32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Gracious God our father, forgiver and keeper of our lives, it is in you that we live, we move, and we have our mere existence. We humbly come before you, oh God, asking for your blessings to be upon this august Assembly. May your blessing be upon the Speaker of this House, all of its Leaders, and all of its Members, and all of their families. God, we ask a special blessing to be upon Representative Bennett. We pray, today, for his continued health and for a speedy recovery. As well for the family of Representative Gordon, and the continued health and recovery of her daughter, Jianna. Now, God, as this House meets and deliberates to conduct their matters of business, I pray you would guide their hearts, guide their minds in the spirit of fairness, the spirit of right thought, the spirit of right speech, and the spirit of compromise and agreement. I pray, oh God, today, that you would impart your supreme spirit of wisdom upon all of their activities so that all of their affairs of business may reach a successful conclusion as it will bring glory unto you. So, we thank you, today, for being our source of guidance. We ask this, in your precious Son's name, Amen."

Speaker Burke: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Miller."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Miller 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 Burke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, I am pleased to report there are no excused absences on the Democrat side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect the Representatives Tom Bennett, Tom Demmer, Jeff Keicher, Joe Sosnowski and Grant Wehrli are excused today."
- Speaker Burke: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Being 113 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave being granted, Leader Harris on the Motion."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so the following Bills can be heard in Committee this week: House Bill 2292 in Judiciary Criminal; House Bill 2785 in Executive; House Bill 2624 in Executive; House Bill 2625 in Executive; House Bill 3501 in Executive; and House Bill 3046 in Executive."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Proceeding to page 6 of the Calendar, Order of Bills on Second Reading, we have House Bill 2275, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2275, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. The Chair intends to call Bills on Third Reading today. The Chair will first work through House Bills that were on the Calendar last week, and then the Chair will go back to the beginning of House Bills on Third Reading. Please pay attention. Page 12 of the Calendar... on page 12 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2071, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill. Representative, there's a Floor Amendment pending... please move the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of adopting the Amendment. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2071, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski is recognized to present the Floor Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1. It simply... it accommodates a technical concern of the fund and the county. I ask for its adoption."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized.

Representative... Representative Zalewski moves adoption of
Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those
opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments,
Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2071, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski is recognized."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2071 allows for a Cook County employees that were furloughed in the last couple years to purchase back their service time out of their own... pocket. I ask for passage of the Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I know we went round and round with this, so I just wanna give a little bit of time for my side to get seated and understand what we're doing here. This Bill allows people to buy a purchase credit for time that they did not work, correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Batinick: "And it does, it does allow for them..."

Zalewski: "Hold on, hold on. Repeat that... repeat that question."

Batinick: "It allows them to purchase... I'll be more specific. It allows them to purchase time that they lost because they were

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

furloughed when Cook County had the soda tax repeal issue, correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Batinick: "What was it? About ten percent? Something like that, of the time that they that they lost?"

Zalewski: "It was a day a month is what I'm told, Mark."

Batinick: "A day a month. Okay. And then they have to purchase back the… both the employer and the employee portion, with interest, up and to the date?"

Zalewski: "At the funds assumed rate, correct."

Batinick: "Correct. So, I'm gonna go... I'm gonna go straight to the Bill here. You know, on the surface, we look at Bills like this and we think 'eh it's no big deal'. But this issue is, when you do the actuarial calculation, there's gonna be 10 times the liability to the fund than there is new assets coming and when you total everything together. So, this is another pension enhancement. In and of itself, is it large? No, it's not large, but for decade after decade we have passed Bills like this that have put pressure both on our five state pension plans and downstate pension plans and plans around the state. There needs to be moratorium on anything that makes it worse... that makes it worse financially for the pension plan. So I urge my side to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Our staff indicates they don't agree with that... the previous speaker's statement. I know he... we had a really good...

I respect his opinion. We had a really good robust exchange about this. I don't agree with the premise that it does that

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

based on what we're hearing from the actuaries. I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2071 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, having received 75 voting 'in favor', 36 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared passed. Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just like to introduce a good friend of ours who has returned. He's my Page for a day, former Representative Chad Hays. If you need a drink or anything, feel free to push your Page button and I'm sure he'd be happy to help you out. Welcome back, my friend."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Welch, for what reason do you rise?"
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise because today I have very special guests here in the House with us. I'd like to recognize my beautiful wife, ShawnTe, my five year old, who's fallen asleep already, Marley. And then the other reason that I rise today, because I have two special birthday's today. I have my birthday twins here, little Tyler, is seven today, and my seatmate is 27 today. So I think that we should wish them both a very happy birthday. And Katie Stuart was gonna lead us in singing happy birthday to them."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Speaker Burke: "We're going to do that later. Moving back to Third Readings. We have House Bill 2160, Representative Conroy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2160, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Conroy is recognized to present House Bill 2160."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that passed both the House and the Senate unanimously last year and then was sadly vetoed by the Governor as he left office. This Bill creates a prior authorization... a uniformed prior authorization form for both private and public insurance. And what this does is it will eliminate a barrier to care for patients. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2160 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared passed. Representative Unes is... oh I'm... House Bill 2177 for Representative Unes. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2177, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Unes is recognized."
- Unes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2177 came from me from the Superintendent of District 66, Canton High School.

 And while talking with him last year over Veterans Day, and

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

the things that he does with his students in his district on Veterans Day we realized that he had several Vietnam Veterans that left high school early... because in that era you could leave high school and go fight for your country... three of which never came home. They were killed in the line of duty and never came back home. We wanted to be able to recognize and honor these soldiers that left high school and never made it back home. Of course today, this wouldn't be an issue because you can't leave high school early. So, this Bill, 2177, would allow for a high school to posthumously grant a high school diploma to those students back in the Vietnam era or before that went and fought for our freedom and fought for our country and never made it back home. And I know of no opponents and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2177 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2200, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2200, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative D'Amico is recognized."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

House Bill 2200 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's

Office. Basically requires the judge to give a reason why he

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- is going to rescind a statutory summary suspension. I'll answer any questions."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2200 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2252, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2252, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons is recognized."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House... this House Bill is a cleanup of the statute to make the language basically gender neutral when referring to clerks for Illinois. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2252 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 110 having voted 'in favor', 3 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bills, received the Constitutional Majority, and is hereby declared passed. Representative Bristow, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bristow: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. That was my seatmate's fault.

 I have some very special guests in the gallery. I have Dr....

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

they're on the Lincoln side, I have Dr. Val Harris and staff members and a group of her adult education students from Lewis and Clark Community College in Godfrey. And I'd like to give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hurley, for what reason do you rise?"

Hurley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Hurley: "I have two special guests from district down, which happens to be my birthday too, Eric and Lily Tait. Lily is ditching school today but she's enjoying it. She was sitting in the Speaker's Chair, in the Senate President's Chair, and we got to tour Secretary of State's Office. So give them a nice welcome from the House."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier, for what reason do you rise?"

Meier: "Two points of personal privilege please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Meier: "Today, I'd like to recognize the Illinois 4-H Legislative Connection. We welcome 31 4-H members from across Illinois, who are attending the University of Illinois 4-H Legislative Connection Event being held today at the Capitol. These youths represent 24 4-H programs from counties throughout the state representing nearly 200 thousand 4-H participants in all 102 counties. The teens are active in their clubs, communities, counties, and in community service and 4-H projects ranging from animal science to aerospace, shooting sports to visual arts, nutrition and wellness to environmental studies, and more. These youth represent the Illinois 4-H Youth Leadership

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Team, and are speaking for Illinois 4-H program. They've been active in their local 4-H clubs, communities, community service, and 4-H areas of animal sciences, camping, civic engagement, college and career readiness, environment, healthy living, leadership, and STEM. And also today, to my left, in the corner over here, I have student here from the Germantown Elementary School, that are going to testify in committee later. They are Jordyn Robke, Garrett Arentsen, Landon Holtmann, Owen Huelsmann, and their teacher Danny Glynn. So I'd like you to give all these future leaders of Illinois a big round of applause."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish, for what reason do you rise?"

Kalish: "Point of personal privilege, Madam Chair."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Kalish: "First, to all of my colleagues, I think we should wish Sara Feigenholtz a congratulations on being named National Council Legislator of the Year for Behavioral Health. At the same time I'd like to welcome my business partner, who's up there in the gallery to make sure I'm working when I say I am, Jack Feiler. Please give him a warm round of applause. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "We next have House Bill 2256, Representative Welter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2256, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Welter is recognized."

Welter: "Madam Speaker, 2256 amends the Emancipation of Minors Act. It deletes the language stating that no order of complete

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

or partial emancipation may be entered if there's any objection by the minor's parents or guardian. What this does is it provides instead, that an order of complete or partial emancipation may be entered if there's an objection by the minor's parents or guardian only if the court finds in a hearing that in the emancipation would be in the minor's best interest."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Cassidy. Seeing... Representative McDermed, do you wish to speak on this Bill? Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you. Was this a Bill that was brought to you by a constituent, Representative?"

Welter: "Yes, it was."

McDermed: "And were you as baffled as he was by the fact that the Bill didn't actually already provide this? That the State of Illinois law didn't actually already do this?"

Welter: "Yeah, because you would think it's kind of contradictory. You would think the purpose of emancipation, separating yourself from your parents. I was little befuddled to find that you need their consent in Illinois. This gives them a different avenue that if a court, again, finds them mature and fit, to be able to grant that request."

McDermed: "So, this will be reviewed by the court?"

Welter: "Yes."

McDermed: "This is a good law that we probably should have passed before you and I were here. Thank you, Representative."

Welter: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no... Representative Welter to close."

Welter: "I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2256 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2266, Representative Halpin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Halpin."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2266 is Halpin: initiative of the Comptroller's Office. It's administrative Bill. It does five things for primarily. First, it changes the requirement to allow the Comptroller's Office to keep their employee list based on county as opposed to specific individual addresses. Try to maintain some protect privacy of transparency, but employees. establishes a 60-day time line for involuntary withholding notification to the Comptroller's Office. It allows funds deposited into the Cemetery Consumer Protection Fund to be used to maintain cemeteries that are in receivership. Allows the Comptroller's Office to publish reports on the website and continues the move to digital transparency. And then lastly, clarifies the scope of agency quarterly reports to her office that are used to compile locally held funds report. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And ask for a 'yes' vote."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2266 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Over here on the Abraham Lincoln side of the Body over here, we have some great kids from Eastern Illinois University, the Student Action Team, that's lined up here by the windows. On behalf of the six graduates who are in this Body as well as Representative Miller, who represents the home of the Panthers, we'd like to welcome them to your Illinois House of Representatives and thanks for being here folks."
- Speaker Burke: "House Bill 2308, Representative Windhorst. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2308, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."
- Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill amends the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963 as it related to the conditions of the bail bond. It says that in the event the defendant is unable to post bond the court may impose a no contact prevision with the victim or other interested party that shall be enforced while the defendant remains in custody. Currently under law the court can impose a no contact order, but that only applies when the defendant posts bond. This would apply

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

while the defendant is in custody. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Miller, are you seeking to ask questions on this Bill? Representative Welter is recognized.

Welter: "Does the Representative yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Welter: "Representative Windhorst, is this your first Bill on Third Reading?"

Windhorst: "Yes, it is."

Welter: "So as my good friend Dave Severin would ask, are you nervous?"

Windhorst: "Slightly."

Welter: "All right. Very good."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, on a more serious matter, not having fun with you. This Bill is about posting bond and how to post bond. Are you sure there's not a conflict of interest for yourself?"

Welter: "I'm sure."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst to close."

Windhorst: "I'd ask for a 'yes' vote. This'll be a good Amendment to our Code of Criminal Procedure and I believe it would be good for victims. So, I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2308 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2309, Representative Windhorst. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2309, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill amends the No Contact Order Act, the Civil No Contact Order Act, and the Illinois Domestic Violence Act. And it provides that no petition or order for those violations will be public until the order is served upon the respondent. This is a measure designed to protect the safety of those seeking orders of protection so that way the respondent doesn't have prior knowledge of the order and avoid service. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Rita, do you have a question on this Bill? No. Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2309 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. This question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2334, Representative Sosnowski. Out of the record. Representative... House Bill

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

2399, Representative Keicher. Out of the record. House Bill 2433, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2433, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2433 would require that every hospital in Illinois have the proper instrument for taking pregnant women blood pressures. It has been found that oftentimes the blood pressure is the same type of blood pressure cup that is taken for regular patients. But pregnant women need a special type of cup for the blood pressure and it has to be calibrated properly. So, I want to make sure that that's done because if you have high blood pressure, chances are you could have a stroke and cause you... cause a person... a women to die. So I'll be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have in regards to 2433."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2433 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 2 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, if you're... if you would take your lights off if you're seeking personal privilege or recognition, we'll get back to you in a little bit. House Bill 2440, Representative Martwick. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2440, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick is recognized."

Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2440 is the annual Technical Corrections Bill by the State University Retirement System. It includes three technical corrections, which do not impact member benefits. It covers legacy, DoIT employees, changes the definition of basic compensation, and changes the definition of disabled child. I know of no opponents. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2440 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2455, Representative Martwick. Clerk, please... read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2455, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick is recognized."

Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2455 is similar to a Bill that passed out of the General Assembly last year on a vote of 111 to 0 in the House, 52 to 0 in the Senate. It is an Amendment to the Illinois Secure Choice Savings Program. And it makes a couple of changes to make the plan a little bit more flexible and

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

more effective. So there's six substantive changes. Changes the authority of the board to enter into agreements with other governmental entities, establishes deadlines for payments of payroll deductions to the fund, changes some investment options and creates some additional audit and reporting requirements. I know of no opposition and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, as you know I voted for this in committee, but I think we have some people on my side that are confused about exactly what the Secure Choice Savings Program is. It's a little... there's a lot of noise in the chamber, so I had people asking me about this Bill. Can you explain where we were and the changes that were made going forward? So, does that work for you?"

Martwick: "Yes, could you define where we were?"

Batinick: "What... give me a synopsis of the Secure Choice Savings Program and then a quick synopsis of the changes."

Martwick: "So, the Secure Choice Savings Program is the initiative that the Treasurer passed a couple of years ago that allow for private retirement savings for people in the public... excuse me... in the private sector who were... did not otherwise have access to it. So it creates a situation where employees can have money deducted from their check and that money deposited into an IRA for retirement savings."

Batinick: "Was this the Representative Currie Bill previously?"

Martwick: "It was Representative Currie's initiative. Yes."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Batinick: "Okay, and then the quick changes that you're making?" "The changes that I'm making change some of the Martwick: investment options. It... it is... it changes some deadlines for ... it requires the board to establish deadlines for payment of payroll deductions to the fund. It allows the board to have the authority to enter into agreements with other governmental entities including other states, in the event that one of these is private sector, someone moves, they have portability with their investment. It allows... it creates some audit and reporting requirements and gives the board the authority to determine whether to establish any of the additional investment options based on analysis of cost, risk level, feasibility, and profile, benefit ease implementation."

Batinick: "Thanks for the thorough explanation. No further questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2455 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2459, Representative Halpin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2459, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Halpin."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This House Bill extends a program that allows Illinois facilities to accept involuntarily admitted patients from the State of Iowa. It's been a successful program in the first two years and I'd ask for a 'yes' vote. I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2459 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2466, Representative Andrade. Out of the record. Sorry, sorry, sorry. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2466, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Andrade."

- Andrade: "Thank you, Madam Chairperson... Speaker. House Bill 2466 is an exact Bill that passed last year unanimously by both sides. House Bill 2466 is called the, basically the ring Bill. It's an exemption to the eavesdropping law with intercom systems that is on one's personal home. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2466... excuse me, Representative Ammons, do you wish to speak on the Bill? Please proceed."

Ammons: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Ammons: "Thank you. I just wanted to clarify what we are actually exempting in this piece of legislation."

Andrade: "This Bill exempts the eavesdropping consent requirement that it's... you require with two people consent in the State of Illinois. This is only for basically... are you familiar with the Ring system, the doorbell?"

Ammons: "Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes."

Andrade: "So, it's in there for intercom systems. You know... the intercom system Ring has a camera. They have a little light also, a flood light and it's an intercom system that's on the... on your home. It's just specifically for a residence, and it needs consent of the owner to be placed... on there."

Ammons: "And this just ensures that the residential home owner will not fall victim to the eavesdropping law?"

Andrade: "This... yes. Indirectly, yes, because right now it is a felony to record."

Ammons: "Correct."

Andrade: "And so this protects the… actually, right now there's probably close to 200 thousand homes in Illinois that has this system."

Ammons: "Okay."

Andrade: "That's just the ones that they know of that have signed up. So I would probably say, right now there's 400 thousand felons possibly felony that could because they recorded the sound."

Ammons: "Thank you so much for clarifying that."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Yingling is recognized."

Yingling: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Yingling: "Representative, can you just give me some clarification under what the current law says for recording on residential property? So, if you... let's say you have two people walking up to a front door and they're having a private conversation between them, and there is a recording device recording their conversation, what does the law currently say on that?"

Andrade: "It requires their consent currently."

Yingling: "It requires their consent?"

Andrade: "Right."

Yingling: "So, I... I guess I'm just..."

Andrade: "So, so here... so I would say that there is... I can never pronounce that word. What's the word? If someone records surreptitiously, surreptitiously. So the Ring Doorbell is basically the right of expectation... the right of the expectation of privacy on a persons' property or out in the open. There is no right of expectation or expectation of privacy."

Yingling: "Okay. So under... under this Bill, people moving forward... if it passes and gets signed into law, moving forward, people have to assume that anything they say to someone else on a piece of residential property is probably being recorded and that that information then can be released to the public?"

Andrade: "It's... that's the current situation now. That's what's basically... it's gonna have to happen, yeah. Because right now you probably have 400 thousand residents of Illinois that are, it's a grey area that they're committing a felony because they have this system installed on their home. Now they... the caveat is they are not recording surreptitiously because it's

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

on their home, the doorbell is becoming basically the notice to the person that hey, you... it's not secretly being recorded. It's just there. I think the number one case in the current law is surreptitiously. Basically, if I record surreptitiously, if I hide the doorbell, if you can't see it, and then you have no idea you're being recorded, but this is in your face recording."

- Yingling: "And I'm sorry, can you just clarify? So, it... once they have this recording of, let's say, two people talking at their front door, are they allowed to post that online? Are they allowed to broadcast it on Facebook?"
- Andrade: "It all depends if... if they are recording surreptitiously, no. If they are recording surreptitiously, no, they cannot."
- Yingling: "But if they have like a ring doorbell then they would be able to do it?"
- Andrade: "If it's in your face and it's not surreptitiously, I would say, yes. That's the grey area that I'm trying to clarify that these residents of Illinois should not be charged with a felony. And I don't want to wait for them to be charged with a felony. I guess... it's a grey area. Right now, that's the way the Bill is... the way the law is currently written. It's surreptitiously. And so I guess if you wanna file... if you go up there to the... if you go up to the persons porch and you get recorded while you're campaigning and they put it on the internet and you file a criminal charge against them, I guess the courts gonna have to decide that were you being recorded surreptitiously or is that camera... is that camera

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

enough notice to you that your level... your expectation of privacy should not... there is no level expectation of privacy."

Yingling: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I just in era where we are increasingly giving away our privacy rights and we can constantly be recorded at any moment, I would just encourage the Body to think carefully about what precedence we're beginning to set here by willingly giving away our privacy rights in this Bill to a large corporation that is recording us. So, do as you please. Unfortunately, Representative, I think I will be a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative... Representative Thapedi is recognized."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Representative Andrade, just some clarification. You talked about the courts being involved in the matter, but isn't first the prerequisite of the police to decide whether or not they're gonna move forward and make the recommendation for the State's Attorney's as to whether or not they're gonna prosecute the case? The only reason why I ask that is that..."

Andrade: "That is correct. Yes, I misspoke."

Thapedi: "So what can we do to make sure that the police officers, when they're looking at these situations, that they actually move forward and make the recommendation for the various county prosecutors to move forward and make the determination, if the felony review unit wants to move forward

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

so be it. So what can we do, if anything, to make sure that that's resolved?"

Andrade: "I believe the Bill is the way to do it. To clear up any distinguishing... I mean that's why I believe the Bill is necessary, is to clear that up is because this is on people's private residence. So the level... the expectation of privacy is not there. And they're not recording..."

Thapedi: "It's not there or it's... it's not there or it's higher?

Wouldn't you have a high expectation of privacy in your own home?"

Andrade: "So, the Bill requires the owner or the lesser to consent. They have to install it. I cannot, a third party cannot install the system without your consent. So, you're the owner of the property. You're... you are consenting and you are installing the ring on your property, on your property. So it's... you have the owner's consenting because he has... he wants to be able to record. The biggest difference now is the audio. That is the difference now of this law. Basically, you can record a video right now with zero problem, but the difference now is the capability of the system to record the voice and store it in a, basically in a cloud system."

Thapedi: "And that's because we're a two party consent state, right?"

Andrade: "Correct. We're in a two party consent state."

Thapedi: "All right. Thank you for the clarification."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, are you finished with your questioning? I'm sorry. Representative Carroll is recognized."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Carroll: "Thank you, Madam Chairperson. The Sponsor yield?" Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Carroll: "All right. I have some questions to the sponsor. So, let me understand, I'm trying to understand the Bill, I'm not trying to be difficult."

Andrade: "No, no, no, that's fine."

Carroll: "Okay. So someone comes on... I have a Ring Doorbell, someone comes to my house, they have a conversation on my porch, they threaten me, okay? They haven't given me consent. So, this is allowing me then the opportunity to post this video online. Is that correct?"

Andrade: "Yes."

Carroll: "Okay. So in other words, right when you see that Ring Doorbell you come to my doorstep, you're automatically giving me consent to record whatever goes on?"

Andrade: "Well, this Bill, you don't need their consent."

Carroll: "Okay."

Andrade: "And there is a possibility, that even without this Bill, but... there's a grey area that you are not recording surreptitiously. So, even if you without this Bill... I think you still have a right to record and hear. And everyone just saw Capitol Fax posted a Ring video and a whole conversation this last election. So is Rich Miller... right now is Rich Miller a felon because he posted the video on Capitol Fax?"

Carroll: "Well, I have a Ring Doorbell. So people will post on there all the time when there's somebody selling something door to door, there's suspicious activity in the neighborhood..."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Andrade: "Yeah."

Carroll: "...and the consents not given so..."

Andrade: "Right, right."

Carroll: "This Bill..."

Andrade: "This... this Bill is for public safety. This is a public safety Bill to protect you and your home."

Carroll: "Okay. So... but I'm saying though, on the app I'm able to send video clips out that I'm feeling are..."

Andrade: "Immediately."

Carroll: "Right. So this then will just waive liability on that.

Is that correct?"

Andrade: "Yes."

Carroll: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor."

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

Butler: "Thank you. First of all Representative, can you spell surreptitiously for me?"

Andrade: "I can barely pronounce it, let alone spell it."

Butler: "Okay. So, I just... I think I'm with you here, but you're trying to protect the homeowner, right?"

Andrade: "Correct."

Butler: "Okay. So... but I'm looking at the legislation here and I'm a little concerned because it says 'with the consent of the owner or the lessee of the dwelling in which it is installed'. So you can be a renter and the owner can install it and record this without the consent of the person renting. Is that correct?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Andrade: "Yes, maybe the word 'or' should be taken out and... I'll change it to say 'and' in the Senate."

Butler: "Okay. So, that's one issue I think with this that really concerns me."

Andrade: "Okay."

Butler: "That and owner can install this without..."

Andrade: "No, you're right. You're right..."

Butler: "...the consent of otherwise. The other question I have..."

Andrade: "It should be 'and'.

Butler: "The other question I have is, is the use of a doorbell or intercommunication device that has audio or video capabilities. That seems pretty broad to me."

Andrade: "It's an intercom system."

Butler: "It seems like it could be anything in the home."

Andrade: "Right, they have an intercom. It's in your home. So... but I... it's the consent of..."

Butler: "So it says the use of a doorbell or intercommunication devise?"

Andrade: "...intercom system."

Butler: "So that goes... that could be something completely separate than Ring? So could I ask you to pull this from the record..."

Andrade: "Yeah, so people also have these devices..."

Butler: "Could I ask you to pull this from the record and maybe work on it to address some of these concerns? Because, I mean, I think the consent of a renter on something like this is probably a pretty big deal, at least, I don't know about anybody else, but at least it is for me."

Andrade: "I have no problem with that. I'm always willing to work with everyone, you know. I mean, I think the Bill passed 114

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

to 0 last time, maybe no one was paying attention last time. I don't know. But I guess now the new class is actually listening. So I have... no problem. We'll change it to the word 'and' and I'll sit down with you and we'll talk."

Butler: "And a better definition of what you're trying to get here I think."

Andrade: "So... the definition is... well here if I'm pulling the record, I don't want to waste people's time. So, we... can keep Bills moving."

Butler: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Weber is recognized."

Weber: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Weber: "Thank you. I've... I guess one of my concerns is, and maybe
I haven't heard it addressed yet..."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me. Representative, I don't mean to interrupt, but the Sponsor indicates he's going to pull this from the record. House Bill 2473, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis. Out of the record. House Bill 2487, Representative Mussman. Please read the record."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2487, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mussman. Please proceed."

Mussman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I'm here on House Bill 2487. So, last year we created the task force on Human Services Contracting Act, but in the original

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

drafting of the Bill there was an uneven quantity between the appointments from the House and Senate Minority Leaders and the House and the Senate Majority Leaders. So this... I had promised to bring a trailer Bill, which is what this is. So it simply makes sure that both parties are supplying seven members to the task force. And since the task force hasn't started yet, it extends their preliminary reporting dates, their final reporting dates and the dissolving date of the task force. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2487 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2489, Representative Walsh. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2489, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2489 amends the Mobile Home Local Services Tax Act by requiring a Secretary of State to provide county collector in each county a quarterly report of transfer of title for mobile homes. Currently they charge a hundred dollars to the county treasurer for that report. What this Bill would say, they'd have to give the report at no cost. There are no opponents and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2489 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2492, Representative Walsh. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2492, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you again, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2492 is an initiative of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers and it would create two specialty decals on a license plate. One for the IAMAW where the dollars that are raised through that would go to Guide Dogs of America Fund. And secondly, the other one would be for Machinist Local Lodge 701 May Auto Mechanics and their decal monies would go for the Mechanics Training Fund. I know of no opposition and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2492 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

passed. House Bill 2499, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2499, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Well thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2499 reconciles two sections of the Park District Code to clarify when a park board spot may be declared a vacancy. It's just a parity of language from one paragraph to the other. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Burke: "On this question... or the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2499 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', O voting 'against', and O voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2502, Representative Willis. Out of the record. House Bill 2505, Representative West. Out of the record. House Bill 25... House Bill 2557, Representative Andrade. Representative Andrade. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2557, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2527 creates the Artificial Intelligence Video Interview Act that regulates the use of artificial intelligence analysis on recorded interviews, including notification and consent procedure.

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Basically, this Bill will require that if an employer is taking an interview or that... right now there's companies that are analyzing your face and your motions in order to see if you qualify for the job. What's happening is, they'll send you an email and they'll say 'please answer these three questions and send it back to us'. And what the applicant does not know, is that his motion is being... is being basically decided if he's a loser, a CEO, or a winner, or if he's getting hired. All this Bill does is requires that the employer must notify. And for just legislative intent, I wanna make sure that this is... that they don't have to be given physical notice. I don't want to create paperwork there. Just that the employer must notify the applicant that his face and... his video will be analyzed by a third party."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, apparently even if your Bill's pass 25 to nothing in committee, I need to make sure..."

Andrade: "Absolutely."

Batinick: "...that we're all good here."

Andrade: "I always... it is always good practice to get questions."

Batinick: "This is... this is tied just to the hiring process, nothing else?"

Andrade: "Right. It just says that... yes, recorded video interviews. Yes, it's only for when they're applying for the position."

Batinick: "Okay. What was the genesis of this Bill? Where did it come from?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Andrade: "So, as you know, I'm a graduate student at DePaul and it's my professor who was talking about it in my data analytics class."
- Batinick: "Okay. So this was suggested by your professor? But you know if this is actually occurring in the marketplace often now?"
- Andrade: "So, I'm not gonna name the company, but there's a hotel association and there's articles all about this. There's a hotel that received 48 thousand applications, 28 thousand applications were automatically dismissed. They didn't even get a chance to interview. They... 28... just based on those three minute video, they were not considered for their job. Basically, they said they do not qualify based on the video."
- Batinick: "So, but it wasn't the answers to the video? It was to the AI technology?"
 - Andrade: "It's the... no, it has nothing to do with the answers. They use 500 thousand data points based on your actions, based on if you're move just like that, if I went 'you're', 'you're' twice. I mean it basically... they... what I read and I research I did was, they'll take their model employee for that certain position and they'll record them and they'll build data points off of that person. And so with this Bill... So it's actually the future. They actually... I mean that's every video process established. So this is a current practice. All this does is require that the employer must notify and it also..."
- Batinick: "Okay. So they can... they can still do this practice if they see it as a way weeding candidates it just requires notification. It doesn't have to be written, it can just be verbal?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Andrade: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for clarifying."

Andrade: "And the video has to be destroyed eventually."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for your clarification."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Jaime, I'm gonna try to make this more succinct here for everybody. This is really just a notification mandate."

Andrade: "Yeah, that's it."

Wheeler: "All it does is say that you gotta notify somebody that their facial could be used in analysis situation, that's it?"

Andrade: "Right."

Wheeler: "And it destroys the video later. But this video notification process, if I remember from committee, you mentioned it could be written, it could be verbal, and it could be electronically submitted. Is that still right?"

Andrade: "Yes. Yes, absolutely."

Wheeler: "So this is a very simple Bill that just does those very simple things?"

Andrade: "Right. Transparency."

Wheeler: "Exactly. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Flowers: "Representative, I'm sorry. I was not in your committee..."

Andrade: "That's fine."

Flowers: "...so, therefore, I didn't listen to the debate. So tell me again about this artificial intelligence."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Andrade: "So, currently there are companies that will analyze your gestures, your facial expressions, and they will use that as a filter for hiring."

Flowers: "So, how many... how do we know the different types of people that this artificial intelligence have captured in order to make it fair because you said that they use their modeled employee? So... and so and so, we do know who the model employees are. And so if you take my facial expression and put them up against...

Andrade: "And I would say CEO right off the bat."

Flowers: "Right, right."

Andrade: "CEO."

Flowers: "But you know what I'm talking about."

Andrade: "I do, I do."

Flowers: "It is discriminatory. And so if you don't have African Americans, Hispanics in that group of so called artificial intelligence that's making these decisions on my expression or my body movement or whatever, then you know who will not get the job and who will get the job."

Andrade: "Leader, I agree with you and I think... I agree with you.

This... I just wanna clarify, this practice is going on right
now, but this Bill... what this Bill does it tells you, because
right now they do it without even notifying you."

Flowers: "But, Sir, they would never, never notify me because I would not fit their artificial intelligence. I'm not the model that they used. And so, therefore, I would never be notified and it is artificially discriminating and I can't file a suit against them because it was the artificial intelligence that did it and not their own biases that did it. And so... and so,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

how am I supposed to get over, through, or around this artificial intelligence to have my model into the loop?"

Andrade: "So I... Madam Leader, this Bill does not legalize it, this Bill does not... it's being done. I understand your concern and I think that is a good Bill that you're going to have next Session."

Flowers: "Well, I think what you should do this Session, is maybe you should legalize the artificial intelligence and put some guidelines into it because right now, you would be... you would be hurting a lot of people. This company is using this artificial intelligence to hire a certain group of people and to disqualify another group. And I would never want to be privy to that type of shenanigans under the pretense of artificial intelligence."

Andrade: "Ma'am, and I agree. That's why I had another Bill in Labor that prohibits, prohibits the use of data analytics, prohibits the metadata to have an algorithm that can indirectly determine someone's race or where they live. That that... they should not depend on credit worthiness and (unintelligible). So I was trying to work it in another Bill, but it was held. It was held for the bigger ethics package. So, my goal was that, that Bill will indirectly affect this Bill and it will prohibit any, any use of metadata that will determine someone's hiring and credit worthiness based on where they eat, based on where they live, based on... you know, it's illegal right now, but sometimes... let's say if someone goes to a certain store and shops there every other day, you might determine that person lives in this neighborhood and they... so I have a Bill, but it was held, and I was hoping

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

that that Bill indirectly would would affect this Bill and they would not be able to do based on race."

Flowers: "Well..."

Andrade: "I'm just wanting to take baby steps. That Bill is... I think it actually should be looked at. But this just..."

Flowers: "But to me, this is not a baby step. This is a giant step forward because by taking this step forward, this giant step forward, we're now telling the artificial intelligent group of people they don't have to worry about trying to incorporate or integrate other nationalities. You're giving them a plan. You're giving them a way out. All they..."

Andrade: "No, Madam Leader."

Flowers: "...all they will have to say is, 'we're complying with current law and the law is make a telephone call. That's it."

Andrade: "No, Ma'am. Madam Leader, they are doing it now. This brings attention to... this is going on. There's no... nothing in this Bill allows them to use racial discrimination or anything, but that's why I had another Bill to tie it in that you can't use metadata to determine someone's race or anything."

Flowers: "I respect what it is that you're trying to do and I thank you for answering the questions, but I don't want to make any contributions to any racist artificial intelligence.

None whatsoever."

Andrade: "But... I... well, I respectfully disagree that this Bill gives any right to do that. It's just the opposite."

Flowers: "Well, because you said it..."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Representative Flowers, there are several other speakers. If you could please bring your questions to a close."
- Flowers: "Representative, I was only going by your remarks, and you know who the model employees are, realistically speaking."
- Andrade: "And that's why I have another Bill that indirectly will prohibit using metadata for that."
- Flowers: "But thank you. I'm not gonna belabor the point. I appreciate your time. Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, just to clarify, currently there are companies...

 there's at least one company out there that's currently doing
 this?"
- Andrade: "There... I would say there's hundreds and hundreds and hundreds."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So what your Bill does, is it requires now, instead of just being able to do it without letting anybody know, it requires them to let the individual know who's being interviewed?"
- Andrade: "Right. And he needs to give consent."
- Davidsmeyer: "And they have to give consent."
- Andrade: "Right. They have to give consent in order for the Bill.

 That's the only thing the Bill does. And destroys the video after..."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, so this is a good, you know, personal protection Bill, right?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Andrade: "Right. This is a personal protection Bill. That's right."

Davidsmeyer: "So, could I do the interview through a Ring doorbell?"

Andrade: "Possibly, yes. They do interviews through Skype doorbell right now."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I think this is a good Bill. Thank you."

Andrade: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Williams."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Williams: "Just a quick question, Representative. Does this Bill include any provisions restricting the use of those 500 thousand data points that are collected?"

Andrade: "All this Bill does is give notice to a practice that's being used right now."

Williams: "Great. So you're saying all this Bill does is provide notice that data's being collected. I just will note for my friends on the Republican side..."

Andrade: "And destroyed."

Williams: "...Okay. Note on the other side of the aisle, I'm very intrigued by the fact that you are concerned about a simple notification of collection of private personal data. If you're concerned about that, I have a great Bill on geolocation you might be interested in. My point would be on all of these Bills that deal with the collection of data or the usage of technology, I think... to the Bill. I think we need to go a little bit further with our inquiry on all of these Bills and take a look beyond just what we're addressing

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

in terms of permitting technology. Every time we acknowledge technology, utilize a new technology, or provide restrictions or limitations on the use of technology, I'd recommend we take it a step further and ask the question, 'are there prohibitions or restrictions on what data is collected? How it's utilized, if it's sold, if it's shared, if it's aggregated for any other purposes, because that's a lot of times, what this is really about. Maybe on the surface a large company is utilizing artificial intelligence and the multi-prong data points for screening purposes. But hey, if they can make a lot of money selling that information to someone else why wouldn't they? I think that's at the bottom of a lot... at the foundation of a lot of the issues. And I would just encourage all of you to take a look a little deeper when we're talking about advancing technology and ask yourself the question, what is this data being used for? How is it being used? And are people even aware that it is being utilized and collected? Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, Shall House... Representative Andrade to close please."

Andrade: "I just wanted to clarify something. The Bill... there is a Section 10 that... it's called about sharing video's limited, that they can't share it. So I do add that in there. An employer may not share applicant videos except with persons whose expertise is necessary to in order to evaluate the applicants, so actually it limits sharing also. So I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2557 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'in favor', 3 voting 'against', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Harris for a point of personal privilege."

- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just like to acknowledge the presence of the Attorney General of Illinois, Kwame Raoul on the floor, and welcome him to the House of Representatives."
- Speaker Burke: "House Bill 2582, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. House Bill 2613, Representative Grant. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2613, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Grant. Please proceed."
- Grant: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Bill 2613, it's basically a language technical fix allowing speech language therapy to be added to professional medical group. For some reason it was overlooked and that piece of medicine was not allowed to be in the group language. So it's just a technical fix."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm gonna go straight to Bill. This is a great cleanup Bill. This is also the Representative from Wheaton's first Bill and I'd like... I think the Body to should take notice that we really appreciate the animation that she brings versus her predecessor. This is fantastic. Such a distinct difference in energy level coming out of Wheaton these days. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2613 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yay', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 26 of the Calendar under the Order of Resolutions we have House Resolution 165, offered by Leader Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 165, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we declare African Methodist Episcopal Day at the Capitol on March 27, 2019 and wish the AME continued success in its mission to minister to the social, spiritual, and physical development of all people."

Speaker Burke: "Leader Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Before us, today, in the gallery, we have a group of distinguished individuals from across the state. On behalf of them, I bring to you House Resolution 165. Whereas, the Members of the Illinois House of Representatives would like to declare African Methodist Episcopal Day on March 27, 2019 and welcome the AME church leaders of the congregants from the Fourth Episcopal District to the Capitol. The African Methodist Episcopal Church was born through adversity and grew out of the Free African Society, which was established in Philadelphia by Richard

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Allen and others in 1787. Due to racial discrimination, at St. George's MEC, members made plans to transform their mutual aid society into an African congregation, Bethel AME, was dedicated in 1974 with Richard Allen as its pastor. geographical spread of the AMEC prior to the Civil War, was mainly restricted to the Northeast and Midwest. denomination reached the Pacific Coast in the early 1850s, the most significant area of development during the Civil War. Because of its rapid spread below the Mason Dixon Line, AME membership reached 400 thousand. Today, the African Methodist Episcopal Church has memberships in 20 Episcopal districts, in 44 countries of 5 continents, and over 17 thousand members over the age of 18 right here in the State of Illinois. Let me say that again, Ladies and Gentlemen, over 17 thousand members over the age of 18 in the State of Illinois. The work of the church is administered by 21 active bishops, 9 general officers who manage the departments of the church, Reverend John Franklin White is the 130th elected and consecrated bishop and is the presiding bishop of the Fourth Episcopal District. Be it resolved, that we declare African American African Methodist Episcopal Day at the Capitol on March 7, 2019 and wish the AME continued success in its mission to administer to the social, spiritual, and physical development of all people. Could we please give them a warm General Assembly welcome on AME Day here at the Capitol? I would be... I would be remised if I also did not recognize my father, who is the first man to my step-mother, the elder presiding bishop Elaine Gordon."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Leader Gordon-Booth moves for the adoption of House Resolution 165. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Going back to page 15 of the Calendar House Bill 2617, Representative Martwick. Out of the record. House Bill 2628, Representative Andrade. No need to run, we're here all day. Clerk, please call them please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2628, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Burke: "Representative Andrade."
- Andrade: "Madam Speaker, House Bill 2628 is an initiative of the Chicago Teachers Pension Fund. It is a technical corrections Bill that updates language as surrounding the start date of benefits and refunds. House Bill 2628 codifies current practice and does not make any changes to members' benefits. Is there any questions? If not, I will respectfully request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2628 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'... vote 'nay'.
 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 1 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2639, Representative Andrade. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2639, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Andrade: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2639 is simply a Bill that passed last Session, but the Governor just forgot to sign it. He didn't have enough time. That's all it was. We're just extending. So, we're gonna try giving it a second shot to the guy upstairs or downstairs now. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative, could you offer a brief explanation of the Bill?"
- Andrade: "House Bill 2639 reenacts a public building commission in Chicago's authority to do design build procurement and extends that authority until June 30, 2023."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2639 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to House Bill 2659, Representative Hammond. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2659, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2659 simply is a technical change that removes duplicative provision in an HFS rulemaking on some Bills that we ran last Session. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2659 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2662, Representative Martwick. Out of the record. House Bill 2669, Representative Unes. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2669, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2669 updates Illinois law in regards to fertilizer spreaders and it also removes a burdensome registration fee. I know of no opponents and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2669 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2699, Representative Walker. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2699, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "House Bill 2699 is a simple Bill initiated by the Community Bankers Association. It is both pro-consumer and

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

pro-business. It makes it easier and sometimes more quick, or quicker for a borrower to receive notification that their mortgage has been paid off. I would yield."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I understand this isn't your first Bill, is this your first Bill this century?"

Walker: "Century? It may well be."

Batinick: "All right. Millennium too then. I urge an 'aye' vote.

Good Bill."

Speaker Burke: "The question... Representative Walker to close."

Walker: "This is both pro-business and pro-consumer. Everyone should vote 'aye'. Please vote 'aye'.

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2699 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2719, Representative Ammons. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2719, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2719 changes the composition of the board for the Diversifying Higher Education Faculty in Illinois Act to reduce it from 21 members

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

to 11 so that they can easily make quorum to take care of the business of diversifying higher education. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2719 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2720, Representative Stuart. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2720, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. 2720 was just an initiative of the Board of Higher Ed. It just seeks to kind of match the timing for fiscal reporting. It doesn't change any of the requirements, it just extends it 30 days to make a better match."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2720 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2722, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Out of the record. House Bill 2729, Representative Didech. Please read... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2729, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you. This Bill provides that a member of the Lake County Board shall not receive a salary or other compensation from Lake County if they are receiving benefits from IMRF. It has recently come to light that members of the Lake County Board are exploiting a loophole that allows them to artificially increase their salaries. This Bill will close that loophole, which should've never existed. I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, this is your first Bill, correct?"

Didech: "Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "I don't have any fun for you because I actually wanna get into the meat of the Bill a little bit. Why'd you only do Lake County?"

Didech: "That's where this abuse is happening. I think we need to make sure it stops."

Batinick: "Okay. I do believe it's been happening in other counties though as well. Are you aware of that or not? Did you look into that?"

Didech: "I'm not aware of it, but if it is I'm happy to introduce additional Bills to address that abuse."

Batinick: "Any chance of amending this one to add Will County to this one? Let me ask you this, do you have a Senate Sponsor?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Didech: "I believe so. I've talked to a number of Senators about this Bill."
- Batinick: "Okay. Would you indulge me in making this statewide and when it moves over to the Senate, maybe amending it in the Senate and bringing it?"
- Didech: "I'm certainly open to that. I want to make sure that we're cutting down on this abuse as much as possible. If this is happening in other places I'm happy to put this reform in place other places."
- Batinick: "Okay. To the Bill. As everybody has heard, this is the Representatives first Bill. If you wanna have some fun, somebody else is going to light up their light because this is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. I certainly urge an 'aye' vote and I certainly urge more lights. Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Reick."
- Reick: "Is it working? There we go. Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."
- Reick: "Representative, can you explain to me what kind of abuse we're dealing with here?"
- Didech: "Absolutely, yes. There are currently members on the Lake County Board who are earning a salary from Lake County. They are also pulling out of their IMRF pension that they earned from their previous service on the Lake County Board. So they are holding the same position that they held when they paid into the pension, they're earning a salary from that position, and they're pulling money out of their pension."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Reick: "Are they accruing current service time in their new... as county board members while they're dealing with an IMRF withdraw?"
- Didech: "No, they are no longer accruing additional service time.

 They're just pulling out of their previous service time of the same position they currently hold."
- Reick: "Then I fail to see the abuse. Can you please explain to me why a pension that someone has earned... they're not... they shouldn't be allowed to draw that pension even though they're in the same role and not further getting pension credits?"
- Didech: "My understanding is that pensions are supposed to fund retirement. If you are holding the same exact position where you earned that pension, I don't understand how you're retired and should be pulling a pension."
- Reick: "But you're not adding to the cost of the pension system, nor are you abusing your rights under that pension while still serving in the function as a member of the Lake County Board. Again, you're... you're giving people... you're telling people who have served, gotten their pension credits, are collecting that pension, and decide, maybe subsequently, to run again for Lake County Board, that they can't do it. There any number... I know what your answer's going to be. But the fact is, is there are any number of people on this floor who are drawing a pension from prior government service."
- Didech: "But not from this government service. Big difference."
- Reick: "No, I don't see there being a difference. These pensions have been earned. These people are entitled to draw them, they're not accruing further pension credits in their current

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

role under the Lake County Board and I fail to see any kind of conflict."

Didech: "I disagree. And I think it does add to the cost of the system."

Reick: "To the Bill. This doesn't add to the cost of system at all because these people are no longer accruing benefits nor are they paying in to the pension system. They're eligible for the... to be drawing that pension and I fail to see any kind of conflict here. Therefore, I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill, first Bill notwithstanding. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Where are you?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

McDermed: "Okay. Thank you. Now isn't the situation that exists right now, where county board members can both draw a pension and serve and draw a salary a result of action that we here in the General Assembly took in the last Session?"

Didech: "I believe this is a result of action that was taken. I don't think it was last Session, I think it was a few Sessions ago. I think it was a mistake and I think we should close that loophole."

McDermed: "Well, are we allowed to tell IMRF that they can post date their pension plan? Such... because my understanding of what happens is when we changed the law for county board members and said that you can't be in the pension system unless you work more than 'x' hours okay. That pensionable job description ceased to exist. Once it ceases to exist, if they are pension eligible, they may draw their pension. So,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

can we go back and tell IMRF, oh you can't let these people draw their pension anymore because we made a mistake or we... I mean I just don't think we can do that. Yes, this an outcome of what we did. Yes, this resolves a problem going forward where part-time employees were collecting very generous pensions, but to penalize people for doing what IMRF told them to do, which is, you can draw your pension now and because you're in a new job now, because you're in a job that is not pensionable anymore, it's a new slot, you can continue to draw the salary and draw a pension. Why is that on the county board members?"

Didech: "Well it's not their job..."

McDermed: "I think it's just a function of what we did. And yes, it's an abuse, but I think to stigmatize these people and demonize them like they're some kind of evil, greedy souls is inappropriate when we put them in this position ourselves. I... I'm not a fan of triple dipping, but we eliminated the possibility of doing this in the future so, let's just move on and not demonize people that are still there. That's what I say. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Carroll: "Thank you very much. I have some questions for you. How well do you know Lake County?"

Didech: "I've lived in Lake County for my entire life."

Carroll: "Okay. And in your time in Lake County, especially in the last couple years, have we been dealing with issues of potential corruption on the Lake County Board?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Didech: "This issue that we're debating today is the tip of the iceberg. We've been dealing, in Lake County, with a county chairman, county administrators, senior staff, members of the county board who failed to exercise oversight, who are putting millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money in their own pocket. This is Bill is one Bill in a series of reforms that we need to put in place to stop the pilfering of taxpayers of Lake County."

Carroll: "Thank you very much.

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Mayfield: "Representative, I represent Lake County. I represent a few of the individuals who you are speaking of and I would like to say that they are not committing fraud. I have issues with this Bill. I know my Senator, our Senator is carrying it in the Senate as well and it is punitive because he has an issue with one specific board member who he does not ... yes, I know what I'm talking about here, I know the history... does not want to receive the pension. The issue is, the individuals earned their pensions. One of the individuals here is a African-American female, 71-year-old, senior citizen, who uses that money to pay her taxes, because you know taxes in Lake County are off the chain. They are entirely too high. So, what you want to do is, you want to take money out of her pocket, food out of her mouth, force her to lose her home because you're taking away a right that she's already earned. Are you aware of that?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Didech: "My position is that elected officials, especially from the one position that they're currently holding, should earn one salary at a time. She can have one or the other, the salary or the pension. If you're still working in the position where you're earning a salary, how does it make any sense to pull out your pension which is for your retirement?"
- Mayfield: "Because the pension plan allowed for them at the age of 65 to start taking their pension. So what you are saying is that the pension plan made a mistake. You wanna take money that they've already earned. No one in your district sent you down here to diminish anyone's pension plan. That is not what we wanna do. We don't wanna start taking away people's pension. It's not costing the state or the county one additional dollar. This is money that they've already earned. So, how can you justify taking someone's pension from them that they've already earned? She's 71 years old."
- Didech: "Well, there's a misconception that this isn't gonna cost taxpayers more money if you begin pulling money out of your pension sooner than you're getting paid sooner and it goes on for the rest of your life. So this absolutely is costing taxpayers more money."
- Mayfield: "But that's an option that was available to her under that pension plan."
- Didech: "And we need to stop it from happening. I think it's a big problem."
- Mayfield: "Okay. If you wanna stop it going forward for any new people, but you cannot take away from people who are currently collecting their pensions. You cannot diminish what they are already receiving, and that is what your Bill does. I have an

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

issue with this Bill. I'm asking everyone in this chamber to vote 'no'. No one down here should be diminishing pensions of anybody. We should not be forcing people into foreclosure, taking money out of senior citizens mouths just because we have political issues within our district. I'm urging a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Kifowit: "I understand this is for one county, but sometimes when we do Bills for just one county it can have rippling affects. So, our analysis says, that if they're receiving benefits from the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund then they would be ineligible for salary. Is that correct?"

Didech: "I'm sorry. Could repeat that question?"

Kifowit: "I said, our... my analysis says that if they are receiving any salary or compensation from Lake County, if they are receiving benefits from the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund that it will be prohibited. Is that correct?

Didech: "Correct."

Kifowit: "So, if there's a police officer if Aurora who draws from IMRF because of all their services as a police officer and happens to live in your county and wants to run for the board, therefore, they would receive zero stipend when other board members would receive a stipend?"

Didech: "Right. And I think it's important to recognize the reality of the situation in Lake County. This is not like many other counties throughout the states. These are very relatively highly paid county board members that get a salary,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

they get stipends, they get health benefits. So they are not retired really in any sense of the word."

Kifowit: "Well, Representative, with all due respect, you're talking about the here and now. When we make laws, they're gonna be on the books for decades. So we have to look at all situations that could happen in the future. And you could get a retired city employee who might wanna run for county board and what you're advocating is for that person to get zero and other members of the board to get a stipend because that person paid into IMRF in a city capacity, maybe even in a different city capacity."

Didech: "Yes, and I think we have an obligation as stewards of taxpayer funds to ensure that we are not creating this mechanism for people to be pulling two salaries at the same time."

Kifowit: "So, your definition of two salaries is one salary where the person dedicated 30 years of their life and paid over 10 percent of their pay into a retirement fund, which they earned, and you want to label them then and let everybody else on the board who didn't put in 30 years of service for a city, to get a stipend. Because they can get their 401K right? If they had a 401K, they could get their retirement money if they're drawing from a 401K. They can get their retirement money if their drawing from the State University Retirement System. They can get their retirement money from any other retirement system, but unless... but if you're a city employee, who just happened to be... the only retirement system available to them is IMRF, now you're going to put them in a

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

different class even though they're doing the same work. They don't get any stipend than all the other board members?"

Didech: "Well this is the abuse that's happening and I think we should address the abuse that's actually happening. I understand your point that there are other situations that may arise and those are something that we may need to address. But I think it's important we address the abuse of taxpayer dollars that is happening."

Kifowit: "Well, I guess for me, you're not quantifying what the abuse is. Because if somebody pays into a retirement account such as State University Retirement System, State Employee Retirement System, they're okay, and they can draw their retirement, and they can get paid. But if you're in IMRF it's an abuse if you pay 30 years into IMRF and you want to draw your retirement and you want to serve on the county board then you get zero. You're considering that retirement system an abuse but the other retirement systems are not an abuse?"

Didech: "Well, it's an abuse because what's happening is it is current county board members who earned that pension from that same service on the county board. These aren't police officers or firefighters who earned this in a different capacity. These are current county board members who earned this benefit from the same service on that same board."

Kifowit: "But it doesn't seem like your Bill differentiates the 30-year city employee from a county board member. Maybe you should pull this from the record and actually look at the consequences of how this Bill is written with regards to city employees that give decades of their time to their pension. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Didech: "Thank you. I appreciate the feedback. We're gonna work on this Bill. I'll pull it from the record."
- Speaker Burke: "Out of the record. House Bill 2737, Representative Halpin. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2737, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Halpin."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This House Bill amends the Soil and Water Conservation District Act to make sure to add healthy soil, soil quality to the list of things that these soil and water conservation districts are charged with promoting education and materials to local farmers and other stakeholders. I know of no opposition. And I would as for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2737 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2786, Representative... House Bill 2802, Representative Welch. Please call the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2802, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2802 is an initiative of the School Management Alliance. What this Bill does is, is it provides that if a vacancy occurs on a school board, and

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

members of the board fail to fill the vacancy within 60 days instead of 45 days, then the Regional Superintendent of Schools shall fill the vacancy within 30. What we're attempting to do here is give local school boards more time to find school board members market, advertise and be transparent about the process of filling an open vacancy. I would ask for approval."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2802 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2818, Representative Costa Howard. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2818, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2018 (sic-House Bill 2818) is actually quite a simple Bill. It adds sexual assault and stalking to crimes that victims can keep their addresses confidential amongst... excuse me... the Victims of Domestic Violence Act. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2818 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On
this... on this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2824, Representative Zalewski. Clerk, please read the Bill. There is an Amendment pending that you'd like to adopt? Clerk, please take this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2824, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Madam Speaker, I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1.
 It's technical cleanup the fund asked for."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor vote... say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2824, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill was introduced a few times, the previous Governor vetoed it. It's a very simple Bill that the Municipal Fund of Chicago asked for that administrative and substantive corrections dealing with service disability. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "On this... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2824 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', O voting 'against', and O voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2832, Representative Mussman. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2832, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2832 would designate the month of April each year as Sikh Awareness and Appreciation Month. The Sikh religion is the fifth largest religion in the world and there are 25 thousand Sikh Illinoisans. 2019 is actually a very special year for them because it is the 550th birthday of their Guru Nanak Dev, the founder of the Sikh faith. They've had several one day proclamations, going back all the way to 1991 under Governor Edgar, but they would like this to be a more annual recognition. Other states like California, New Jersey are already doing this recognition and we would certainly like to extend that kindness to our neighbors. So I appreciate your support."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2832 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2846, Representative Conroy. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2846, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill is the Bill that we had last year as well. And this is kind of the PANDAS cleanup. We passed the PANDAS Law in 2017, it was signed. And this creates a code to be used for PANDAS/PANS so that it takes a barrier away from patients getting the insurance coverage that they need. This Body supported it unanimously last year and I ask you again to stand with me to support these children and their families with a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2846 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Gordon-Booth, for what reason do you rise?"

Gordon-Booth: "A moment of personal privilege please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Gordon-Booth: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to arise and acknowledge several hard working constituents from my district who are here for the Illinois Public Pension Fund

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Association Day. Here today are Craig Johnson, Chris Heaton, Sgt. Sherril Stenson, Jenna Long, Sean Curry from the Peoria Police Unit #27. Please join me in welcoming them to their Capitol."

Speaker Burke: "House Bill 2852, Representative Smith. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2852, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Bill 2852 amends various Acts relating to the governance of public universities in Illinois where competency based learning programs are being offered. This Bill simply requires state universities to notify students who are eligible for competency based credits, formally known as life experience credits. It simply requires the universities to notify these students that they are eligible for these credits. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2852 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2860, Representative Robinson. Out of the record. House Bill 2862, Representative Mayfield. Clerk, please call the Bill... or read the Bill. Representative, you have an Amendment pending. Would you like to adopt it?"

Mayfield: "I'd like to adopt the Bill... the Amendment, yes."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2862, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mayfield, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield for the adoption of an Amendment."
- Mayfield: "Okay. What the Amendment does is it takes out language and removes opposition from the Bill. And I recommend an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick. Representative Mayfield has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor vote 'aye'... say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2862, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Okay. Basically what this Bill does it is an initiative of the North Shore Reclamation District. And we had some challenges with flooding over the last year. And what this Bill does is just gives them the right to go into certain areas to fix sewer lines where there is a health risk and also gives... grants them additional emergency powers. That dollar amount that is listed there is a just a few cents short

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

of what was actually spent to fix a broken sewer main. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I noticed there was some opposition in committee. Was it to the increase in the dollar amount? So you're going from the emergency fund going... or the emergency purchase authority going from three hundred and fifty thousand to a half a million dollars, is that correct?"

Mayfield: "That was part of it. And the other issue was the open lands. And we took their... we took out the language that they were objecting to, which we were okay with, so that removed all of their opposition. So as far as I know, there is no opposition to the Bill."

Batinick: "But it still does the 350 to the 500 in the Bill?"

Mayfield: "Correct. Correct."

Batinick: "And there wasn't... okay. I assume..."

Mayfield: "Right."

Batinick: "I assume some people on my side will be for and against it. I'll listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Okay. Just so you know, the reason that they increased it was when we had the broken sewer main, we actually spent almost 500 thousand on repairing that and it was an emergency repair that we could've fixed a lot sooner, had we not had to go through a hundred different hoops. So that is where that dollar amount came from. It wasn't that they just pulled a number out of the air. That is what it actually cost to fix that and to avoid any health risk because when you're talking

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

about sewer waters and waste, you don't want that just leaking out there. You don't wanna risk it going into open waterways. That kind of thing. So that's where it came from."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. Yeah I wasn't sure if you said it was a few dollars, few cents short if you meant the 350 or the 500."

Mayfield: "No, no. I mean what we actually spent."

Batinick: "Right. Right, what you actually spent. I wasn't sure which number you talking about. Okay. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2862 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'in favor', 47 voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2868, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2868, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I'm presenting House Bill 2868. And what this does is requires the State Board of Education to develop a work-based learning database to help facilitate relationships between school districts and businesses. I would be happy to answer any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

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

Batinick: "I'm looking at this, and this was in my committee Representative, but it says that you intend to pass the Bill as is, but has committed to conversations with the Illinois State Board of Education. What exactly does that mean? I've seen that used for holding for an Amendment, but not passing a Bill out of the House."

Scherer: "The... I talked to the Illinois State Board of Education about this and they had misunderstood what the Bill was actually doing. And so once we talked about it, Amanda Elliott from State Board of Education was fine with it."

Batinick: "Okay. I don't see anybody..."

Scherer: "Because she had some questions and it had popped out so quick, she hadn't had time to look at it. But this was several, several weeks ago."

Batinick: "Okay. So, you are continuing to talks then or you're not continuing talks?"

Scherer: "We're done talking. She's fine with it. They don't have an opposition to it."

Batinick: "Okav."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill... pardon me."

Batinick: "Yeah, I guess... yeah we haven't been informed on exactly... it doesn't say that they're a proponent. What's the cost? Do you have any idea what the cost of this particular Bill is, Representative? What the cost is going to be what to the State Board of Education?"

Scherer: "It's gonna be an online database that both businesses and schools can go to. It's a very pro-business, pro-education

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Bill. So, businesses and schools can look at this online data base and say, oh, this company is willing to work with my students on this concept, so we'll go match up with them."

Batinick: "Okay. What is cost... estimated cost?"

Scherer: "I don't have any special estimated cost because it's all online and it's just part of what the job of ISBE is gonna be."

Batinick: "Right. Okay, so I guess the State Board of Education has to develop a work-based learning database to help facilitate relationships between school districts and businesses and expand work-based learning in this state. I guess... I don't... nothing quickly jumps into my head as to what exactly this end product is gonna look like. That seems pretty open ended, which gets me back to the cost."

Scherer: "We're leaving it open to the State Board of Education to do it however they see fit. And Amanda and I talked about that."

Batinick: "Okay. Hang on. To the Bill. There's obviously going to be a cost to this. The conversation are ongoing. We weren't part of what those negotiations were. I urge caution, especially when we don't know what the cost of something is gonna be. So for that reason, reason alone, I'm gonna urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bourne."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

Bourne: "Thank you. From my recollections in committee, ISBE was also concerned that the Bill was vague, that there aren't definitions for the database and that they were concerned

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

that the definition of work-based learning is different than that that's in their accountability plan. Is that something that you've talked to Amanda about?"

- Scherer: "It's our understanding that there would not be a big cost to this. And we purposely left it open ended because I didn't feel it was my place to tell ISBE how to do their job, that they... it's left open ended so they can design it the way they see it best to be done."
- Bourne: "Yes, but were some concerns with some discrepancies in the way that work-based learning is defined in the accountability plan and the way that work-based learning is defined in this statute. Do you know if that has been clarified or if they need clarification?"
- Scherer: "It's my understanding that the work-based learning is defined in here. And as I said, ISBE doesn't have a problem with that. To my knowledge, there is no opposition."
- Bourne: "Okay. I think that we... to the Bill. I think that in committee we all agreed that it could be advantageous for students to have this ability to see which employers in their district they're willing to work... who are willing to work with them. I think there was some implementation questions on whether we would just be compiling schools that are already... complying... compiling businesses that are already doing this with current schools or if there would actually be outreach to new businesses. I think the intention is good. I just asked ISBE, they said that they can work within these parameters, but, I would ask that in the future when we have some discrepancies, that we're able to have that conversation before the Bill comes up on the floor. Thank you."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, I'm reading the actual text of the Bill here. It's just two paragraphs. In fact, it could be two long sentences. But there's no, I guess they're gonna create an online database. We don't know what it's gonna cost. We don't know how they're gonna use it. Is it gonna be done by rule? Is there any oversight for this? Is there any reporting requirements for this? So, I guess I'm seeing we're creating something, but it doesn't mean anyone's gonna use it. Is there... can put something more into this that gives it more actual energy behind it that would clarify what the... the purpose is kind of clear, but it's very vague how we actually get it done. So I appreciate the efforts for flexibility, but I don't understand how we actually get it to be a useful place. Do you have any further thoughts on that?"

Scherer: "So work-based learning means an educational strategy that provides students with real life work experiences in which they can apply academic and technical skills and develop their employability. I'm really surprised that the Republicans would not be supporting this because it's very good for education and very good for small business with a very minimal cost. And it's something that very important for our...

Wheeler: "That's the problem."

Scherer: "...workers and for our students to be able to go to this database and see what opportunity is out there for them."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Wheeler: "Everyone one this side of the aisle has agreed with the concept of work-based learning being important. No one's disagreeing with that. Everyone's got a question about how much is the cost and how's it gonna be used? What oversight does it have? Those kinds of things. The actual administration of such a thing. And the Bill, being only two paragraphs long, two sentences long, that you just read half of, really doesn't tell us any of those things. So, I'm just trying to encourage you to further develop the Bill. I think you've got a good idea here, I just wanna see more development of what this actually would turn into so people could understand what it means."

Scherer: "Okay. I see here that Representative Demmer, who's not here today, but he filed a fiscal note and that the General Revenue Fund budget thought that it would be an impact of 180 thousand dollars."

Wheeler: "So it's a hundred thousand dollars?"

Scherer: "Which is not that much when you look at the State Board of Education's entire budget and how much good it'll do for our students and our businesses."

Wheeler: "Well gosh, you lead me right into something I just have to ask about then. If we're gonna spend a hundred thousand dollars today, then I'm gonna ask you if there's a revenue estimate before we start... what? A hundred and eighty thousand dollars a year at the beginning and ninety thousand dollars reoccurring, is that what I understand? So, if we're gonna spend some money today, I'm gonna ask if we have a revenue estimate before we start spending money. Is there a revenue estimate in your Bill?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Scherer: "So once this is put in place, it will just be free flowing and if you are a business, you can just put your name in, and if you're a school, you can take it out. It's not 180 thousand... anyway my understanding is it's not 180 thousand every single year. It's just a startup cost."

Wheeler: "Right, it's \$90 thousand every single year, \$180 thousand to set the database up. Ladies and Gentleman, this is well intentioned Bill with very little clarity, some expense and not much explanation. Vote your conscience."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Davidsmeyer: "So, have you worked with the department to see if they can do that without this Bill? To allow them to do this? I mean, they don't need legislation to be able to do this do they? If they wanna do it, they can. So it's so open ended, wouldn't it be better to work the department and allow them to structure something like this on their own? And the only reason I say that is because I recently had a Bill, and I was gonna run the Bill and I talked to the department and we figured out a commonsense way to move forward to allow them to do it without having to go through the legislative process. Have you talked to them about the possibility of that?"

Scherer: "I talked to ISBE at length about this Bill and we both concluded that it's a good Bill. It serves a good purpose. There's no opposition. Let me repeat one more time, Illinois State Board of Education is not opposed to this Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "But there is a cost, correct?"

Scherer: "They are not opposed to this Bill."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Davidsmeyer: "I didn't ask if they're... there is a cost, correct?" Scherer: "There is a cost."

Davidsmeyer: "I will refer to a fairly popular commercial that's been on TV lately where they say, free, free, free, free, free, free, free."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Weber."

Weber: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Weber: "So, I have a question. Obviously the \$180 thousand first year and \$90 thousand a year following is a large fee. All right, I guess what I'm concerned with is I don't see any proponents listed. So I guess I'm concerned if... when you look at the 102 different counties and the amount of school districts that are in those counties, wouldn't this be something more practical for local school district to be able to implement on their own?"

Scherer: "Would you... was that a question? Would you repeat that please?"

Weber: "Yeah, I was just saying not every school district is gonna have a wide resource of businesses available. Wouldn't this be more practical for local school districts to implement themselves where there is those resources available?"

Scherer: "This will definitely include local schools. As a teacher, I would have done anything to have had this resource to try to tie my students together with businesses. This was something that I struggled with as a teacher for 35 years. You just don't know what businesses are willing to work with you and which ones aren't. And now, this would answer some big problems that you have as a teacher in figuring out. I'm

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- sure if you're a business owner, you would feel the same way. That you would love to know what schools would like to participate with you on certain subject matters, but you just don't. We need that middle person to tie the two together."
- Weber: "So I guess if... so did the schools reach out to you on this, I was trying to find if there was any proponents. Is there any..."
- Scherer: "Yes, I had school districts come to me and they wanted to know how they could help and what their part of this Bill would be. And I said that they would be working with ISBE on putting their names in of which schools are for it and which businesses would also like to participate. No school is required to participate. No business is required to participate. If you don't wanna work together that's your own option."
- Weber: "So have you had those school districts? Have they... did they file a witness slip? I'm not able to find any witness slips."
- Scherer: "I didn't ask them to do that. I didn't realize that everybody would be opposed to that over there."
- Weber: "Well I don't know if it's over here. I think it's any time we have a 180 thousand plus 90 thousand a year spending, that we would like to know that somebody other than the Representative was hoping to get that done. So anyway, I'm done. Thanks."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Scherer to close."
- Scherer: "Okay. So I would really appreciate an 'aye' vote on this Bill. It's an excellent Bill for schools and businesses working together to make a brighter future for Illinois,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

moving in the right direction, making progress instead of staying stuck back a hundred years ago before the internet was available. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2868 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'in favor', 39 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 20... House Bill 2896, Representative Flowers. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2896, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2896 would call for the Department of Public Health to put together a professional diverse coalition of people. I'm sorry, please forgive me. Will put together a task force to meet quarterly and to discuss diversity in the in the health care field. There's not enough African American women, or doctors, or nurses in the health care field. And so, as a result, studies have shown that if the health care Bill was a little bit more diverse, a lot more lives could be changed, a lot more people could live, and there would be a better understanding of how to treat a diverse group of people. It would improve health care. It would improve the leadership. It would make a planning for success, as far as people health, in a good environment, in a good working place.

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

It'll make it all more possible if we had a diverse working... if we had a diverse health care task force to put this together. I'd me more than happy to answer any questions you may have in regards to 2896."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

Flowers: "Yes."

Willis: "Representative, I see that you have members of a variety of different health care fields on here, but wouldn't part of the problem truly be getting people to be educated in these fields? And are you perhaps missing a whole section of people to encourage them to go into the academics of these fields instead? What is a doctor that's already practicing gonna do about getting somebody to be admitted into a medical school or a nurse that's already practicing, encouraging a young person to take nursing courses? I think that you're really missing the point on your task force. Not that you... there isn't a shortage of diversity in the field, but I think you're missing where it can be most effective. Would you consider adding somebody from the education fields to your task force?"

Flowers: "Representative, thank you very much for bringing that to my attention, but the fact of the matter is, as far as education in the health care profession period, we have tried to pass all kinds of legislation to encourage more minorities to go into the health care field. And so, this legislation here would go along with the legislation that we have passed before, but we have to get African-American and other minority students into the schools, into the schools. That's the most

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

important part. And so, therefore, that's the reason why we need to understand that diversity is very important in regards to all of our health. And if we were to diversify, our health care would be a lot better."

"I'm not saying that that's not true. I just think that Willis: you're missing the point of getting people from diverse backgrounds into the field if you're not looking at how to get into the entrance of it. Having somebody that is already a minority come and put together an idea in the task force, they've already gone through that struggle and it's the idea of getting the new... new generation in there to get more diversity on that. And with that, I think that while I understand what your goal is, I don't think the members that you have picked for this task force are going to be able to accomplish what you want to see happen. And I would respectfully ask you to reconsider this and put in an Amendment to look at people that are at institutions so that we can get people into the fields of it, not people that are already in the field practicing, but people that are at the health care training centers. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you, Representative. And again, I think the people that are the professionals are the ones that should be seeking and training and hopefully they're educating. There are lots of doctors out there that are in continuing education and in recruiting. So I agree with you 100 percent in regards to the that there needs to be more minorities that's educated. I disagree that we need to have educators as far as recruitment.

I think we could have that as diverse as well. But thank you." Speaker Burke: "Representative Stava-Murray."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Stava-Murray: "So, I just wanted to say thank you for this Bill.

And I actually really like the idea of having people who are already in the field because I think they'll have unique lived experiences that they can give advice off of to identify where were areas that were difficult for them, that could be potential pain points that need to be solved. So I think that it makes a lot of sense to have people who have successfully navigated themselves into that field as experts for the task force."

Flowers: "Thank you very much Representative."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2896 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'in favor', 4 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2934, Representative Morgan. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2934, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill that is dealing with an issue that we've had as more and more people reside at homes that do not necessarily have family members living with them. So as they try and have service through juvenile court, the service has been problematic in making sure that the service is delivered, at sometimes people are residing in homes with extended family members, but also in large dwellings where they don't have family members living with

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

them. So this allows service of summons and literally only allows service of summons additionally to the dwelling and to the house hold and not just to the family members. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2934 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2935, Representative Morgan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2935, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a second Amendment to the Juvenile Court Act. This is basically for situations when counsel has removed themselves but there has not been the appropriate filing in that court case. This allows, simply the judges to vacate the order of counsel for juveniles. And again, that is the only change. But it allows the judge, only the judge, to take that action would it... right now, the statute is silent about giving the judicial... judiciary the ability to vacate counsel. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2935 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against',

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2940, Representative Davis. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2940, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third reading of this House Bill.

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."

"Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As soon as I find my Davis: notes. House Bill 2940, again, is an initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission, which is a division of the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. I've served on the Commission for... since its inception. And the Mandates Committee of BFR is trying to use a process to eliminate unused statutes, to eliminate unused funds, funds that were put in place that were never appropriated dollars as the way to help clean up our statues, a way to try to help our statutory process run a lot more efficiently. So this is one of our omnibus initiatives that contains several things that we're trying to clean up in various statutes. So House Bill 2940, number one, repeals a graduation grant incentive within the Board of Higher Education that has not been used since 2004. Secondly, it repeals four pilot programs regarding the recording... regarding recording custodial interviews, which were enacted subject to appropriation in 2003. ICGA has not received appropriations to fund this mandate since 2003. Number three, it repeals a section of the School Code allowing Chicago Public Schools to file applications with the State Board of Education to receive funds for the purposes of conducting year-round school feasibility studies. While this was signed into law during the 81st General Assembly, CPS has

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

never used this section. Fourth, it makes a section of the Nuclear Safety Law requiring the Illinois Emergency Management Agency to conduct a study on the impact and cost of nuclear power subject to an appropriation. This study requirement has been in effect since 2004, and no agency, stakeholder, or industry has requested such a report. And five, it removes various references to the Construction Evaluation Council at the request of the architect of the Capitol. This council has never met since it was enacted in the 84th General Assembly during the years 1985, 1986. Again, this is an omnibus Bill. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2940 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2941, Representative Davis. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2941, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. House Bill 2941, again, is another initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission. It amends the Public Aide Code to require that the Departments of Corrections, the Cook County Department of Corrections, and the Office of the Cook County Sheriff... or

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

me, of every county shall Sheriffs, excuse intergovernmental agreements within the Department of Health Care and Family Services under the Public Aide Code and shall provide all required information in a timely manner. So what this is attempting to correct is that we have these intergovernmental agreements where they're supposed to share information with the Department of Health Care and Family Services. Unfortunately, that information is not shared. But the reason we need the information is to make sure that we're not providing Medicaid coverage to inmates who are not eligible to receive Medicaid coverage while incarcerated. So we wanna make that sure we're not providing that. But once they're out, maybe they're eligible, but while they're in they're not. And this is to make sure that we're getting the information from these various units to make sure that we're not providing health care coverage. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2941 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis, again. House Bill 2946. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2946, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Davis: "Thank you, again, Madam Chair. This Bill is not, I repeat, is not an initiative of the Budgeting for Results Commission. But what House Bill 2946 it seeks to do is amend the Pedestrians with Disabilities Safety Act by authorizing and requiring that the Governor include in their pedestrians with safety... Pedestrians with Disabilities Safety Day Proclamation include information on the history of persons with disabilities. I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2946 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'in favor', 2 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2968, Representative Davis. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2968, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative... House Bill 2988, Representative Williams. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2988, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill simply clarifies current law and the exclusive jurisdiction of counties and municipalities to zone for wind. Under current law, counties and municipalities have this exclusive authority. And despite this, unfortunately, some other units of local government

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

have attempted to thwart this by utilizing an antiquated and inapplicable process. But during 2007, Illinois clearly established that not the state, not every unit of local government, but simply counties would have the authority and municipalities would have the authority to zone for wind. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, it was kind of loud in here. Can you briefly explain the purpose of the Bill and the genesis of where it came from?"

Williams: "Absolutely. This Bill arose in the context of zoning. So in 2007, Illinois Legislature opted to permit counties and municipalities to exclusively zone for the development of wind farms."

Batinick: "That was in what year?"

Williams: "2007 was the first time that big debate happened. And at the time the GA decided that rather than having a statewide standard, they'd let local government and local communities decide what was best for them. This Bill simply clarifies that under current law, after various townships attempted to thwart the development of windfarms by conducting what I would say would be an illegal zoning practices using an antiquated procedure and putting all the pending projects into a state of limbo. So rather than... you know, rather than stop the future development of projects and put everyone in a sense of uncertainty, I was, for the third time, clarifying that townships do not have the authority to zone for wind."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Batinick: "Can you expand on the antiquated technique that was used for townships to?"

Williams: "Well sure. I am actually a township attorney. And you may be familiar, if you practice this area, with the concept of Dylan's Law. And Dylan's Law provides that only specifically granted authority may be utilized per certain units of local government. So unless a unit of government is given exclusive authority in a certain area, they are unable to act. In this case, wind is not mentioned at all in the Township Code. However, it appears explicitly in both the Counties Code and in the Illinois Municipal Code."

Batinick: "Okay. Sounds like a riveting topic, in which some of my Members will be on both sides of the aisle."

Williams: "Very much so."

Batinick: "I will listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Welter."

Welter: "Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

Welter: "Representative Williams, not to belabor the point, but under current law, who has the authority to zone windmill projects?"

Williams: "It is exclusively granted to counties and municipalities."

Welter: "So would it be accurate to say this Bill is just clarifying existing law?"

Williams: "Absolutely."

Welter: "That's what I thought. Because when I served on the county board helping the Lee County government, we worked

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

with and welcomed two separate wind projects in Grundy County. During the zoning process, all local stakeholders were involved and public hearings were held. At that time, township officials were invited and encouraged to collaborate on what the best reasonable policy approach was. I point this out because county and municipal governments truly are the best government bodies to allow for the zoning. They have the planning and zoning staff and they have the resources to take a deep dive into the zoning impacts and best practices that would impact their local communities. It truly is the best level of local government. It really baffles me that anyone on my side of the aisle would want to create an additional barrier to massive investment in Illinois in the billions of dollars statewide. The arguments that you might hear against House Bill 2988 are that more government involvement in regulating business development is good. You are truly saying suppressing private investment is better policy approach. The idea of more government prohibiting private investment is not good policy and it's not conducive to economic development regardless of your party affiliation. I'll remind you that these are large projects that span many townships, and at times, many counties as well. Adding another layer of small government townships should not be allowed. It would undermine the decision that's made at the county or municipal levels. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Halbrook.

Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Chair and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. This particular language affects two townships in the heart of my district in Douglas County

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

directly south of Champaign. I believe the statute is very clear that in the absence of county zoning, the townships can zone themselves regardless of whatever the issue is, whether it's about business or some agricultural situation or when or whatever the case might be. In fact, there was Senate Floor debate in the spring of 2015 when Senator... State Senator, Scott Bennett addressed the issue that the Bill that they're trying to change, that they're saying is clarifying the issue, actually said it was very clear that the townships have the ability to zone themselves. The other interesting situation is that this situation is currently in litigation. And so I find it quite peculiar that in my five years of being in the General Assembly, and I've talked to other senior Members in the General Assembly in both chambers, that they've never seen a current situation that's being litigated, come to Springfield for a fix. With that, Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge a 'no' vote. If you're with townships and you want to encourage township zoning, I believe that if this... this authority is stripped away from townships in this matter, that they will come after county zoning next on wind, and they will... put into existence a statewide ordinance across the state for wind. Thank you. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to speak to the Bill.

This is very personal to me because it's in my back yard. And

I would encourage a 'no' vote today mainly because I don't

want a cotton picking windmill in my backyard that I have to

listen to and look at. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

Butler: "Thank you. Representative, I know we've had a lot of discussions over the past few weeks about the future of renewable energy in the State of Illinois and I guess my question is how come we're not addressing this through some of the other legislation that's moving its way through the General Assembly?"

Williams: "Well, I think is less about the merits of renewable energy and more about the ability of local government to weigh in on the appropriateness of any particular development in... within its borders. This... nothing in this Bill says a county has to approve or appropriate resources for the development of wind farms in their area. Quite the contrary, this Bill just says that the counties have the authority to determine whether wind farms are appropriate and that townships do not. So even if it's... even if you don't think that that's what the law currently says, it just makes sense that you wouldn't have a township by township patchwork of laws relating to the development of large scale wind and solar projects. It just doesn't make sense. Under the particular example that was brought up, one wind farm that's being proposed in central Illinois, under the proposed township rules, they could put up maybe two or three turbines. So that would obviously thwart the development of the project completely. And I think what's missing in this conversation, this is a Bill about property rights. It is the right of a property owner to utilize his or her land for the purpose they choose. And precluding that, by allowing the smaller units of local government to basically

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

exclusionary zone windfarms out of, you know, potentially to not be developed at all, interferes with those individual property rights as well."

"So, we currently... you mentioned a patchwork Butler: regulations. I mean, as is currently we have a patchwork of regulations because it is done on a county basis largely. And I made the point the other day in committee about here in Sangamon County, you can look across into Logan County and see 75 wind turbines in Logan County that those folks in Sangamon County had nothing... no say over whatsoever. So I think, you know, we're picking which level of government we want to get involved here, whether it's township or county or, as Representative Halbrook said, statewide. And I'll be honest, I don't know where moving forward when it comes to statewide regulation I see some merits, but certainly see a lot of flaws in that as well. But, you know, we... I would hope when we're moving through this we take it in total because there's another Bill that's working its way through here that was that was in the Executive Committee last week about wind turbines on Lake Michigan. And in that Bill, it gives a three mile set back from the shore of Lake Michigan for wind turbine and potential wind turbines in Lake Michigan. So we're setting a standard there for the folks in Chicago, but we're obviously treating it differently for those of us downstate. And that's one of my big concerns that I continue to talk about is that I think we've got to take a much more comprehensive approach to this. And I wish this would actually be part of the discussions on some of the other legislation you've got going

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

on instead of one that's still being litigated I guess. So, thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

Skillicorn: "Representative, I'm truly undecided on this issue.

So just a couple questions. I just, push me over the edge either way and I'm just trying to be fair about this. Under current law, do the counties have or have not the complete authority for zoning?"

Williams: "Both the Counties Code and the Municipal Code have virtually the same language which provides that they may do zoning for wind farms. Townships do not mention the word wind and in the basic rules of statutory construction the specific outweighs the general. So I would argue that under the classic rule of statutory construction, we opt for the more specific zoning, therefore providing that townships cannot zone for wind."

Skillicorn: "So current law specifically says wind farms under county jurisdiction. For a second here, let's remove that because I'm kind of curious of zoning intent here. What about any other establishment? Does the county have the authority over it if it's in a... if it's not in a city or town?"

Williams: "I'm not sure where the zoning authority falls for other areas. I've only focused on the wind farm development. I believe it's called WECS in the statute, WECS. I'm not sure what that stands for. I can certainly find out for you. But here we're focusing specifically on what's a relatively new area but the Legislature did see fit both in 2007 and in 2015

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

to reiterate the fact that both counties and municipalities have that authority whereas townships do not."

Skillicorn: "And I'm also curious, you know, if staff or someone knows what other zoning authority townships have because literally I am on the edge on this Bill. And I could vote for it or vote against it. It has been communicated to me, and I'm open to listening, that counties have the authority in unincorporated areas. And if that's the case then it seems like an 'aye' vote is valid. If there is a... other situation where townships have authority in unincorporated areas then that's something I want to know about because I'm just trying to be fair."

Williams: "Sure. And what we're trying to do is clarify what has been discussed before, but to an even more specific clarification to avoid this in the future. We have not only individual property rights that was discussed earlier, but we do have a matter of public policy. I know that these individual projects can bring hundreds of thousands of dollars to local communities, the likes of which they won't see without them. I know also that there are strong environmental benefits, if that's important to you. I quess I would say that there's something for everyone in providing the law to stay as it is and that's to provide for county and township zoning. As a practical matter, townships are smaller in size and it's just not practical that they would be the ones to regulate larger scale projects that might span several townships. So this seems like a middle ground to me. One of your colleagues referenced perhaps considering a statewide standard. That's certainly something we could reopen, but I

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

would argue that local governments should have the ability to regulate and that's what we have here."

Skillicorn: "Well, I think it's also one of the arguments. They don't want a statewide standard on this, they want local control."

Williams: "Exactly."

Skillicorn: "Obviously they're arguing that townships will be more vocal than counties and they certainly don't want Springfield, you know, crushing them with the decisions."

Williams: "Perhaps not."

Skillicorn: "Do you know of the specifics going on? Does this cross township boundaries? Is it multiple townships for one project or is all within one?"

Williams: "I think it could be. I don't think they determine how to place wind turbines based on township boundaries or county boundaries. I think they look at the sites that are most workable and then work with individual landowners to acquire those sites for placement of turbines. I know the one particular project that was referenced earlier, there's over a hundred landowners that have agreements with the developer to rent, for lack of a better term, lease their land for utilization of the wind farms. That is, I think, a property right of those owners to determine if they want to gain the financial benefit. In some cases between one and two thousand dollars a month just for the placement of the wind turbines. And I have seen photographs and maps that depict how these farms are developed and you're still able to, in many cases, utilize them for other purposes, too. So it's a value added for a lot of these landowners."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Skillicorn: "And one last question, what is the con of holding on to this Bill for a while and letting the court case play out? Williams: "Well, I think it's what we said earlier. Right now there are not just one, but several potential wind farms looking to be developed and companies are not going to invest the millions of dollars it takes to develop a wind farm if there's uncertainty in the law. So I think the reason to do this is to do this is to provide for certainty in the law. I am confident that the litigation that was referenced earlier would resolve favorably and be consistent with the conversation and the points that I'm making today but we know how lawsuits go. They can drag on for months and years and even decades at times and that doesn't seem fair to the landowners and the counties that stand to reap great, great economic benefits from the development of these farms. So I would argue that certainty in the law is better for development, better for the residents, and landowners alike."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Representative. You've been a great sport."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

McDermed: "Representative, I just want to have you repeat, for the benefit of everybody here, when did this Body first act to give this authority to counties?"

Williams: "Well, somewhere in this pile of papers I have transcripts both from 2007 and from 2015 that go through the discussion about the development of wind farms and how the

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- zoning is to take place. 2007 was the year I first was able to find legislative history on it."
- McDermed: "And then it was this Body addressed it again in a second Session?"
- Williams: "It was reiterated just as part of a larger discussion.

 And I can't put my hands on the dialogue right now, but it
 was reiterated that counties and municipalities have the
 authority to zone for wind."
- McDermed: "So would you say this issue has been thoroughly discussed by this House?"
- Williams: "I would say this is a further clarification of what we've already done before and maybe the language should have been a bit tighter but I will say the development of wind farms has really increased as of late because people understand the need for renewables. They can put their hands on documents that show the great economic benefits that these developments can provide to the town. So I think there's been more attention provided, more opportunity for landowners and more opportunity for developers and for units of local government to reap great financial benefits."
- McDermed: "And so the legislative intent back in 2007 and later on was, again, and still is to put the authority in the hands of counties and it was the decision of this group, this Body in its infinite wisdom, that that was the best repository for that decision making."
- Williams: "Yes, I think it seems that it was the middle ground approach. Not staying away from the argument that the state should have the ability to weigh in on what a particular county should do in terms of zoning for wind, but saying that

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

the township is too small of local... a unit of local government to make a determination about a project that could span multiple townships. So counties sounded like a reasonable ground and so the word wind was put in the Counties Code and also municipalities of course, because their boarders are different and very frequently not conducive to the development of large scale developments anyway."

McDermed: "Do you think we need to spend any more time chewing this issue over?"

Williams: "I feel pretty confident that this is the right direction to go, Representative."

McDermed: "I agree. Vote 'yes'."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The previous... one of the previous speakers, Representative from East Dundee, had asked about general zoning powers for the townships and that power is located in Article 110 of the Township Code, but that Article only applies to counties that have not adopted a zoning ordinance. And if at any time a county does adopt a zoning ordinance, after the township has adopted a zoning ordinance, the county ordinance, by law, supersedes it. The Township Code ordinance also doesn't apply to a municipality located within that township. So for a long time, township zoning has always been superseded by those two municipal governments."

Williams: "Thank you, counselor."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Weber."

Weber: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "She indicates that she will."

- Weber: "So, I did vote 'yes' on this in committee, however, I was under the understanding that the county did create zoning or is it just an ordinance?"
- Williams: "There is an ordinance, but as I read in the Township Code the statute would still provide for that. And I would also note, reiterate the fact that wind is specifically provided for both in the Counties Code and deliberately provided for in the Municipal Code but is nowhere mentioned in the Township Code. If it was the will of the Body, they could have easily added townships into that mix."
- Weber: "So I mean if... and I don't have it in front of me, but I thought that I read in the case where the county does not have zoning, that the townships can create zoning or am I wrong on that?"
- Williams: "I could read the exact language. I think it leaves it open for discussion, which I think is the problem, that's why we're looking to clarify what I believe is current law."
- Weber: "So is this in court right now to where we should be sitting and waiting for a court to make a decision or what's the issue on that?"
- Williams: "Well, I would certainly hope not because as I said, I think this litigation, and the township activity in the particular case that was referenced earlier, is designed to stall, if not to destroy the opportunity for the development to move forward. So there is a concept in the law called exclusionary zoning and that is not permitted. You're familiar as a former board member with this concept. And you cannot create zoning rules to prohibit a legal use. And that

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

is exactly what's happening here. The township in this case is zoning so specifically that they will eliminate the opportunity for a legal use to be developed. So that's the legal argument. I still maintain that the public policy arguments, as well as the property rights issue all lean in favor of 'yes' on this Bill."

Weber: "Thank you. I think this is pretty difficult. I'm not really sure I am a hundred percent on it and understand it a hundred percent, but I will continue to listen to the debate. Thank you."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Again, I think we've discussed this in a lot of details. It is a clarification of current law. I believe it is supported by... supported by what is currently in the Illinois statutes. It is a matter of providing property rights to landowners to use their land as they choose. And finally, it just makes good sense from a public policy perspective. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2988 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'in favor', 12 voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3014, Representative Mah. Clerk, please read the Bill."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3014, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Representative... sorry. House Bill 3014 simply asks that the Department of Agriculture rename Ethnic Village during the State Fair to Village of Cultures. I have spoken to Department of Agriculture about this and they are not opposed. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3014 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 1 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3041, Representative Unes. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3041, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3041 simply creates a universal decal for pancreatic cancer awareness. There's an original fee and renewal fee of \$25 with the funds being split between the Secretary of State and the Theresa Tracy Trot Illinois Cancer Cure Foundation Fund. I know of no opponents and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3041 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3053, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. House Bill 3069, Representative Meier. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3069, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "3069 is a Bill asking for all of our CILA's in the state, whenever there is a 9-1-1 call, to report that to the Department of Human Services whether it's a fire call, missing person, or an ambulance call. Just that these calls go to the human services is notified and can take note to see what's going on there."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3069 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3092, Representative Moeller. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3092, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Moeller."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Moeller: Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3092 creates the Native Prairie and Forage Preference Act. It simply requires state agencies when they are developing their landscaping to prefer... to make a preference for native plants that attract pollinators of just honeybees and monarch butterflies. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3092 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3151, Representative Evans. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3151, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me, Madam Speaker. This clarifies that the CPAC of, The Citizen Policy Advisory Council will be permanent and it also adds our shares because we have a lot of our law enforcement and judicial representation on the Citizen Policy Advisory Council so it makes it permanent to add shares. So, I request your support."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Madam Chairman, to the Bill. Representative Evans and I are the two House delegates to CPAC and I would like to add my approval of this to his and ask for everyone to vote 'aye'.

CPAC is a wonderful organization where we do a lot of fact

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

based decision making with respect to social justice reform issues. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3151 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3153, Representative Welter. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3153, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Welter."

Welter: "Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, House Bill 3153 requires the Department of Children and Family Services to place a lockbox, a suggestion box in each group home, shelter, and traditional living... or transitional living arrangement that accepts youth in care for the placement by DCFS. Provides that DCFS shall issue an annual report to the General Assembly outlining the concerns submitted to the box and the solutions for those concerns. I'll remind the Body as well that we already require DCFS to place lockbox suggestion boxes in each residential treatment center that accepts youth in care. This is just an expansion on that. And I would encourage an 'aye' vote and entertain any questions."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3153 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3191, Representative Connor. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3191, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3191 is a Bill designed to protect child victims of sexual assault from being crossed examination... excuse me... from being cross examined by pro se defendants. An identical measure passed the House last year but died in the Senate. The only objection is from the Cook County Public Defender's Office, deals with a constitutional issue. This legislation does apply to adult victims of sexual assault as well. However, for purposes of statutory construction it is primarily designed for child victim and judges can use a different standard for child victims than adult victims. It's good legislation, it protects children in a courtroom setting. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3191 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against',
and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3213, Representative Marron. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3213, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3213, first of all, I'd like to thank Representative Martwick on the bipartisan effort on this one. It's just really two simple technical fixes to the TRS pension system. The first one, just last year the General Assembly implemented a defined contribution savings plan to that system. And so this allows school districts to report their payroll information and payments to the pension system multiple times a year versus currently they're only allowed to do so once. And then the second fix just makes sure that the downstate teachers' pension system is compliant with federal withholding law."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "You delivered that a little quietly. Could you repeat it? No, I'm kidding. This is your first Bill, Representative, correct?"

Marron: "This is my first Bill."

Batinick: "Let me see how well you know your Bill. That's an interesting view of me on the screen there by the way. Is there a... let's talk about the technical parts of your Bill. Serious folks. This is a serious issue. Is there a casino for Danville in the Bill?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Marron: "Not in this Bill, but just like my predecessor, I am pushing for a casino in Danville."
- Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for answering that question. Congratulations, Representative."
- Marron: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Burke: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 31...
 3213 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'.
 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.
 On this question, there are 111 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3233, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please call the Bill... or read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3233, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Evans."
- Evans: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and the great Members of the Assembly. What this Bill does is it changes our Rules of the Road to further clarify the importance of safe driving around our large trucks on our expressways. I request your support."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3233 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Bill 3265, Representative Meier. Out of the record. House Bill 3269, Representative Walsh. Out of the record. House Bill 3299, Representative Davis. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3299, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."

"Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Mr. ... excuse me, Madam Chair, Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 3299 is a relatively sensitive subject that involves persons with disabilities. And essentially what the Bill is attempting to do... as I'm looking for the right notes here. This Bill would require developmental disability providers to ensure that adult service consumers have access to reviews of their capacity to consent to receive sexual education materials and resources as determined to be appropriate for... appropriate for that particular individual. Over the last year... there was a Bill that I had last year, and that was... and that was House Bill 1440... I believe it was 1446 where we attempted to try to have this conversation and move this Bill last year. And as a result of moving it out of committee, I agreed to have stakeholder meetings on this particular issue. And over the course of the summer, I held three stakeholder meetings that took place... that took place in Springfield and Chicago and in Marion, Illinois where we allowed the opportunity for those who support what we are trying to do as well as those who are against what we're trying to do to state their particular opposition with regard to this Bill or support for this particular Bill. So what I can assure you is that the Bill we introduced last year is different than the Bill that we have

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

subsequently introduced with regard to that sense. So what we do know about why a Bill such as this is important and is needed is that the proposal was the result of repeated cases of disability rights violations handled by the Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commissions Human Rights Authority in which consumers were denied the right to sexual expression, engaged in inappropriate sexual activity, were involved in a criminal justice system due to sexual activity and were also victimized by inappropriate sexual advances. Again, we talked about the three meetings that we held all over the state in order to try to solicit feedback. Self-advocates share their personal stories of how they had been victimized due to the lack of sexual education, family members stating that they understood that their loved ones are being... are sexual beings and need access to educational information, advocacy agencies that consider sexual expression and access to education a basic right. And disability service provider groups that have encountered conflicts related to sexual expression and education. Now generally we don't speak about the opposition, but I want to point something out with regard to the opposition. So, one of the things that we learn are individuals who are the quardians of their children and other loved ones are very protective of their rights and I can appreciate that, but what this Bill attempts to do is to follow the Probate Act. The Probate Act is what determines how that interaction takes place between the guardians, the individuals, as well as their treatment teams. And it basically says that when it's appropriate that individuals wishes, if they can make that decision, what

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

should be paramount in this broader discussion. But what we learn is that the individuals that were opposed to what we are trying to do, many of them are guardians, feel that their quardians rights should be paramount. And I want to be clear about that. The guardian's rights should be paramount. And a challenge that we have with that is the Probate Act. The Probate Act, and I'm sure somebody'll ask, and I can read it, talks about how that relationship should work. And it doesn't necessarily suggest that the guardian's rights, no matter what the situation is, even in a situation where the individual can make and have some decision making capacity, it states that the quardian's rights should not be paramount in those situations and if there's a conversation and a process to take place. What we learn from the opponents is that they feel the quardian should be the final arbiter and that decision should be it. Now again, our Bill follows the Probate Act, and how the Probate Act lays out how that relationship should be. For those individuals who think that the guardian's rights should be paramount, what I would encourage them to do is to file a Bill to change this section, Section E of the Probate Act because our Bill is following this effort. This effort right here. So again, those that are opposed, maybe you might want to have a broader discussion about the Probate Act and what the Probate Act means, but our Bill follows the Probate Act that shares how this relationship should be. So again, we feel that we are requiring appropriate materials to those individuals who can, certainly age appropriate materials for those individuals that of course can understand. But again, we want to work with families, we

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

want to work with the guardians in order to try to make this possible. So... and there is a process by which the materials can be brought forward. There's an approval process by the Department of Human Services that the materials have to flow through. This does not have a budgetary impact to the State of Illinois. And again, I understand that this is a delicate situation for many in this room but we are hearing horror stories. I am a commissioner on the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. And so we have horror stories through the Human Rights Authority about how individuals are being victimized. And we feel that if at all possible, if we provide the appropriate education for individuals that they can help protect themselves from the unwanted and sexual advances of others. Call them predators if you want to, but whatever that is, we feel that providing this education can help them in terms of protecting themselves as well. So, I could go on, but I'm sure there are Representatives that want to ask questions and let's start with the questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick.

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "So, Representative, I want to take... you talked about a whole bunch of stuff and I wanna drill that down into just kind of the specifics of the Bill a little bit shorter so my side can understand it. A couple things, we did pass a Bill dealing with this last Session correct?

Davis: "I did file a Bill that went to committee. And at the request of Members of the committee, we moved the Bill on to Second Reading and I agreed to have meetings, not hearings

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

but meetings, stakeholder meetings on the Bill and we had three of them over the course of a few months."

- Batinick: "Okay. And you mentioned that there were differences between the Bill you filed previously and the Bill you filed today. What are those differences?"
- Davis: "Hold on, Representative. I think I... so again, similar to 1446 of the 100th General Assembly. They do have some of the same language but this Bill adds a treatment... that a treatment team must determine the appropriateness of sexual education for a person admitted. The education must include explaining of the signs of possible predators and that materials that include or refer to a religious or faith based perspective must not be excluded in terms of providing that education. House Bill 3299 also expands the sexual education requirement for those receiving habilitation services from the state. There are some of the differences."
- Batinick: "So you add a treatment team. So a treatment team determines... because I think there's another Bill that basically say you allow for the education, but more on a case by case basis with a guardian having final authority. What you're saying is is the guardian is not going to have final authority and this is gonna be kind of based on the treatment team. And the treatment team is going to determine what education is appropriate for the individual. Is that correct?"
- Davis: "Well, just so you know, the guardians are a part of the treatment team. So we are in no way excluding guardians from this conversation. Again, the Probate Act is what already determines how this relationship works."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Batinick: "I caught that part and I'm not gonna ask you to read the Probate Act, but you said that the guardian is part of the treatment team. Who else is on the treatment team?"
- Davis: "They are part... the treatment team includes, for those individuals I believe in facilities, if you will, the treatment team includes the individual, when it's appropriate for the individual to be there and they are... they can make decisional... you know, they have decisional... decision making capacities. The treatment team includes professionals who have knowledge of the individual, so that would be employees of the facility that may include caseworkers, social workers."
- Batinick: "Okay, I guess... if... the guardian is part of the treatment team is it like democratic? It's a vote? What if there's dissension in the treatment team in terms of what should be done with the individual?"
- Davis: "That's the Probate Act. That kind of spells out how that works. Again, the Probate Act... and without reading the entire Probate Act, I think there's a particular piece of it that may... I believe this may this may help as well, it says where possible, the guardian shall determine how the ward would have made a decision based on the wards previous expressed preferences. So, the guardian is taking into consideration what the ward would want in this situation. So again, it's all about everyone working together to come up with the appropriate decision."
- Batinick: "Right. And that sounds like it goes to the guardian.

 I think that I have some other Members that have questions.

 I'm gonna sit back and listen to their answers."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Thank you. Will the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Meier: "First off, I'd like to thank you for going around with the meetings. We... there were some changes to this Bill. I am still very strongly opposed to this Bill because I believe when you go through the process to become a legal guardian, you are the legal guardian and you are to do what is right for that person according to the Probate Act. Our facilities currently have sex ed training for the residents. It's already there. The idea that this group can still override a guardian is where a lot of people in this state have a problem. When a guardian is going to be overridden, it should be done in the court system. The court should determine, not a group of people there, but the courts that appointed that quardian are the people that are responsible for going ahead and taking that quardianship away. Just like with the State of Illinois when they lost guardianship over 20 some residents because they weren't being taken care of right. The State of Illinois and the court system took the quardianship away from the State of Illinois to protect those residents. That is the check and balance of the probate. That is the check and balance of having a quardianship. It gets taken away in the court system by a court system, not by a group there. We believe that the parents and the loved ones should do this. When this was tried in the past the things that went on were very bad. It wasn't well thought of, people from out of state were brought in for training. And many of these residents may have the urges, but

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

they don't have the responsibility and they don't know how to take care and act upon those urges. So in this...

Davis: "Is there a... is there a question, Representative?"

Meier: "Yes. In this, who is responsible for what happens when these residents are shown how to have sex but they don't hold or have the mentality to know how? Who's responsible for that?"

Davis: "Well, you know what, since you brought up the Probate Act..."

Meier: "Yes, let's talk about Probate Act."

Davis: "...why don't I take a minute and read it? This particular Section says, 'decisions made by a guardian on behalf of the ward shall be made in accordance with the following standards for decision making. Decisions made by a guardian on behalf of a ward may be made by conforming as closely as possible to what the ward, if competent, would have done or intended under the circumstances taking into account evidence that includes, but is not limited to the ward's personal, philosophical, religious, and moral beliefs, and ethical values relative to the decision to be made by the guardian'."

Meier: "Okay. Can we discuss that? If ...

Davis: "Hold on, I'm not done. 'Where possible, the guardian shall determine how the ward would have made a decision based on the ward's previously expressed preferences and make decisions in accordance with the preferences of the ward. If the ward's wishes are unknown and remain unknown after reasonable efforts to discern them, the decision shall be made on the basis of the ward's best interest as determined by the guardian.' So again, the Probate Act suggests that at

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

the... the first effort is about what the ward, if they can say what they want, would want or based on a conversation about the ward. You want the guardian to be the final arbiter and I'm not questioning that, I'm simply saying that the Probate Act already spells out how that conversation goes and how those decisions are made. And again, if you want the guardian to have the ultimate say, then I'm suggesting that you change the Probate Act. And if you changed it, this Bill would follow the Probate Act."

Meier: "Mr. Davis, when we talk about the Probate Act, it's put in there to protect the resident, to protect the loved one."

Davis: "I just read it."

Meier: "So if we have a three-year-old, your child, and they wish to and they've been out in the yard with this red can and they've been throwing stuff out of it, running around because they wanted to and now they have a pack of matches and that was a can of gas, you're supposed to let them light that can of gas because they want to? Or are you as a proper guardian supposed to take those matches away even though you wish to do that or you wish to light those firecrackers off in your house, are you supposed to let them do that? Or do you as their legal guardian that you are responsible for them and what they're doing, do you go over there and take those matches away to stop that? That's what we're saying this Bill is. Many of these people are not capable of making that decision. We believe for those people, we're not saying all there is a big difference in disabilities from people who have the mentality of a six month old to being very functional. We are saying that the parents and guardians who

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

have been appointed by the courts in the State of Illinois have the right under the Probate Act whether to take that pack of matches away or whatever else it takes to protect that person. They need to be there at the table. They don't need a group of people there being able to override them because we've watched what's happened with that in the past. That's why the State of Illinois has lost guardianships, when they were they place of last resort and were given the guardianships, courts in this state had to take them away from the State of Illinois. So when you read the Probate Act, it says you are supposed to take care of them, you honor that Act. You try to do what you want... what that resident wants."

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

Meier: "That it's... you've got to have a little bit of reason. That's all the parents have ever asked for here. They're trying not to stop the Sex Ed Bill. I had a Sex Ed Bill out there also. It's the parents, guardians abide by their legal responsibilities because there will be a cost to this state, there will be a liabilities to this state if there are pregnancies or if there are sexually transmitted diseases because residents, even though they may have gone through sex ed training... think of a two or three year old going through training on how to have safe sex. They're not gonna be able to remember how to do it and the State of Illinois, who is guardians over these people, will become responsible for what happens to them or the other people."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Morgan."

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

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Morgan: "I only have a comment to the Bill. I just want to thank the Sponsor for working on this issue. I have a brother and a sister-in-law with special needs and the issue of education of those with developmental disabilities is one that none of us can really appreciate how difficult, how complicated, and how important it is to make sure we have education. The way that their bodies and their minds develop is something that we really can't appreciate and this is a really important topic and a really important initiative to make sure that we're providing as much education as we can. And I think... I really appreciate the Sponsor working on this. This is incredibly complicated, sensitive issue, and I really think it's important. So I really strongly support it and thank the Sponsor for putting it forth."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Caulkins: "Thank you for undertaking this. I spent 25 years on an IDT's. We owned group homes and CILAS, so I think have a little bit of experience in how this works. And I can tell you that if you allow an IDT, which I can give you exactly who belongs or who serves on an IDT, to make these decisions, you're liable to have a situation where the parents' wishes are not honored. And I think it is... first of all, our developmentally disabled citizens have a guardian for a reason. And that it is, if they can't make informed decisions on their own and they rely on their guardian, be it a parent, a brother, a sister, or someone that is appointed by the court

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

to help make those decisions for them. So I don't think... I guess I don't look at this Bill as being helpful. I don't think that the IDT should have the ability to override the rights of a guardian. And this is going to create more problems than it solves. I've sat through choice situations where people come in and talk to residents and try to discern their choice, you know, in a room without assistance. It never turns out well. I applaud you for going around and holding these hearings. I think it's important. I think there is a Bill out here that will address the needs of this type of sex education, but I think this is misplaced. And I don't think that we should, in any way, infringe on the right of the guardian to make the decision for their ward. And to the Bill, I urge you, please vote 'no'. Let's find a better way to do this."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Actually, first a question to the Speaker. Are we

on limited debate? Is there a timer right now?"

Speaker Burke: "There is not."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay, I believe that Representative Meier was cut off a little bit earlier and I wish that he would be allowed to speak again. But, question to the Sponsor. What... would you consider amending this? Because I've heard a lot of concerns about as opposed to... I think the goal of making sure the individual's not being molested and making sure that the individual knows, you know, time, and proper place, and things to do certain acts is the... is a good goal. My concern is,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

should we be teaching a 'how to' to some of these individuals? So the ultimate concern... and I know you're saying that the... this group, this task force, or whatever can decide, you know, what the individual can handle, but I think that you're gonna have a lot more 'how to' than you will otherwise. So I think that the guardian needs to be able to be involved and they need to be able to override certain things."

Davis: "Is that a question?"

Davidsmeyer: "Would you be willing to clarify or delete the 'how to' of the education?"

Davis: "Well, I don't... there is no 'how to' have sex in this Bill.

It's about providing materials to individuals. But we already have a process where these types of materials have to be vetted by our Department of Human Services. We aren't changing that process. So any materials that want to be used or brought forward still have to be vetted by the Department of Human Services."

Davidsmeyer: "So I believe we need to..."

Davis: "That's their ability to do so. So, if they felt that a material or materials were, and I'll use the term inappropriate, for whatever purpose they were going to be used, they have the right to say, no, those materials cannot be used. So again, this isn't just opening a door that anyone can bring in any materials and use any videos. No, this is not that. And I would expect that if a owner of a facility felt that the materials were... had not been going through the appropriate process that they would say something to make sure that the appropriate agency, which again is the Department of Human Services, looks at the materials to make

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

sure that they are appropriate. So I don't think this is a 'how to' in that respect."

Davidsmeyer: "So if the individual is running the program or whatever, the facility, if they said they don't believe that it's appropriate, even though this group told them that it's okay, are they allowed to say no?"

Davis: "What group?"

Davidsmeyer: "Let's say that were vetted by DHS and the individual running the facility said this is not ok for this individual."

Davis: "Well, but... so..."

Davidsmeyer: "Do they have ability to say no?"

Davis: "Does the facility have the ability to say no?"

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Davis: "I'm not sure if the facility does, but the facility can at least verify whether or not the materials have been vetted by the Department of Human Services."

Davidsmeyer: "So if it's going to cause more harm than good, because I've heard horror stories about them coming in teaching and saying... at state facilities, and I'm not sure how long ago this was, so I can't date it, but I've heard stories about somebody coming in, teaching sexual education, and the state employees are supposed to be there to ensure that nobody gets hurt in the process of sex. And that's not what we're trying to do, right? We want to make sure that these people are not being abused and they're not doing something inappropriate out in public."

Davis: "Well, part of why we're moving this measure is to make sure that individuals are educated enough to know when they might be being abused or someone is attempting to do something

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

to them that they shouldn't be. That they can say, no, no that's not appropriate. I mean, again, I know you didn't attend even the committee hearing that we had. Well, I think."

Davidsmeyer: "I was probably in another committee. So, yeah."

Davis: "Okay. You didn't attend the hearing that we had. And there was a young lady here in who lives here in Springfield that talked about how she had been abused by someone and wished that if, she felt that is information had been provided about what's appropriate, what's not appropriate, that she might have been able to stave off the abuse that she dealt with."

Davidsmeyer: "I think I agree with you on that. My point is for these individuals, I think that we should be looking at making sure that they know what constitutes abuse and the proper time and a place for the activity."

Davis: "And you don't think they are materials out there that do that already?"

Davidsmeyer: "To ensure... pardon me?"

Davis: "You don't think that there're materials out there that do that already?"

Davidsmeyer: "No, I think that it should strictly be that. It shouldn't be a 'how to'. I think this allows for 'how to' education on sex for the mentally disabled. And I don't know that it..."

Davis: "No. It provides sex education. Which would be the same type of sex education that could be in our schools. But it's about sex about given..."

Davidsmeyer: "But in your school..."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Davis: "...given at the appropriate level for an individual to learn and to understand about sexual expression, sex education, the abuse that you speaking of as well."
- Davidsmeyer: "As a parent, if my kids in school, as a parent I can opt them out, right? So you're saying the school is the basis for this but you're saying the guardian for this cannot?"
- Davis: "And the Probate Act explains how that relationship works.

 And it says that in situations where the wishes, for lack of a better word, of the individual are not known that the guardian is supposed to interpret that. And in certain situations..."
- Davidsmeyer: "So the guardian can opt..."
- Davis: "...the guardian, because we don't know the wishes of the individual, can say, no, I don't think that individual wants to have this information. It's already here."
- Davidsmeyer: "So you're telling me that the guardian, because of the Probate Act, the guardian will be allowed to opt their individual out?"
- Davis: "In determining the ward's best interest, the guardian shall weigh the reason for... the reason and nature for the proposed action, the benefit or the necessity of the action, the possible risk and other consequences of the proposed action, and the availability of alternatives and their risks, consequences, and benefits. And shall take into account any other information, including the family views, the views of family and friends that the guardian believes the ward would have considered if able to act for him or herself. And again, where possible, the guardian shall determine how the ward

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

would have made decisions on the ward's previously expressed preferences and make decisions in accordance with the preferences of the ward. If the ward's wishes are unknown and remain unknown after reasonable efforts to discern them, the decision shall be made on the basis of the ward's best interest as determined by the guardian. By the guardian. I'm reading straight from the Act, by the guardian."

Davidsmeyer: "You're reading from the Probate Act but your Bill says that if the treatment team does not agree with the guardian they can override the guardian. So it actually overrides the Probate Act."

Davis: "And if the guardian... no, the Probate Act determines."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, it does."

Davis: "And if the guardian... listen... listen, if the guardian feels that the treatment acted... did not act in the best of the interest of the ward, of course the guardian can say, you know what, I don't think this facility is a good place for the individual to be at and can go somewhere else. I mean, we're not... see the thing is we're not changing..."

Davidsmeyer: "In your Bill..."

Davis: "...we're not changing the ability of the guardian to step in. We're not changing that because we're not changing the Probate Act. And in any current situation under other circumstances, other than dealing with sex education, if the treatment team suggests something and the guardian feels that it's inappropriate, they can act in the same manner and say, you know what, this is not a good place for us to be and then we can seek to move somewhere else. Again, the Probate Act dictates that."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Davidsmeyer: "I agree. So, I'm gonna read this little piece from the Probate Act. 'If the ward's wishes are unknown and remain unknown after reasonable efforts to discern them, the decision shall be made on the basis of the ward's best interests as determined by the guardian.' But your Bill says opposite of this. Your Bill says that the treatment team can override the guardian. Your Bill says that."
- Davis: "The treatment team can already do those kinds of things.

 So again, we're following..."
- Davidsmeyer: "According to what according to what current law can they do that?"
- Davis: "We're following... we're following what already exists. So again. Under other circumstances other than..."
- Davidsmeyer: "But the Probate, you keep bringing up the Probate Law. The probate does not allow the treatment team to override the guardian. It says right here that the guardian determines what's in the best interest."
- Davis: "Can do what's in the best interest. And again, if... if the guardian feels that the treatment team is not acting in the child's best interest or the individuals best interest they already have a mechanism in terms of what they can do. We're not changing any of that. We're not changing any any other circumstance that may exist in that situation. We're not changing any of that."
- Davidsmeyer: "So the guardian can override the treatment team is what you're telling me?"
- Davis: "The guardian can make a decision whether or not what the treatment team wants is in the best interest of the individual and then they have the ability to act accordingly. So again,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

from what I understand, under current situations the guardian can say, this treatment team does not have my individual's, my child, my brother, my sister, my ward's best interest. And then they already have the ability to make various decisions. We're not changing any of that."

Davidsmeyer: "So if... if the guardian makes the decision that this is not the right thing for them, they would have to move them to a different facility to get a different treatment team?"

Davis: "Excuse me?"

Davidsmeyer: "They would have to move them to a different facility to get a different treatment team, correct?"

Davis: "I think that's an option that they already have."

Davidsmeyer: "I mean, but..."

Davis: "They already have that."

Davidsmeyer: They can't override the treatment team."

Davis: "They already have that. Again, take this issue away and put another issue on the table. Whatever that relationship is how it works is already how it works. We are not changing any of how the relationship between the ward, the treatment team, and the guardian. It already works. We're not changing any of that. So again, I know you wanna focus on this issue because it's that kind of issue..."

Davidsmeyer: "It's important."

Davis: "...but again, talk about any other thing that the three groups have to decide on and if the treatment team is going something that the guardian feels is not in the ward's best interest, they can already make decisions. We are not changing that."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Davidsmeyer: "So, who has the ultimate say on whether individual is required to take sexual education?"
- Davis: "What do you mean required? We... it's required that it be provided but this conversation ultimately determines whether or not it happens, whether or not it takes place."
- Davidsmeyer: "So who hast the ultimate decision?"
- Davis: "And again, I know you wanna focus on the fact that we're talking about sexual education, but take this out."
- Davidsmeyer: "That's what the Bill's about. That's why I'm focusing on that. Obviously I am gonna focus on that."
- Davis: "And so again, if you looked under any other circumstances that... that conversation... a conversation, excuse me... a conversation has to take place on behalf of the ward, the guardian, the treatment team, and the ward, as dictated by the Probate Act, determines how the conversation goes. And any other circumstance..."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I'm not trying to rehash this."
- Davis: "...if the treatment team is not acting, the guardian feels the treatment team doesn't act in the ward's best interest, they have the ability to make certain decisions."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, ultimately, this is a yes or no question, ultimately the guardian has the opportunity to decide what's best for that individual? Not the treatment team?"
- Davis: "Would you like me to read the Probate Act again? You just read the section of the Probate Act. You just read it."
- Davidsmeyer: "So it says the guardian. So all you have to do is say yes."
- Davis: "You just read it."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative. Excuse me, Representative."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Davis: "You just read what the Probate Act dictates."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm trying to get an answer."

Speaker Burke: "We're trying to be respectful of your ability to debate, but there are four additional people who are seeking recognition and we do have committees. So if you could succinctly wrap up your questioning it would be greatly appreciated."

Davidsmeyer: "So the Probate... does the Probate Act say that the guardian makes the ultimate decision? I don't want you to read it to me, I just want a yes or no. And ask the staff member behind you if that's their understanding, please."

Davis: "So, repeat the question, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "So, does the Probate Act say that the guardian has the final decision?"

Davis: "Again, I don't think there's a yes or no question to that...
answer to that."

Davidsmeyer: "So it's up in the air."

Davis: "Again, if the decision shall be made on the basis of the ward's best interest as determined by the guardian. I just read a piece of it. By the guardian. I'm just reading the Probate Act. Our Bill follows the Probate Act."

Davidsmeyer: "So we don't have a legal opinion on that?" I know we all have a ton of lawyers running around here. Eventually you'd think one of these lawyers would come chime in and say, this is what the Probate Act says."

Davis: "But to your... but to your point, if you feel that the interpretation of the Probate Act is different, then that's your interpretation of it."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Davidsmeyer: "You're the one running the Bill so I'm asking your interpretation and what the intent of this legislation is. Is the intent to take away the authority of the guardian? Or is the intent to have the guardian have the ultimate authority to make decisions for their, basically their child, their ward?"

Davis: "Would you like me to read it again, Representative?"

Davidsmeyer: "No."

Davis: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "I want to... I'm asking your intent, not what the Probate Act says. What's your intent?"

Davis: "It's the Probate Act. It's the Probate Act."

Davidsmeyer: "To the Bill. I don't think... I don't think there's any reasonable understanding of what's going on here. I wish that we could pull this from the record and have further discussion so we could actually get a better understanding. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to yield my time to Representative Meier."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier. And, Representative Meier,

I know you'd like to speak on this, but please be mindful of
the Members time and the fact that we have committees still
to go."

Meier: "I will be. I'm very mindful. But when people's lives are at risk, I think it's worth taking the time, especially our most vulnerable in the State of Illinois. Now twice in the committees that we've had this year I've heard the statement from Mr. Davis, Representative Davis, that you may have the

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

mentality of a two-year-old, but your body has urges. So, which one of these... where are you gonna side on this? You've never given us an answer. Do the urges and the committee override or does the guardianship and the probate override on what a person with the mentality of a two-year-old should do? I would like the answer to that."

Davis: "You're saying should the urges... so my statement was just acknowledging something that already happens. And the idea is again to be able to provide age appropriate sexual education materials to individuals. Maybe to even help them understand what their bodies are going through and the changes that their body are undertaking. So, so what you stated, in part, is some of the rationale for why we even wanna move in this direction."

Meier: "I still haven't heard the answer on where the team is going to stand, on the urges or on the mentality of a two-year-old? Because, you know, I hear about this team, but I think we can go back into the past of the state because of the way things were done. You had a person who testified in committee about how terrible the facility was she was in. That facility's been closed for 37 years. So I'm gonna go back and talk to her about her transition teams put together by the State of Illinois when residents were being moved. They didn't even take into affect that their wheelchairs wouldn't fit down the hallways of residence they were being moved in. They didn't take in affect that the fact that they were on pick up restrictions and they needed a one on one and people died. So these teams scare us. That's why our guardians fight so hard for their loved ones. We just wanna know the

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

answers, you know, to the probate case, to the court hearings. Will the Probate Law stand? Will the teams ruling over the parents that they decide stand? I don't believe a guardian or a parent should have to go have to go back to override this team. I believe that the Probate Act states that that guardian and parent has the right over this team who's doing this. We're not against education. We believe it's a good thing. It's going on in our facilities already. We want to have everybody as safe and healthy as we can but we do question the guardianships rights, the parents' rights. We have to be careful here. I want an answer on the two-year-old or on the 25-year-old body. And I want an answer for sure that the guardianship will stand with the Probate Act over this transition team if that's what they believe is best for that loved one."

Davis: "So again, with regard to the statement you made about urges, that's not a... my answer to that question was again, that is the premise by which this type of discussion is ensuing. This is, this is why we're having this conversation. So there's no question to answer there. For me that's the basis of why we even want to try to have this discussion, is because those things take place. Even people who support your position have talked about situations like that where their own individual, their own child is at a certain age in terms of their development, but recognize that they're, you know, they're the age of an adult and that these are the types of things that happen. They've even acknowledged that. So again, there's no question to answer there. I'm giving you the answer that the reason why we even consider doing this, part of the

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

reason why we consider doing this is for those reasons. So that's the premise. That's the basis under which we even seek to have such a conversation. And again, the Probate Act. Your people, the people that support you want to change the Probate Act to make the guardian paramount in this discussion. If that's what they want to do and if that's what you want to do, then all I can do is encourage you try to do it. Our Bill follows the Probate Act, as I've read several times. And the Probate Act speaks to how the relationship works with the quardian. Now treatment teams, you mentioned those, they've been in existence. We aren't recreating the wheel by saying we are creating treatment teams, they already exist. And as a relationship that already exists between the treatment team, the guardian, and the ward. Again, we're not changing any of that relationship that already exists, but if your supporters feel that there needs to be a change in how that relationship works, then that's what you should do. But that's not this Bill. It's not."

Meier: "To the Bill. We stand on the Probate Act and the legality it gives our guardians, our parents, our loved ones. This is Illinois Law. We stand on that. It states in here, the transition team or the team working on this should not be able to override them unless they determine that that guardian is not a fit guardian and then they should be the ones to take them back to court and move forward. This Bill... we're not against sex ed. It goes on in all of our facilities already. The residents that are capable have what they need. What we have a problem with is that people other than the guardian have the final say. If you take that one little line

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

out of there and live by the Illinois Guardianship, there wouldn't be no opposition here. Thank you everybody for their time and have a good day."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Should this reach the prerequisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Burke: "Members, a verification has been requested. Please be in your seats. Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Bryant: "Thank you. I'll keep my remarks relatively short. So, I want to thank Representative Davis for doing what he mentioned, which was doing subject matter hearings in several areas of the state, including in Marion. But after that hearing none of the recommendations that were offered at the hearing were made a part of this Bill. So, I think we can boil this down to just a couple things. First of all, the Probate Act has been read several times. It's very clear in the Probate Act that the guardians have the say, the final say on what gets done with these individuals. Representative Davis' Bill says that the interdisciplinary team can override the quardians, which is in conflict with what the Probate Act says. So, but the problem is that if the interdisciplinary team overrides the quardian the courts still say that the guardians have responsibility. So we could actually be placing the guardians in a position where a team of individuals has overridden their right, and then we... then the courts hold the quardian responsible. Beyond that, you said that the guardian has the opportunity to move that individual.

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

I would hate to think that that's what it would come down to because with the PUNS list, we know that there are thousands that are waiting just for placement alone. So we could force a guardian into saying, I don't want my loved one to live here anymore because the interdisciplinary team is not following what I want them to do and now my only option is to try to get them moved, but there's no place for them to move. So this is not a bad concept, it's just that you cannot override what the guardians say. And even though we're saying we're going to follow the Probate Act, this Bill does try to override what the guardians say even though they're still held accountable. I urge an 'aye'... a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Kalish: "I just want to thank you for bringing this Bill. When we heard this in committee we discussed a lot of these issues. I thought that you had done a great job, Mr. Chairman... Leader Davis in listening to all sides working on this for a number of years to get a good piece of legislation. That's why I signed on as a chief-co. And I urge all of my colleagues to vote 'aye', to vote 'yes'. Thank you.

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Willis: "Leader Davis, in this Bill are you asking them to teach

a 'how to' on sex?"

Davis: "Absolutely not."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Willis: "Are we looking more at preventative or basic education?

Is that what we're trying to do here?"

Davis: "Basic sex education."

Willis: "Okay. So our whole idea is that so that we don't have...
and I think we've all heard of scenarios where people have
been sexually abused at facilities, taken advantage of, not
necessarily knowing what's going on, how to say 'no'. Is that
what part of this education process will be also?"

Davis: "Absolutely."

Willis: "Okay. And so, we're... you know, just because you are developmentally disabled doesn't mean that you cannot have sex or get pregnant or get a sexually transmitted disease, correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Willis: "So, so we're looking at the overall health benefits of having developmentally appropriate discussions about sexuality and sex education, correct?"

Davis: "Yes, correct."

Willis: "Okay. So what would be, in your opinion, try to take a step back and look at... we've heard very long from the opponents on this, and what would you say is there any basis in anything that they're saying that would make sense or want you to have to change this Bill in any way? That you haven't already done because I know you've done a lot of work on this Bill already."

Davis: "Well we certainly have and the lady from Southern Illinois said that we never, that we didn't take any of the suggestions under consideration, and that would be absolutely wrong because the Bill we filed last year is different than the

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Bill that was recently filed. So there were changes made based on some of the commentary that we heard from the meetings. Like for instance, making a specific reference to the Probate Act that dictates how this relationship works and how this conversation ultimately comes together."

Willis: "So, her... and I think we heard it from a number of people, their concerns that the legal guardian of the person with disabilities would not be consulted is totally false, correct?"

Davis: "Absolutely false."

Willis: "So they have... they're the first line and if they choose or if they say I do not want my son or daughter or my brother or sister to be given any sexual education material or having any discussion to them, your Bill will not supersede that, correct?"

Davis: "Yes, there's nothing overriding that."

Willis: "So, if I am a guardian and I say no, even though we know that people with developmental disabilities understand a heck of a lot more than we give them credit to and certainly have sexual urges and explore their sexuality, there is nothing in this Bill that says we're going to override that and teach them about sex ed, or put them on birth control, or teach them how to take care of themselves sexually, correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Willis: "Okay. So we're... so we are totally protecting the rights of the guardian, but on that same token, is it not correct that in many facilities the state is the guardian?"

Davis: "I'm sorry, Representative, can you repeat that? I'm sorry, can you repeat that please?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Willis: "I said, is it not correct in many facilities the state is the official guardian of people with disabilities?"

Davis: "In many circumstances it is."

Willis: "So they have nobody else. And so we are their parents. And I think that everybody... and to the Bill. I think there is everybody here on the floor, as a responsible parent at one time or other has had to have that sex talk with their child. And sometimes it's uncomfortable, but we have to do it because that is our responsibility as that parent. And we need to do that. We do not necessarily have to give them a 'how to', but we need to explain the responsibilities of sexuality and what we can do with that. We, as the State of Illinois, being quardians of many people with developmental disabilities, we have a responsibility to make sure that they too get the age appropriate sexual information that they need. It is in their best health interest. It is also in the best interest of the state. We want to make sure that somebody that's in a home doesn't get abused because they don't understand the difference between good talk... good touch and bad touch. And they only can do that if they understand where the no zones are and understand what it means to have a physical contact. So I would urge everybody to step out of that comfort zone that many of us have, take that step forward, and realize that we are the parents, we are the quardians of many people with developmental disability and we owe it to them to make sure that we protect them the best ways ever. I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please excuse Representative Mazzochi for the rest of the day."

Speaker Burke: "Thank you. Representative Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Caulkins."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates that he will."

Caulkins: "Thank you. We just listened to a very impassioned plea about the need to present this information to the individual and I don't think anyone... I don't think anyone denies the fact that that information should be made available. I think the crux of this debate is should the guardian be the person to make that final decision? Should the guardian have the ability to say, I don't want my ward to go through that process and have that wish honored? And your Bill makes that an IDT decision could easily override the guardian. The guardian has the ability to tell a physician I don't want my ward's drug regiment changed. Why shouldn't the guardian have the ultimate decision to override the IDT if there's people on the team that think they know better?"

Davis: "Is that a question?"

Caulkins: "Yes, Sir."

Davis: "Okay. So again, and I'll hold up this little piece of paper again."

Caulkins: "I understand the piece of paper."

Davis: "But you're... I'm answering your question. The Probate Act already suggests how that should happen. Now, again, if you

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

and others on your side or that may be opposed to this feel that the guardian should have the ultimate say, I'm not trying to debate that with you. Again, the Probate Act can be changed. And you can file a Bill to change it to say that in whatever circumstance you want, desire that the ultimate authority, and however you want to word it, rides with the guardian, should be as such. The Probate Act, as I read it, doesn't give the guardian necessarily that ultimate authority, but it says that with, working with..."

Caulkins: "I understand."

Davis: "...and understanding what the interest of the ward is that the guardian does have a right to be a part of the discussion and to offer whatever commentary they deem necessary. Our Bill, and we specifically put that in the Bill from the first version, to suggest that this is what we follow is the Probate Act."

Caulkins: "Do you... Sir, do you believe that the guardian should have the ultimate decision making process for their ward in all cases?"

Davis: "I think that's a... I think that's a question to be discussed, whether or not."

Caulkins: "Well that's what we're sitting here discussing."

Davis: "Well I'm telling you it's the Probate Act and you want to change the Probate Act."

Caulkins: "No, Sir, you want to change the Probate Act."

Davis: "No. Our Bill specifically references the use of the Probate Act. I'm sure the young man to your right will tell you where we reference the Probate Act. I'm sure he can tell you that. That's what governs us. And again, like I was

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

sharing with the other Representative, take this issue off the table. You... whatever the however it works currently, we're not changing how those situations work. So again, you, I believe, just mentioned or said that you own these types of facilities, correct?"

Caulkins: "I ran... I owned and ran for 25 years."

Davis: "Okay, you've ran them."

Caulkins: "I owned them and ran them."

Davis: "So you know how that relationship works. You know how the Probate Act is involved in that decision making process. We aren't changing that. This Bill does not change that."

Caulkins: "But what you're talking about in your Bill, Sir, is that the IDT, the interdisciplinary team, can make a decision without the consent of the guardian as result or as it pertains to sex education."

Davis: "No, I don't think we're saying without the consent of the guardian. Maybe you got that part wrong. The guardian is a part of the discussion."

Caulkins: "I understand."

Davis: "Okay, you just said without the guardian. That's what you just said. Without the guardian and that's not what this Bill does."

Caulkins: "I said override."

Davis: "No, you said without. You said without the guardian. So are you?"

Caulkins: "Let me restate this then."

Davis: "Please."

Caulkins: "Your Bill says the IDT can override the wishes of the guardian as it pertains to sex education."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Davis: "The Bill, unless you're reading some language that I don't have, this young lady to my left here is telling that the Bill does not say that. Unless you're reading some language that we don't have."
- Caulkins: "Your Bill, Sir, says, shall be determined by the treatment team, the IDT."
- Davis: "Which the guardian is part of the team."
- Caulkins: "But the guardian or any member of that team can descent... right?"
- Davis: "Okay. And again, as you said you know... again I wish you could put this in a context outside of this particular issue.

 And how... how does it already happen?"
- Caulkins: "No, Sir, we're not..."
- Davis: "You said that you've run the facilities. Tell us how it happens. Tell us how it already happens."
- Caulkins: "How does it... it happens just the way the Probate Act says, and the guardian has the ultimate say, as a part of the IDT."
- Davis: "The Probate Act... the Probate Act says in conjunction with the guardian if the wishes of the individual are not known or can't be discerned. That's what I read in the Probate Act. So if you're talking about those situations, yes. But in the situations where the individual does have some decision making capacity then what's paramount is supposed to be the wishes of the ward. I can read it to you again if you like. And it says it right here."

Caulkins: "I understand."

Davis: "Not making it up."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Caulkins: "But the ward is a ward for a reason. And that is that they have been judged incompetent to represent themselves."
- Davis: "So they're incompetent? So you're saying wards have no ability to make any decisions on their own? You just called them incompetent?"
- Caulkins: "That's how you get a guardian. You are unable to take care of yourself. That's why you have a..."
- Davis: "But does that mean they're incompetent? Are you sure you want to stay right there? That the ward is incompetent."
- Caulkins: "I will say that. That's why they have a guardian."
- Davis: "No, well maybe somebody else your side can explain. I don't think that's why they have a guardian because they're incompetent."
- Caulkins: "Why do you think the individual has a guardian?"
- Davis: "I don't think it's because they're incompetent. They may need help."
- Caulkins: "They're incompetent to make decisions on their own."
- Davis: "They may need help. They may need help. They may need someone to help them with whatever decisions they make. But not because they're incompetent. Are you sure you want to stay right there?"
- Caulkins: "I just said it."
- Davis: "Okay.
- Caulkins: "That's how you get a guardian. Do you not understand how you go to court and get to be a guardian? That's the only way."
- Davis: "Oh, okay. So my colleague here just said that... so when you say incompetent you're not... why don't you explain to me

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

when you say incompetent? Maybe you can help me to understand what you mean by incompetent?"

Caulkins: "It's a legal definition."

Davis: "But what does it mean? What's the legal definition?"

Caulkins: "It means that the individual is not judged able to make those make decisions for themselves on how their affairs are conducted."

Davis: "Make decisions on their own, correct?"

Caulkins: "On how there... yes, I mean that's why. They are developmentally disabled. And yeah we are. And I guess I go back to this, we talk about offering this type of information. It is offered. There are other ways to do it. I just think that the Bill that you're offering us here today takes away from the guardian their ability to make the final decision. And that's what I object to."

Davis: "Okay. Well obviously you are welcomed to your interpretation. That's certainly not how... that's certainly not..."

Caulkins: "It may not be."

Davis: "Again, the Probate Act suggests how that relationship works. Again, if that's your interpretation, I can't argue with you if that's how you interpret the Bill."

Caulkins: "No, it's not. It's how it's written, it's not how it's interpreted. It's exactly how it's written, Sir.

Davis: "Guardians are a part of those treatment teams, Sir."

Caulkins: "I understand that."

Davis: "They are a part of it."

Caulkins: "I've sat in... I've sat on them for 25 years."

Davis: "Okay, then you understand."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Caulkins: "I understand the guardian is a part."

Davis: "Then you understand. So again, we're not changing how that relationship works. So in your 25 years..."

Caulkins: "You are, Sir."

Davis: "...if the guardian said no, then what?"

Caulkins: "I didn't hear that?"

Davis: "In your 25 years, if the quardian said no, then what?"

Caulkins: "Then another way is found."

Davis: "I'm sorry?"

Caulkins: "Then the IDT must work around that. In either convince the guardian that it should be different."

Davis: "Okay."

Caulkins: "Or they honor the wishes of the guardian and find a different..."

Davis: "Okay. And you're saying that the treatment team can honor the wishes of the guardian now?"

Caulkins: "That's not what your Bill says. You're Bill says that the..."

Davis: "We aren't changing the relationship."

Caulkins: "You are changing the relationship."

Davis: "We are not changing the relationship, Sir."

Caulkins: "Your Bill clearly states, Sir, that the IDT, which the guardian is a part of, makes the decision. It takes away the final say, the final say of the guardian. You're allowing a team of people to override the guardian. That's... I'm reading it, I've lived it, and I'm telling you that is a bad idea."

Davis: "You're saying the word override is in the Bill?"

Caulkins: "You are overriding, they have the ability."

Davis: "The word override is in the Bill?"

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Caulkins: "I'm reading your Bill, Sir. It says that..."

Davis: "I'm just... you said override. I'm asking you is the word override, you said, I'm reading it and you said override. So is override in the Bill?"

Caulkins: "I appreciate you not playing semantic games."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins, please in the interest of moving on with the rest of our business, can you bring your questions to a close?"

Caulkins: "I... again, to the Bill. This Bill is bad. It is bad for guardians. It does nothing to promote the sexual education of developmentally disabled adults and we have better ways to do it, it's already being done. And to infringe on the rights of the guardian is wrong and will create more problems that it solves. And I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Burke: "For final comments, Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A quick question. Will, this has been a long debate and I know that many things have ben said, but when the lady from Addison asked you a question about who has the final say, you specifically said the guardian had the final say. But at other points in the discussion you've said the team can override the guardian. Can you tell me definitively which it is? Somebody's gotta be able to have the final say. Is it the guardian or is it the team's ability to override the guardian?"

Davis: "So again, the guardian is a part of the team. So they're supposed to try to come together to try to ultimately determine what is in the best interest of the ward. And again, if the guardian is somehow disapproving, they have options that they can exercise and that's currently the way things

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

are. Currently, if a guardian does not approve of what the treatment team says, they have the ability to make certain choices now. And we're not changing what they can already do relative to the ward that they are trying to act in the best interest of."

Reick: "So basically what you're saying is the guardian does not have the last say. Is that what you're telling us?"

Davis: "Would you like me to read the Probate Act to you again that talks about..."

Reick: "No, that's fine, Will."

Davis: "...the relationship what the ward has when... the guardian has when the ward's cannot make the decisions on their own then the ward... excuse me, the guardian can step in. But when the ward does have the ability, does have some decision making capacity what should be paramount is what the desire of the ward is. That's the way it's been. We are not changing that."

Reick: "To the Bill. Finally, I will say that if this Bill goes into law it will override the Probate Act. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Skillicorn has requested a verification. Representative Davis to close please."

Davis: "Well, I appreciate the comments. How incorrect some of them may have been, what they're characterizing here. Again, what can currently happen in the relationship between a treatment team and a ward, we're not changing how that works. Again, I feel strongly that individuals on the other side of the aisle want the guardian to have the ultimate say. And if that's what they desire then they need to change the Probate Act to give the guardian that ultimate say. The Probate Act

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

dictates how the relationship works and how it all comes together. This is the ultimate say. Again, if they want to change it so that the guardian has the ultimate say then they should do so. And they are welcome to file a Bill in order to make that happen but that's not what we're attempting to do here. If anybody questions the need for this then I encourage you to have a conversation with the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, whose responsibility is to look into these kind of claims. They can share with you the stories of why having this type of effort is necessary about providing appropriate sexual education materials to wards who are encountering a variety of situations. And I've got data here that I could read, but certainly, if anybody questions I encourage you, come to a Guardianship and Advocacy Commission meeting. Have conversation with the Director of the Human Rights Authority. Have a conversation with that individual, with Theresa Parks and she can tell you specifically the situations that she's been made aware of and why this type of effort is necessary, even including the fact that she herself is a guardian of a ward and why she feels that having this is necessary. So again, while I appreciate the comments that were made, particularly from the other side of the aisle, we feel that this is a viable Bill and it's necessary to have this. And I certainly ask for a 'yes' vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Skillicorn has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3299 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The

32nd Legislative Day

Skillicorn: "Withdraw."

3/27/2019

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'in favor', 42 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

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

Representative Ammons, Representative Andrade,

Representative Arroyo, Representative Buckner,

Representative Burke, Representative Carroll, Representative

Cassidy, Representative Connor, Representative Conroy,

Representative Conyears-Ervin, Representative Crespo,

Representative D'Amico, Representative Davis, Representative

DeLuca, Representative Didech."

Speaker Burke: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Skillicorn, do you wish to withdraw your request for verification?"

Speaker Burke: "On this question, there are 68 voting 'in favor', 42 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Page 23 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions we have House Resolution 215 offered by Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 215, offered by Representative Mayfield and Hammond. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FORST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS that all women residing in skilled nursing facilities in Illinois should be honored for their life long service to their families and communities."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. Today we celebrate the many Women of Wisdom who live in Illinois nursing homes. By honoring these elderly women, many or more... by honoring these elderly women, we acknowledge that they have lived their lives with boundless spirit, courage, and commitment. They are some of the oldest women living in Illinois. Many of them are more than a hundred years old. They raised their family, they served in the military, they were farmers and factory workers, they lived through the Great Depression. These Women of Wisdom had a which... a rich history. They made our great state what it is today. Unfortunately, these women are often forgotten because they live in nursing homes and their friends and families have passed on before them. Most of you should have received stories about a Woman of Wisdom in your area. I encourage you to read these stories and to learn about these courageous women. Whether their courage was on the battlefield, fighting to make their neighborhoods safer or struggling to get their children the education and health care that they needed, they have great stories to tell. These are the stories of our history. Please join me in honoring their commitment and contributions to our great state by adopting House Resolution 215. And I ask for leave so that all Members can be added as cosponsors. And if you did not receive a pin with a Woman of Wisdom please let me know. And I know there are others who may want to speak on this as well, but thank you so much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hammond."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I join my colleague, Representative Mayfield, in House Resolution 215. As we celebrate the many Women of Wisdom who live here in Illinois in our long term care facilities. Over 60 percent of the long term facility residents are women. Women who have done much for our state and for us. Today we honor the Women of Wisdom for their contributions and their life accomplishments, no matter how big or how small. They have earned the right to be honored, cared for, and most of all, protected. The State of Illinois owes these Women of Wisdom the very best care that we can provide as these women must now look to the younger generations, yes us, to care for them. Please join me in supporting House Resolution 215."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Jones, do you wish to speak on the Resolution?"

Jones: "Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you. I also join my colleague in not only having women of distinction in my district, but I would also like to take this up further and mention them by name because not only have members of my family who are nurses worked in many of these nursing homes, but they've also cared for my aunt who lived in one of these nursing homes who passed away. These women not only have contributed to our society, but they're also integral in the lives of members who live in my district. Eleanor, who's at the Villa in South Holland, who's 105 years old. And we also have... if my phone can corporate... we have Thelma, who lives in a rehab in Glenwood who's 98 years old. And we also have Mrs. Bay who lives in Aperion Care in Dolton, and that is representative of my district and also Representative Davis' district. But these

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

women have shown that they're integral in our community and I'm proud to stand here today in support of House Resolution 215."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Arroyo, do you wish to speak on the Resolution?"

Arroyo: "Yes, I do, Chairman... Chairwoman. I also stand in support of House Resolution 215. Myself and Camille Lily, on behalf of Julia, she's in Generations at Elmwood Park Elementary. This Puerto Rican woman happens to be 101 years old. So I want to talk a little bit about Julia. Julia was born in 1917, raised in Puerto Rico. She decided to come to the United States at age 29 years of age. As a child she loved and expected to participate in the state things that did her. She loves... she loved it when she took her dancing classes in order to facilitate. Julia has two sons that she is very proud of and she thought that they would expect others to finish school. Her oldest child graduated from college. Julia volunteered as a babysitter and cleaned houses when she first came to Chicago. Her family appreciated help for Julia presented... represented and her did not go in her vain. Julia worked at two cleaning stores. One store worked for 10 years. She left the clothing store and worked at another clothing store where way later she retired at age 63 years of age. The work Julia had done throughout her life would always be noticed. She worked and did everything she could to make her life for herself and her family. Today Julia resides at Generations at Elmwood Park at age 101 years old. We feel honored to have her here. She loves to attend and her peers

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

to have good heart. Thanks everybody for supporting Julia and the Women of Wisdom today."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I join the rest of my colleagues with honoring Women of Wisdom in our district. I am proud to represent Alden of Waterford in Aurora that has two distinguished women I will briefly engage the Body with. Dorothy is 92 years old. In 1949, she graduated from the School of Nursing and the interesting thing is that she trained in the Polo Unit and she was required to pump the iron lung machine by foot for four hours every day. So if that doesn't give you an idea of what this woman has seen progressing in our medical industry I don't know what else will, but a foot pump iron lung is what she had to work on. In addition to that, Helen is 90 years old and she was a long time school teacher educating our youth and volunteering in the community. And again, I am honored to recognize these distinct women from my district."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you. I, too, would like to speak on the Women of Wisdom. And in doing so, I want to mention my mother's name, Lula Mary Flowers. But I'm here, today, to also give honor to Miss Georgia. Georgia was born in 1925 in Arkansas. And as a little girl, she worked in the cotton fields. Eventually, she and her family moved to Chicago in 1940. She raised four sons. And Georgia is an amazing woman who always share her positive vibes with others and provide words of wisdom. She enjoys listening to music and singing. She also tells many stories about her childhood growing up in the south and in the booming

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

metropolis of the City of Chicago. And so I would take this honor... this opportunity to honor Miss Georgia. And she is at Forest Edge in Chicago and she's 93 years old. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you. I'd like to honor my Woman of Wisdom from my district. Her name is Vern. She's 96 years old and she lives in Symphony of Buffalo Grove. She's a graduate of Northwestern Business College. After her education, she worked for many years as a secretary at various businesses as well as St. Mary's Catholic Church where she has been a parishioner for over 40 years. Vern worked as a realtor in the northwestern suburbs and helped many families into their new homes. She also taught her children the value of volunteering. As a family, they volunteered at their church and for Meals on Wheels. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Severin."

Severin: "Thank you. I would be remised if I didn't speak on this issue. I had the privilege of growing up on an, the home that I lived in, my 8 brothers and sisters on 30 acres. We had intermediate... an intermediate care facility. I've been here three years, I'm still nervous, that tells me I'm doing all right. But very important, we had 96 residents. We had 66 women and I grew up around those ladies, our nursing home was 30 acres. And I tell you what, I want to say this to you, I don't have a person's name, I could start naming women off to you from the time I was 6 years old to... for about 30 years when I worked at the nursing home there. But I want to challenge every one of you in this room. We're all busy, we all think we know what we're doing, we got a lot going on,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

but I challenge every one of you, you have an intermediate care facility, a shelter care home, an ED facility close to you where you live, stop by, stop in for 5 or 10 minutes. And here's what's gonna happen, you're gonna end up staying about an hour maybe two hours. You may even take someone under your wing and become a friend with them and they'll become a family member. So I challenge you to do that. And these Women of Wisdom, they're the ones that are the backbones of America today and I appreciate that. My mother was one of those. My mother and father ran the nursing home and they were perfectionists, the place was amazing, you could eat off the floors. And the Women of Wisdom that were in that facility, and they're in that facility today, there because where we're at today, we have the opportunities because they did what they were supposed to do as Women of Wisdom. So I challenge you today, and I'll stop here, is that sometime in the next week or two, stop in one of those nursing homes, shelter care homes, just stop in and say hello and you'll figure out what life's all about. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield moves for the adoption of House Resolution 215. All Members will be added as cosponsors. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Andrade: "Madam Speaker, I just want to say thank you very much.

I know it's a long day, but thank you for allowing us to call
a lot of Bills today. We got a lot of work done. I think

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

people probably prefer getting their Bills done now before alphabetical order and instead of being here Friday until 6:00. So thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Rita, for what reason do you rise?"
Rita: "Point of personal privilege. I'd like to introduce my Page
for the day who's from a kindergartener from St. Michael's in
Orland Park, my granddaughter, Elaine Kuhn."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Villanueva, for what reason do you rise?"

Villanueva: "I'd like to update the record and show that my vote for House Bill 2628 is a 'yes' vote. I hit the wrong button."

Speaker Burke: "The record will reflect. Representative Ammons, for what reason do you rise?"

Ammons: "Point of personal privilege please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam. I just wanted to remind the Members of the U of I Caucus and the Higher Education Committee that we will be hosting the dinner with U of I tonight at Loukinens and hopefully we'll be on time at 6:30. So any Members who are interested in joining us for the U of I Caucus and the Higher Education Committee, you can meet us at Loukinens at 6:30 this evening."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Costa Howard, for what reason do you rise?"

Costa Howard: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Costa Howard: "I... many of you have seen a group of young men around the Capitol the past two days. I'd like to thank all of you for indulging them in their video and interview skills.

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

One of them is my nephew, Joseph Valliquette who is on the floor today as a Page and his friend Ricky, was also with him. They are both students in Representative Villa's district, but they are also proud, soon to be, graduates of the civics programs that you all have approved time and time again. And I want to thank you because you have done a wonderful job in that program. And thank you, Representative Conroy."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Manley, for what reason do you rise?"

"In following so many people this month for Women's Manlev: History Month and also a woman of great wisdom, you're gonna love this you guys. The woman I'm honoring today is Hillary Diane Rodham Clinton. She's an American politician, diplomate, lawyer, writer, and public speaker. When she was elected to the U.S. Senate in 2001, she became the First American, First Lady ever to win a public office seat. In 2009, she became the 67th U.S. Secretary of State, which was my favorite role she played, serving until 2013. In 2016, she became the first woman in U.S. history to become the Presidential nominee of the Democratic Party. Clinton was born in Chicago on October 26, 1947 where she was raised in the Chicago suburb of Park Ridge. After graduating high school, Clinton attended Wesley College, where she became more involved with social justice activism. She became a prominent student leader and she was elected by her peers to be the first ever student speaker at the commencement ceremony. When she finished her undergraduate degree, Clinton went on to obtain her law degree from Yale University where

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

she was just 1 of just 27 women in her graduating class. While attending Yale, she began to date some hot guy named Bill Clinton. Bill... you guys are paying attention. Bill Clinton became her husband and the 42nd President of the United States making Hillary the First Lady from 1993-2001. Oh the good ole days. As a First Lady, Clinton focused on the fight to reform our health care system so that all families would have access to the care they needed at affordable prices. She worked with Republicans and Democrats to help create the successful Children's Health Insurance Program, which provided health insurance coverage to more 8 million children and has cut the uninsured rate for children in half. 2008, Hillary ran for President. She came up short, but a really great guy won in her place, you might have known him, Senator Barack Obama. She fought hard to ensure that there was a Democrat in the White House. When Obama was elected into office, President Obama asked Hillary to serve as Secretary of State. Clinton made a second Presidential run in 2016, here's where it gets really good, where she received the most votes and primary delegates in the 2016 Democratic Primaries and formally accepted her party's nomination for President of the United States on July 28, 2016. Unfortunately, God knows, she lost the election to Republican opponent Donald Trump despite winning the popular vote by almost 3 million. Following her loss, Clinton wrote her third memoir titled What Happened, and we keep saying that every day since that occurred. Her memoir ended up on the best seller list of Barnes and Noble, Amazon, and the USA Today. I thank you for your time colleagues."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you for your indulgence, Madam Speaker. I rise

for a moment of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

McCombie: "I will continue and be quick here. On this day, let us recognize women who are first among first, Lottie Holman O'Neill. She was born in 1878 and chose to raise her family in Downers Grove of DuPage County. Inspired by the success of Jeannette Rankin of Montana, the first woman elected by the U.S. House of Representatives, Lottie O'Neill ran for the Illinois House of Representatives and became the first woman to ever grace this chamber as an elected Legislator in 1922. She supported putting women on jury's, state assisted assistance for disabled children and eight hour work days. She fought issues that we're still fighting today against abusive income taxes, growing state budgets, and public corruption. She foresaw the damage that would follow national policy proposals and set the stage for issues that continue to divide us today. She retired from the Illinois Legislature on January 8, 1962 at the very young age of 84. O'Neill served in 19 different General Assemblies. Her 40 years of service as a woman in the Legislature is matched by only one, Barbara Flynn Currie. Upon her retirement... wait a second here this is not right. Upon her retirement, she declined an invitation to have her statue in the Illinois Statehouse Rotunda. She didn't want it to be facing the scoundrel who defeated her in her 1930 Senate Primary. On this day in Women's History, let's acknowledge one of our own who broke the mold and started a

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

tradition of strong and vibrant women in Illinois politics, Lottie Holman O'Neill. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a real quick reminder. One of our great annual events happening on April 9 is the Diabetes Caucus bowling even at Strike 'N Spare West. You all had received your information on getting teams together. Deadline is approaching, so we encourage you to sign up. Get your team together. It is wonderful event for all our new Members. I encourage you to participate. You've heard Representative Davis and Leader Durkin talk about it, but I encourage you. April 9, Strike 'N Spare West. If you need more information contact Representative Davis or myself."

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports... announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting immediately after Session at 5:00; Elementary Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing and Charter Schools is meeting in Room 115; Labor & Commerce in Room 114; State Government Administration Room 122; Economic Opportunity & Equity in C-1. Meeting in one hour starting at 6 p.m. is Appropriations-General Services in D-1; Appropriations-Public Safety in C-1 and Higher Education Room 118."

Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption... oh, Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 223, offered by Representative Brady. And House Resolution 224, offered by Representative Brady."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, March 28 at the hour of noon. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction - First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3823, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of this House Bill. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 225, offered by Representative Flowers is referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction - First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 28, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 69, offered by Representative Carroll, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 86, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 90, offered by Representative McSweeney, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 117, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 138, offered by Representative Tarver, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 193, offered by Representative Feigenholtz,

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 199, offered by Representative Wehrli, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1239, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 1339, offered by Representative Frese, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1456, offered Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1461, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1498, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1582, Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. Senate Bill 1609, offered Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1614, offered by Representative Meyers-Martin, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1636, offered by Representative Arroyo, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1651, offered by Representative Villa, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1699, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1715, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1825, offered Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1841, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1889, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1914, offered by Representative Meyers-Martin, a Bill for an Act concerning

32nd Legislative Day

3/27/2019

finance. Senate Bill 1915, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1965, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1968, offered Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2024, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2038, offered by Representative McSweeney, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2068, offered by Representative Caulkins, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 2076, offered by Representative Swanson, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2087, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning persons with disabilities. Senate Bill 2117, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2126, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."