handful of us in this room that would have that other worry and that other question to weigh about that extra hour of transit. Until our relationships are on an equal footing, there will always be questions to answer under those circumstances. This vote today isn't about the next election or even the one after that. This is about a question you'll face at some point in the future. What did you do when faced with this historic moment? Whether that future is embodied in my boys or your kids, your nieces and nephews, your grandchildren or that boy at your son's high school who's being bullied 'cause he's just too different for your small town, it is their opinion of your actions today that should determine what you do. Which really brings me to the piece of advice that I got that always applies, you will never regret doing the right thing. Today, the right thing is to tell my family, these families here today and watching us and those kids wondering if it really does get better, that you are valued, you are equal. Cast your vote for equality for the right thing. Please vote 'yes' and join us on the right side of history."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Before I commence my remarks, I want to point a couple of remarks towards the Sponsor of the Bill. Greg, you have persevered in the face of pressure, attack, even from people who should have been on your side. People picketing your office who

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

should have been picketing the opposition. People in this chamber who have not been friendly to you, have turned a deaf ear when you needed them to at least just listen. And for what you've done over the last years on this issue, not only within your community but for all of us, making us sit here quietly for a couple of hours which is pretty rare, having a significant debate on an important public policy issue, you'll have my undying gratitude for bringing this Body together to do this and I thank you very much. For those of us who were here, virtually all us, on May 31st when the galleries were packed, even more than they are today, and there was anticipation in the air from early morning that this Bill would be called for a vote, it was such a devastating moment for those of us who support this measure, particularly for the Sponsor, that the Bill was not called for a vote. The Sponsor did the right thing at the time; the Bill would not have passed at that time, and he did honor to the cause by doing the right thing at that time. But on that day, we heard from the Sponsor of the Bill with gut wrenching emotion about what this meant to him. We heard, perhaps, the best speech I've ever heard on the House Floor, that day, in my 26 years by Deb Mell, who's with us today. And yet, some of you were not moved. If these stories do not move you, Ladies and Gentlemen, what does? Some of you who will vote 'no' today want to vote 'yes' and don't have the guts to do it. Why it takes guts to do the right thing when you know in your heart what the right thing is, is beyond me. I heard distortions from some who are opposed; distortions dealing with all sorts of things, the religious exemptions in the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Bill, lawsuits, polygamy, teaching homosexuality in the schools. Where... where do any of you read that in this legislation? I've read it from cover to cover more than once and my quess is, some of the people who spoke in opposition today haven't read a single word of the Bill. Sometimes, it's instructive to read the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. If you did, you wouldn't have said some of the things that I heard on the floor here today. As many have said on this floor today and other days, this Bill is simply about love. And as Representative Williams said very early in the debate, we don't talk much about love on the House Floor. It's not an issue we talk about, it's not an issue we legislate, but it's an issue we all care about and it's an issue we all talk about. How we deal with our families and how we deal with our friends and how we deal with our colleagues and how we deal with our business associates. It is inconceivable to me that in a society where over 50 percent of the marriages end in divorce leading to orphaned children, leading homelessness, leading to poverty in some cases, and then some of those folks get remarried and re-divorced. It inconceivable to me in a society that is so desperate for love and so desperate for closeness and so desperate for people to live peaceably with one another, that anyone can turn their back on this legislation. All this legislation proposes to do is to let people be together in peace and in love and make the world a better place. Some have said, oh, if this Bill passes it will destroy the family unit as we know it. Really? Whose? Whose family unit will be destroyed by allowing two consenting adults who wish to get married to

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

get married? Is it going to affect your life, your family, your children, your neighbors, your community? You know it won't. That's just a bunch of rhetoric you have to say because you have ... if you're going to be opposed, you have to say something. It's just rhetoric. It won't destroy anybody's family. What it will do is strengthen the bonds of love and friendship that should make this country what it is. I heard something about religion from a few people. And in my religion, we have a phrase that it is in Hebrew called 'Tikkun Olam'. Tikkun Olam means to repair the world. To repair the world. To go where we find misery and do our best to fix it. To go where there are... are problems in life and find ways to make them better. I can't imagine a Bill we could ever have before us that isn't more about Tikkun Olam than this one is. And isn't that our mission as elected officials? To repair the world. To make it a better place to live for everyone in it, not just the people who are benefited by the current law, not just the people who live in our own house, not just the people who we like down the street, but everyone in our state, and everyone in our country. And to do anything else violates the basic premise of what we're doing here in the first place. Ladies and Gentlemen, in the Senate debate on legislation, they went on for a very long time, as we did, but there was one comment made by one Senator that really struck me. One Senator talked about his three daughters; two of them straight, one of them gay. And he asked the Body why his two straight daughters should have different rights under the law in the State of Illinois than his third daughter? What other way can we answer the question? What other question

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

do we need to ask? Why should that Senator have two daughters that have rights under the laws of the State of Illinois and a third daughter that does not simply because she's gay? For us to conclude that that Senator's third daughter should have less rights than his other two is to slap her in the face, is to slap that Senator in the face, is to slap everyone in the State of Illinois who feels as that Senator does, right in the face. We can do better than that. We have a responsibility and an historic opportunity to do the right thing for the people of the State of Illinois, all the people of the State of Illinois. All of you, probably all of you, saw the movie Lincoln. And the character in that movie that Tommy Lee Jones played said over and over again that ending slavery was about equality under the law, not the religious law, not the law of your church, not the law of your next door neighbor, but the law. And the law of the State of Illinois demands that if we're going to have equality for everybody in the State of Illinois this Bill must pass. I beg of you to vote your conscience and to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Speaker Madigan. Representative Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll be very brief. First, to Greg Harris. Thank you for the long hard work that you've put into this Bill and my regrets for the unwarranted criticism that was heaped upon you by certain 'supporters' of the Bill. It was not warranted. It was not needed. It did not help the passage of the Bill. It probably hurt the passage of the Bill. My thoughts regarding this legislation were formulated before the quote that I'm going

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

to offer to all of us. And the quote that I offer is a quote from Pope Francis of the Roman Catholic Church, who is quoted as saying, 'if someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and he has good will, who am I to judge?' Vatican experts were quick to point out that Pope Francis was not suggesting that the priest or anyone else should act on their homosexual tendencies. But Pope Francis has spoken and he has articulated the basics of my thinking on this issue. The history of civilization is a history of people finding each other. Two people find each other. They get to know each other. They come to a judgment that they love each other, they want to be with each other, that each will help the other move through life and then, hopefully, each will help the other in the raising of children. That's the simple history civilization and people have found each other over all of these centuries; people that are straight and people that are gay. Those that are gay, living in these relationships, under the law are illegal. And so that brings me to my personal thought for those that just happen to be gay living in a very harmonious, productive, relationship, but illegal; who am I to judge that they should be illegal? Who is the government to judge that they should be illegal? And for me, that's the reason to support this Bill. This is a Bill that's long in coming. It ought to be passed today and shortly become the law of Illinois. I plan to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "So, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House for what I think has been a very heartfelt, a very thorough and a very informative debate. The one thing we know is that there

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

are strong feelings on both sides of this issue. And we need to be respectful of everyone who has expressed an opinion today, whether they stood in support of the Bill or whether they stood against the Bill. But at the end of the day, what this Bill is about is love, it is about family, it is about commitment. At the end of the day, this Bill is about the vision that the founders of our country had and wrote into our Constitution where they said, you know, America is a... not a destination, America is a journey. America is a journey. And we'll continue to walk down that road and make America a better place, to make ourselves a more perfect union, to ensure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity. And Ladies and Gentlemen, there's not a lot more I can say to add to what has already been said, but I... I just brought with me today... and I... I promised this serviceman that I would say this on the floor. And so, I have a flag here that has been flown in combat in Afghanistan as part of Operation Enduring Freedom from a soldier, an Illinois boy who is stationed in Kandahar Province, who is over there today defending our freedom. And he just asked that when he comes home from defending and fighting for freedom that we have voted to give him the freedom to marry the person he loves. Ladies and Gentlemen, please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor moves that Senate Bill 10 pass. Members will be in their chairs. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Currie now moves that the House reconsider the vote by which this Bill passed. Mr. Harris moves that that Motion be tabled. Those in favor of Mr. Harris's Motion say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Representative Currie's Motion is tabled. Ladies and Gentlemen, we continue on the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 209, Mr. Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 209, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2, 5, and 6 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 2 is off..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr... Mr. Arroyo. Sorry."
- Arroyo: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I want to move Floor Amendment 6 to House Bill 209. And I want to move it to Third Reading so I can discuss the Bill on Third Reading, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Let's... before we do this, Mr. Clerk, by request of the Sponsor, please withdraw Amendments 2, 3, 4, and 5 and put Amendment 6 on the board. Mr. Arroyo on Amendment 6."
- Arroyo: "I want to be able to discuss it on Third Reading, if you don't mind, Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost, can we go to Third Reading? Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'... On Amendment 6, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 209, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo on Amendment 6."

- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment 6 contains the supplemental appropriation. It's a technical change for House... FY14's budget. The total... the total new spending would be \$49.6 million and only 540... 514 miln... thousand from the GRF. The GRF appropriation is under court claims for 3 different awards. The majority of the supplemental is related to the implementation of conceal and carry, another legal position, a portion of the related of federal funds to the Department of Employment Security. The rest of the Amendment covers numerous technical changes. I am happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen. I know this an exciting time, we have other business before us. Please clear the center aisle. Move your business to the back of the chamber. Please move your business to the back of the chamber. And the chamber will settle down. I erroneously said this is Amendment 6. This is Third Reading. So, we are on House Bill 209, Third Reading. Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first off thank you for trying to have quiet in the… This… this is actually an important Bill. I know the last Bill was important. This is important as well. It does involve reappropriations of funds, a supplemental appropriation."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we still have committees this afternoon. That quieted them down in a hurry. Mr. Bost."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, hopefully, everyone is paying attention. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "I know there's some concerns about some of the things that are in this Bill. One of the things that I'm concerned that maybe isn't in the Bill. One of the… when this Bill was first being talked about, one of the things that we thought may have been coming out is the appropriation for the Department of Corrections based on back pay on some negotiations. Can you tell me if that's in there and why that wouldn't be in there, if it's not in there?"

Arroyo: "No. The back pay is not in there, Sir."

Bost: "And... and what was the reason... that was the original reason for feeling it was not necessary to put in or..."

Arroyo: "Well, the Members... I guess the chairs got together and they decided not to spend no more money at this... at this point right now."

Bost: "Okay. Do you feel the obligation has been made to those members, those employees? I mean, I understand our tight budget and everything like that, but... but who does the negotiation for those employees and do you feel like that is something that..."

Arroyo: "We talked about that in committees a lot, but it's not in the Bill and it's not been..."

Bost: "Okay. Is it... is it something that you can see coming in the future or not?"

Arroyo: "I... I think there's a lot of issues that are going to be coming in the future. There's a lot of things that were left out that some of the Members are still concerned with and I

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

have a couple issues that I think that should be back on the... on this appropriation. So, we'll able to address this down the line at another time."

Bost: "Okay. I... and I'm still concerned as far as the... First off, was that obligation made by we then this chamber or by who? Do you know? I know it may be a little bit off of this Bill, but I'm really needing to find out, you know, because this was an opportunity to have actually have the money placed in the Bill that would meet that obligation. I know you and I didn't make those arrangements but..."

Arroyo: "Oh, I think we came to a conclusion as a Body, that to be able to call this with less GRF 'cause I believe a lot of our Members don't want to spend a lot of money right now. So, this is all we have on the table right now, Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Okay. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, I'm interested in this allocation or actually carveout for separate appropriation line for The School of Labor and Employment Relations with the University of Illinois. Are you familiar with that, Representative?"

Arroyo: "Yes, I am."

Sandack: "And what's the genesis of that? What's... what's the... why the carveout?"

Arroyo: "Well, that's no new money. That's the same money that was in there before. So, I know that some... some Members have issues with the way it was carved out, but all it is is moving

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- money around. There's no different rules here than what was in there previously."
- Sandack: "Moving money around is not usually something that engenders a lot of faith and confidence, Representative.

 What's moving and why?"
- Arroyo: "We are making appropriation for the school, so the school could appropriate it properly for the programs they want. That's the same way we give some people a lump sum and they can spend it as they wish."
- Sandack: "Representative, it's curious that there's no line appropriation for The School of Business, The School of Law, The School of Dentistry, et cetera. Why is there a carveout for this particular school?"
- Arroyo: "I would have to get back to you on that. I don't have that question in front of me, why that one project."
- Sandack: "Well I... Thank you. I respect that and I appreciate it, but I'd ask you then to pull this until you have that information. Would you be willing to do that, Sir?"

Arroyo: "No, Sir."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Speaker. Folks, I don't know exactly what is going on with this carveout, but it's not kosher. It should cause pause. I'm recommending that since the Sponsor won't pull the supplemental that a 'no' vote be made on this Bill because there is something totally untoward with this carveout. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Bellock: "Thank you. Representative, I'd just like to know what was added in Amendment 6 to the supplemental Bill, specifically."

Arroyo: "Representative, I did not hear that. Sorry."

Bellock: "Is there anybody on your staff that knows what's added to the Bill?"

Arroyo: "Three million dollars was added to the Bill. It was apparently 46 million and now it went up to 49."

Bellock: "But I'm asking what specific program was it for, since this came about so fast, just since we've approved that."

Arroyo: "Disadvantage business enterprise program from Department of..."

Bellock: "Pardon me. I can't hear."

Arroyo: "The bus... enter... disadvantaged business..."

Bellock: "Is it IDOT?"

Arroyo: "...program at IDOT."

Bellock: "And the amount is \$3 million?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Bellock: "Okay. And on the other issue that Representative Sandack brought out about the University of Illinois. Is the University of Illinois okay with what was done with that line item? I mean, here's..."

Arroyo: "I would say they wouldn't be okay; they are aware of it."

Bellock: "They're not okay with it."

Arroyo: "I couldn't say that. I haven't talked to them."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Harris, D.: "Representative, thank you. Specifically, can you tell me what's the total supplemental appropriation amount in the Bill?"

Arroyo: "Forty-nine point six million."

Harris, D.: "Forty-nine point six million or..."

Arroyo: "Million, million, no billion."

Harris, D.: "Right. I hope not... I hope not billion."

Arroyo: "Five fourteen of it is GRF."

Harris, D.: "Right. We have a... we have a figure that shows 50 million. Has there been a slight change?"

Arroyo: "It might be a rounding problem."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Arroyo: "I think maybe your calculator is better than mine."

Harris, D.: "What's a million here or a million there, right?"

Arroyo: "Right. What..."

Harris, D.: "It's just a rounding problem. For purposes of clarification though, the big number here deals with issues related, or dollars related, to the concealed carry legislation. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Right. That's about \$30 million."

Harris, D.: "And the concealed carry... of that \$30-plus million, 17 million of it is for administration."

Arroyo: "Prob... Yes, I think so."

Harris, D.: "Can you give me an idea of how much administration \$17 million buys? I mean, are we talking about people? Are we talking about equipment? Are we talking about..."

Arroyo: "What... what this is... this is a new program. This is a new program and this is just probably estimated right now."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Harris, D.: "Okay. We certainly... this... this chamber and this Legislature has certainly said that they want concealed carry to... to begin in Illinois, so we need to have it in place. It just seems to me that that's a lot of... a lot. But going back to your statement, I just want to clarify, we're only talking about \$514 thousand of General Revenue Funds, correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And those \$514 thousand for the most part relate to court of claims issues that we are going to have to pay anyway?"

Arroyo: "Exclusively, three claims, three court of claims."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you very much for your answers."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, if just... if you would just briefly, I want to go a little bit further on the back wages that... that the state is obligated to pay. You acknowledged there's been a court order requiring the payment of those back wages, don't you?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Moffitt: "So you acknowledge it, but it's not in this particular Bill."

Arroyo: "Not at this moment, no."

Moffitt: "Okay. When would you expect that issue to be addressed?"

Arroyo: "Probably when we come back. We don't know when we're coming back, so."

Moffitt: "Do you think that might be yet in 2013?"

Arroyo: "I couldn't answer that."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Moffitt: "So the only time we're sch..."

Arroyo: "I could answer it, but I'm not sure, is what I should say."

Moffitt: "I'll settle for your best guess."

Arroyo: "Maybe after Thanksgiving, maybe before. I'm not sure."

Moffitt: "By delaying doing what the court has ordered us to, are we causing any additional cost or expense for the state?"

Arroyo: "Not to my knowledge, no. I know that there might be some penalties or something like that, but I'm not sure there is."

Moffitt: "Representative, it's my understanding that that court order included interest that we will owe for the back wages."

Arroyo: "Right."

Moffitt: "So, the... so, the longer we wait, the more it's going to cost the state, is my understanding."

Arroyo: "That's... that's what I'm hearing."

Moffitt: "Do you know what rate of interest that court ordered?"

Arroyo: "I think that's also debatable. I don't know how true it is."

Moffitt: "Okay. I've heard the figure is six percent, is what the court ordered and that once the claims are made by the employees that that rate actually goes up to seven percent. So, it's... it's an increasing cost to the state to not comply with this court order, if my information is correct, and I believe it is."

Arroyo: "We would... we would have to look into that. That's the first time I hear the seven percent."

Moffitt: "Okay. Well, I'd appreciate it because there's a... some time value here. It's an added cost, an increasing cost, any delay and it's simply abiding by a court order that has

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

already been issued and I think we really should abide by that and honor it and meet the obligations of that court order. I appreciate your response. Thank you."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Phelps: "Representative, I know my neighbor, Representative Bost, brought this up a while ago. How much was the… you said that the appropriations for the back pay is not in this supplemental. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "The appropriation for what, Representative?"

Phelps: "The back... the back pay for the..."

Arroyo: "No. No, it's not..."

Phelps: "...AFSCME workers."

Arroyo: "No, it's not."

Phelps: "And how much was that, do we know?"

Arroyo: "I think it was 112 million."

Phelps: "Hundred and forty million?"

Arroyo: "Hundred and twelve million."

Phelps: "Hundred and twelve, okay. Well, and I don't want to put you on the spot but I have a lot of people this affects that I represent down in my district. Can we... I'm going to support your measure today but also can we... and I don't know if you want to say it on the record, but will you help me work on this, maybe trying to find a solution and trying to..."

Arroyo: "Absolutely."

Phelps: "Okay."

Arroyo: "We're trying to do that now as we speak."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Phelps: "Thank you. To the Bill. While I support this supplemental, I'm disappointed, deeply, not having the back wages for some 25 thousand employees is not included in this measure. We all know these are the folks that keep our prisons safe, take care of our developmentally disabled, the mentally ill, and they maintain our state parks. And I could go on and on and on. We know the arbitrator has ruled, the court has upheld that the wages are owed, with interest, so I would just hope that coming up soon we will find a solution where these people get their back wages that they owe, we owe it to them, they deserve them, and please help me try to find a solution with that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to reiterate what Representative Bost, Representative Moffitt, and Representative Phelps have said. I want to make the point to everyone in the General Assembly, we all received our back pay. I think we need to take up the issue of back pay with the state workers. I think it's something that needs to be addressed and in a quick fashion. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Demmer: "Representative, could you tell me who suggested that the School of Labor and Education... and Employment Relations at the University of Illinois receive a carveout in this supplemental? That request come from the University of Illinois?"

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Arroyo: "There was two meetings of Economic Development and I believe they had a recommendation. I don't know who made the last decision."

Demmer: "So, that decision didn't even appear before the Higher Ed Appropriations Committee?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure about that."

Demmer: "The Economic Development Committee, on which I sit, we had a subject matter hearing on the Bill, there were no votes taken."

Arroyo: "Well, I don't sit on that committee, Sir, so I couldn't tell you."

Demmer: "Well, I do and so I'll tell you."

Arroyo: "Okay."

Demmer: "There was a subject hearing, no vote was taken, the statement was read. So, this was not requested by the University of Illinois?"

Arroyo: "No. Right."

Demmer: "There are 17 schools or colleges within the University of Illinois's system. Do others receive specific carveouts or is the School of Labor and Employment Relations the only school out of the 17 who receive that?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure."

Demmer: "Why was this school chosen as one of 17 schools who receive that?"

Arroyo: "The... the other chairs also sat in some of the meetings.

So, your chair to your committee sat in some of these negotiations."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Demmer: "Why did that go through the Economic Development
Committee instead of the Higher Education Appropriations
Committee?"

Arroyo: "I couldn't answer that either."

Demmer: "So, we have a lot of questions about where this came from, why it was assigned to a certain committee, the fact that no votes have been taken in the committee. There's not even a question... there's a question still about the status of where the University of Illinois falls on this. I'm not sure why a budget neutral appropriation was included in this supplemental request."

Arroyo: "We had a... we had a vote this morning in committee."

Demmer: "In which committee?"

Arroyo: "And we got it out of Appropriation-Public Safety this morning."

Demmer: "That's right, but..."

Arroyo: "And I believe it was unanimous."

Demmer: "Right. But this component of the supplemental... this component of the supplemental came through the Economic Development Committee. So, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The specific decision to include this appropriation in this supplemental request, it's a budget neutral move. It treats this one school differently from the other 17 major components of the University of Illinois. As Representative Sandack mentioned earlier, I think this sets a bad precedent for the General Assembly to make decisions for the university when they're simply following the administrative processes and powers they're already entitled to. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to echo the comments of previous speakers on both sides of the aisle regarding disappointment that appropriation is not included for the back wages that we have been ordered by a court to pay. I know many things have been said about any revenues that we have received above what we projected, should be used to pay unpaid bills and in fact, two General Assemblies ago I was the Sponsor of the Resolution that said just that, that passed unanimously out of this chamber. Last General Assembly we actually earmarked money for old bills. So, in my opinion, the money that we owe these men and women by court order is a back... is an old bill. It's a two-year-old bill that we need to pay and pay as soon as possible because it's an obligation to the state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I don't want to beat a dead horse here, but I'm also in support of paying these back wages. You know, a contract is a contract and as the way I understand it, the interest we're paying is seven percent. Well, I think anyone knows that we could borrow money cheaper than seven percent. So, I think that we should, as soon as possible, get this taken care of. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Hi, Representative. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, is it... obviously, the back pay is not included here, but do the departments have the ability or the option to fill that back pay if they so choose?"

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Arroyo: "Not anymore."

Dunkin: "So, right now, this is officially a set supplemental appropriation that deals with paying items within the various departments of DOC, in particular, but they... they don't... they can't even do any back pay filling at this moment. I thought... felt they've always had that flexibility at least under the legislation that we passed... the Aprop Bills that we passed earlier this spring and this would be no different."

Arroyo: "I... I'd think so."

Dunkin: "You think so or you don't think so?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure."

Dunkin: "Well, that's important."

Arroyo: "Kenny, I can't hear you. I can't hear you, Kenny. If you could repeat the question."

Dunkin: "Representative, the question is, do... does the Department of Corrections have the option or the ability to pay the back raises, if they so choose to, as an agency, with this legislation?"

Arroyo: "No, they cannot."

Dunkin: "And why is that? Can you show me where in the... where in the Bill text where they cannot do that 'cause I'm looking at it as well?"

Arroyo: "Those costs were in an earlier fiscal year."

Dunkin: "I'm sorry?"

Arroyo: "Those costs were incurred in an earlier fiscal year."

Dunkin: "Oh, that's right. So, it wasn't for '13-'14. We're talking back pay for '12 and '13."

Arroyo: "'12 and '13.

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Dunkin: "Ahh. So, even if we pass... even the legislation that we passed this past spring, they still did not have that flexibility back then?"

Arroyo: "No."

Dunkin: "So, obviously with this... So, how we going to do that?

How would we do that? Pay them their... pay them the money."

Arroyo: "We have to give them a new supplemental so they can do that."

Dunkin: "An additional supplemental and that cost would be?"

Arroyo: "A hundred and twelve million."

Dunkin: "One hundred and twelve million dollars."

Arroyo: "Yeah."

Dunkin: "Now, how do we get in this situation where we owe employees \$120 million?"

Arroyo: "That was raises, Cost of Living, and all kind of other stuff."

Dunkin: "Representative, it's hard to distinguish what you're saying here; it's hard to hear."

Dunkin: "Kenny, I can't get no closer to this microphone."

Dunkin: "Okay. You're not shy, Representative, so."

Arroyo: "Absolutely not."

Dunkin: "All right. So, how did we get into this situation where we owe employees who worked hard for their money not to receive their back pay?"

Arroyo: "I... I... couldn't answer that, how we get into that situation. The economy I guess."

Dunkin: "Repre... The economy? Representative, the economy negotiated with the unions, or was that the Senate or the House or the Governor?"

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Arroyo: "That was the previous administration and that was a union negotiation, I believe."

Dunkin: "What... which previous administration? Jim Ryan's? I mean, George Ryan, Rod Blagojevich or..."

Arroyo: "No comments."

Dunkin: "No comment? Representative, you're as... I'm saying... There are hundreds of employees that do not... that are saying they don't... we owe them back pay. Was it the Quinn administration?"

Arroyo: "I don't think so. I think that Quinn is still the Governor. That's still the same administration."

Dunkin: "Rep... Representative, who negotiated the deal with AFSCME whereas we owe \$120 million?"

Arroyo: "I couldn't tell you that, Kenny. I wasn't in Appropriation back then.

Dunkin: "And so..."

Arroyo: "I was in Mass Transit."

Dunkin: "You were in Mass Transit."

Arroyo: "Yeah. I was the chairman of Mass Transit. Right now, I'm the chairman of Appropriation that oversees Corrections and does a bunch of stuff. So, I can't tell you something about the previous administration and about the previous dollars. How did they incur 120 million, I don't know, Kenny."

Dunkin: "So, is there a way that we can go back and add that into the supplemental, Representative?"

Arroyo: "Not... not at this time."

Dunkin: "Before... before we vote on this?"

Arroyo: "Not not on this time, Kenny."

Dunkin: "Do you believe that employees should receive their back pay?"

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Arroyo: "I believe that they should get paid what they're owed, just like everybody else got paid their back pay, sure. I believe that. "

Dunkin: "All right. Well, let's give it to them."

Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen. Gentlemen. Gentlemen, hold on. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm wearing out the gavel. If you must talk, go to the back of the chamber so we can hear the Gentlemen who are speaking on the Bill, speak to each other. That includes everyone who just looked at me and laughed. Please go to the rear of the chamber, we have more Bills. Thank you. Please proceed."

Dunkin: "So, Representative, just for clarification sake, how much is in this supplemental here?"

Arroyo: "It's about \$50 million."

Dunkin: "Fifty million dollars. And none of this is for back pay, correct?"

Arroyo: "Absolutely."

Dunkin: "Is there a way that we can go back or take some of the additional millions of dollars that we have and pay something towards the back pay of these state employees?"

Arroyo: "When we come back, we could discuss that."

Dunkin: "When we come back... Representative, this is not... certainly in no way shape or form towards you. I'm trying to understand the level of debt and obligation that we have to the tune of \$120 million of public employees, who've taken us to court already and help me understand this, if it's true or not, interest is being charged on this back pay or no."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Dunkin: "Yes?"

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Arroyo: "We are not sure about that just yet, Kenny."

Dunkin: "So, are we constitutionally bound to honor and pay \$120 million in back pay?"

Arroyo: "I couldn't... I couldn't answer that. I can't commit to that right now."

Dunkin: "Representative, this is a very important question because that means we are starting in the red already and so, right now, this Bill simply closes the gap of we did not fill back in May, correct?"

Arroyo: "Right."

Dunkin: "Hello?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Dunkin: "So, this Bill simply closes the gap that we did not fill back in May, correct?"

Arroyo: "Some of it, yes."

Dunkin: "All right. And... Some of it. All right, Representative.
You... you win."

Arroyo: "I don't want to win.

Dunkin: "I'm just trying to..."

Arroyo: "I'm just trying to pass this Bill. I want to pass this, Kenny."

Dunkin: "I want to pass it with you, but I'm just trying to get some clarification. This is \$55 million. How much of this is going towards overtime compared to regular employees, Representative?"

Arroyo: "None."

Dunkin: "None of it?"

Arroyo: "No."

Dunkin: "Are you sure?"

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Arroyo: "I think so."

Dunkin: "Okay. Representative."

Arroyo: "Si."

Dunkin: "Quantos? Muchos? Okay, Representative. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, I want to get back to the appropriation line for School of Labor and Employment Relations at the University of Illinois. Are you familiar with that?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "How did that get in this supplemental request?"

Arroyo: "Recommendation from the Economic Development Committee."

Kay: "Well, that was never voted on though by the committee. So, was it... was it just the chairman that brought it over to you and handed it to you and said..."

Arroyo: "I believe we voted on it this morning. We got the recommendation and we voted on it this morning. If you could remember, I think you voted 'yes' for it."

Kay: "Well, now, wait a minute, wait a minute. That wasn't the Economic Development Committee this morning; that was the Appropriations Committee."

Arroyo: "Appropriation, absolutely right."

Kay: "Yeah, okay. My question really is, the Economic Development made a statement; they never took a vote. So, my question is, how did this get into this supplemental agreement?"

Arroyo: "I couldn't... I couldn't answer that."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- Kay: "Well, are you... are you familiar with the fact there's a little dispute between the University of Illinois and labor unions with respect to who's going to have control at Champaign with respect to curriculum in schools?"
- Arroyo: "Well, I don't think that there's a dispute. I believe it's still in negotiations."
- Kay: "Well, no, there... there is a dispute because the unions felt like they built the school and, therefore, they own the school and, therefore, the school should be funded. And I think some of us take exception to that... so... what I... I guess where I'm going here... And Mr. Speaker, I... I still can't hear. Forgive me, I still can't hear."
- Speaker Lang: "You're correct, Sir. So, just one second. Ladies and Gentleman. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we don't want committees to start at midnight, we should probably quiet down in the chamber. Ladies and Gentleman. Ladies and Gentlemen. Well, that's a lot better. Why don't we try to keep it this way? Mr. Kay."
- Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, one last question. Is it not true that what we have here is an additional appropriation that was never really voted on that came over to us this morning, we voted on it, not knowing that there's some legislation coming down the line that basically says that the school cannot separate and they cannot join the School of Business? Isn't that correct?"
- Arroyo: "This is not no additional money, Representative."
- Kay: "Well... but this keeps the school open as it is and does not allow the Labor and Employment Relations curriculum and

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

school to move over to the Business School. Is that not correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "I'm sorry."

Arroyo: "Correct. Correct."

Kay: "And so, you... take it one step further. What you've really done here is, you've said to all of us who have an interest in conceal carry that if we don't submit to this, I guess, shady appropriation, if you would, then we're not going to have conceal carry in southern Illinois or anywhere in the state. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "No, I wouldn't put it that way. Representative..."

Kay: "Well, can we separate this out then?"

Arroyo: "No. But I think that's what we have in front of us now, what we passed out of committee this morning. So I'm not willing to move away from Amendments... Floor Amendment 6."

Kay: "Yeah. I think a lot of us in committee, and I'm just going to speak for the Republicans who voted for it, really didn't understand what was down the pipe here with respect to this and I think you're going to find a lot of 'no' votes contrary to the fact that we were under an impression this morning that we're not under now. So, thank you for your answers."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. When we... when we went through the budget process back in May, did we pass one budget? Was it just one budget?

Arroyo: "I believe so."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- Davidsmeyer: "From... from my recollection, it was multiple different subject matters. We passed the education side, the human appropriations."
- Arroyo: "There were multiple Bills that made up the one budget."

 Davidsmeyer: "Correct. Yeah. So, why, when we come back with a supplemental, do we throw a bunch of random subjects into one Bill?"
- Arroyo: "It is very common that we would pass a budget in all one Bill."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I'm... my concern is that we are throwing a bunch of random things into one Bill and... and forcing one vote on many different things that have many different aspects or different impacts on the state. Would you be willing to separate certain parts of this out based on subject matter?"
- Arroyo: "No. Because we've been negotiating this... a lot of the five appropriation chairs have been talking about this and this is the Appropriation Bill we have in front of us. So, no. We've been talking with the Minority Spokesperson on your side and everybody has been included in negotiations. So, I think this is what we have in front of us now."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, the... you said the five people have discussed this and this is what it is."
- Arroyo: "And the Minority Spokesperson. I think there's more than five but..."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Well, this is... this is a tough thing. I think that each of these issues should be able to stand on their own merit. And when we're thrown into a situation where we have to vote on this and pass something that is not in the best interest of the state, I have a very... very big problem

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

with it. I'm not sure where I stand on this because there's a lot of issues that I support in this, but there's also areas that have no business being on this floor. So, we'll see how I vote. Right now I'm leaning 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of a Bill. This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes'; 17 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 4 of the Calendar appear... under the Order of Consideration Postponed, appears Senate Bill 45, Leader Currie"

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We discussed this at length last week. This is a measure that would provide exemptions from current liquor control restrictions for a variety of neighborhood institutions. All of these have support from their aldermen and from the effected churches and so forth. One of them is Northwestern University, which wants to have a white table cloth Italian restaurant in a building that is partially retail already. Another is the Museum of Science and Industry, which it turns out, was in a precinct voted dry in the 1960s. In order for that institution to retain its liquor license, we have to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 45. Happy to answer your questions, I need your 'yes' vote. 70..."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage... Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. This bill requires 71 votes. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, I... I know after the Senate Bill 10 votes, it's been very difficult to hear what's been... what's being debated. If you could just quickly tell us the three loca..., is it three locations that are asking for relief based off of this legislation?"

Currie: "Yeah. There are several. One of them is the Museum of Science and Industry. One of them is the Northwestern University Clinic Building at Memorial Healthcare. There also is a... a store, Reiko Fresh Foods in Chicago, supported by Roberto Maldenatto the alderman of the 26th Ward. There is one on East 75th Street in my area supported by Natashia Harris, also the alderman of the 7th Ward. There is one in Marcus Evans' area that has support from Michelle Harris, who is the ... who is the alderman of the 8th Ward."

Reboletti: "And there are letters of support from the community from the neighboring..."

Currie: "From... from the communities and from the aldermen. And for the Museum of Science and Industry, we have support from the 5th Ward alderman, and as I say, that was a particularly awkward issue, because apparently the... nobody noticed but the precinct was voted dry in 1964, and to make the discovery at this point, is to put all kinds of galas and other events at the Museum very much in jeopardy, unless with 71 votes, we pass this Bill today."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- Reboletti: "Well, it only took us 50 years to catch it, but I will be supporting your legislation, Leader. Thank you."
- Currie: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the passage of the Bill.

 This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 2 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 492. Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 492, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill"
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. On page 3 of the Calendar, and on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 578. Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 578, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous... previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Do we... It's pending. Do we have to adopt it right now since it's a Floor Amendment?"
- Speaker Lang: "Yes, this is the time to adopt your Amendment."
- Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I ask for its adoption."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Ladies' Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 578, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a little bit of cleanup language by the State Board of Education. It is a page and line Amendment to clarify what entities will be primary providers of professional development training for the teachers, administrative and other school personnel. All... all entities, associations, teachers groups, parents groups will be able to file an application with the State of Ill... with the Illinois State Board of Education. There's no limitations, but some individuals actually want us to put it in there. So, I'll take any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There's no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Switches are right in front of you, Members. Mr. Cross (sic-Clerk), please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1849, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

read the Bill. Excuse me, Senate Bill 1845. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1845, the Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1845, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment overview: the Amendment grants a such needed deadline extension to all Illinois Alternative Teacher Certification programs to allow the sponsoring institution the State Illinois... State Board of Education significant time to complete submission and review all new programs purposed on a regulation finalized last June. For example, without the extension, alternative teachers certification program at Benedictine University, Dominican University and National Lewis University, they stand to lose credibility with perspective students and... and up to 375 current expected admissions of candidates who would otherwise be teaching... would be teaching in teachers shortage areas, in the under sourced school in the 2014-2015 academic year. Federal grants related to those programs would be ... also be disrupted. The number of expected admissions including more than 200 Teach America participants, all Illinois Alternative Certification Programs will benefit from the extension granted by the Amendment. We know of no opposition, and ISBE is neutral. I'll take any questions."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hays, Mautino, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting "yes", 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1955."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1955, the Bill was read for second time on a previous day. Amendments 2 and 3 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Supplemental Calendar #1. House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 3656, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3656, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 66, Speaker Madigan. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 66, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming.

 Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 116, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 116, a Bill for an Act for concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1523, Speaker Madigan.

 Please read the Bill."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2196, Speaker Madigan."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2196, a Bill for an Act concerning State

Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #2

was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions

are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions." Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 634, offered by Representative DeLuca. House Resolution 635, offered by Representative Welch. House Resolution 636, offered by House Resolution 637, offered by Representative Welch. Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 638, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 639, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 640, offered by Representative Acevedo. House Resolution 641, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 642, offered by Representative Unes. House Resolution 643, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 645, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 646, offered by Representative Rosenthal. House Resolution 647, offered by Representative Evans. House Resolution 648, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 650, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 652, offered by Representative Sullivan. House Resolution 654, offered by Representative Wheeler. House Resolution 655, offered by Representative Sosnowski. House Resolution 656, offered by

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Representative Turner. House Resolution 657, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 658, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 659, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 660, offered by Representative Leitch. House Resolution 661, offered by Representative Sims. House Resolution 662, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 663, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 665, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 666, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 667, offered by Representative Demmer. And House Resolution 669, offered by Representative Pritchard."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie Moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Members. Members, there are a series of committees this afternoon and you won't know the times unless you listen to the Clerk. Ladies and Gentlemen, please pay attention to the Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting at 5:00.

Judiciary is meeting in C-1 at 5:00. Revenue & Finance in Room 118 at 5:00. Insurance in Room 114 at 5:00. Counties & Townships in Room 115 at 5:00. State Government Administration is meeting in 413 at 5:00. Agriculture & Conservation is meeting in D-1 at 5:00. Meeting at 5:30 is Public Utilities in 114, and Personnel & Pensions in Room 115."

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Speaker Lang: "Everybody hear their committee announcements? And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, November 6 at the hour of 11 a.m. Wednesday, November 6 at the hour of 11 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 1448; recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: recommends be adopted the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2618. Representative Eddie Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 496. Representative Jack Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 2365; recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 492 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1787; and recommends be adopted as amended House Resolution 500. Representative Brandon Phelps, the Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 635;

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

and recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: recommends be Motion to Recede in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1470. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on November 05, 2013: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 1007 and Senate Bill 1045; do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 1342 and Senate Bill 2352; and recommends be adopted as amended House Joint Resolution 55. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3733, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 3734, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3735, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3736, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill of an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3737, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3738, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3739, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3740, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3741, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3742, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3743, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. First Reading of these House Bills.

76th Legislative Day

11/5/2013

Second Reading of Senate Bills to be read and held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 496, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 635, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1007, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1045, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1448, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2352, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2365, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of Senate Bills to be read and held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 2335, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."