Speaker Crespo: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Gary Gaston who is with St. Paul Baptist Church in East St. Louis. Pastor Gary Gaston is the guest of Representative Greenwood. 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 Gaston."

Pastor Gaston: "Please bow your head. We thank you for this day. We thank you for this glorious day. We thank you for the citizens of the State of Illinois, this Legislature. Lord, we just ask your blessings upon all of the decisions that will be made today or exchanged. Lord, we ask for wisdom as they prepare to guide our state. And, Lord, we ask for understanding among all that are present here today. Lord, we ask your blessings again and we thank you. Amen."

Speaker Crespo: "Thank you, Pastor. We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Cabello."

Cabello - 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 Crespo: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect there are no excused absences on the Democratic side today."

Speaker Crespo: "Thank you. Representative Butler is recognized on the Republican side."
Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Mazzochi is excused today."

Speaker Crespo: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Okay, there being 117 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. On page 23 of the Calendar, under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 333, offered by Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 333, offered by Representative Hoffman. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn the passing of Brett A. Korves and extend our sincere condolences to his family, friends, and all who knew and loved him."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate the silence in the chamber to mourn the death of Brett Korves, who was from St. Jacob, Illinois, who unexpectedly and tragically passed away on April 4, 2019. Mr. Korves was born in Belleville to Jack and Shelly (Tribout) Korves on March 9, 1989. He was a third generation firefighter and a ten-year veteran of the Swansea Fire Department. In 2012, the fire department's command voted him Firefighter of the Year, and he won in part because of the work that he did in and as a firefighter and leader in the department, specifically with the cadet's at the Swansea Fire Department. Brett also was an accomplished dirt track racer and was a two-time track champion at the Belle-Clair Speedway. He was
named two-time Rookie of the Year. He was known as '#21 (sic #25), The Kid Korves' and he was also active in the Tribout family business. Him and his family are... have been steadfast volunteers at the Swansea Fire Department. He is survived by his wife, Alex, his son, Brock. And, today, I would ask that we have a moment of silence and extend our sincere condolences to the family, friends, and all who knew and loved him."

Speaker Crespo: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. So Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 333. 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 Hoffman, for what reason do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I would just like to... for the Body to please acknowledge that Brett's mother, Shelly, is here. His grandfather, Dennis Tribout, as well as the Chief of the Swansea Fire Department, Chris Tell. I would just acknowledge them in the gallery."

Speaker Crespo: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Sommer, for what reason do you rise?"

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Sommer: "I'd like to introduce my three Pages for today. Standing here with me are Evelyn Mulvey, who's going to be a seventh grader at Bethel Lutheran School in Morton. Her brother, Eli, who's going to be a freshmen at Morton High School. And, Micah Cosby, who's going to be in the eighth grade at Bethel Lutheran. Parents of Evelyn and Eli, Kathy and Mike are here."
And, Brandon, the father of Micah is here. Please welcome them all to the House of Representatives."

Speaker Crespo: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Bryant: "Thank you. I have with me, today, my Page. This is Amanda Barnhart. Amanda's mom... I'm sorry... Mackenzie Barnhart. Mackenzie's mom, Amanda, is up in the gallery. They're from Jonesboro. You may remember that Jonesboro is very famous for having had a Lincoln-Douglas debate. We ask you to come down and visit us there. But Mackenzie is in the fourth grade of Jonesboro Elementary School with Ms. Kirby and Ms. Bundren. And I asked her what she likes to do, she likes social studies and she really likes the Explorers, so she and I came to an understanding that Ponce de Leon is the best because that's the explorer I would like to have find us the Fountain of Youth, right? And she's a softball player. So, go girl power. Help me welcome Mackenzie today."

Speaker Crespo: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Bailey, for what reason do you rise?"

Bailey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Bailey: "Thank you very much. Off to the right hand side of the gallery, if you would welcome Boy Scout Troop #335 visiting the Capitol and Springfield today from Effingham, Illinois. Thank you very much, have a great day."
Speaker Crespo: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you rise?"

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Wehrli: "If I could have a Springfield welcome to my Page for the day. CJ Gangi just graduated from Naperville Central. This fall he is off to Arizona State University, where he will be studying engineering. And he will also be participating in the ROTC program there. If we could welcome to our Capitol, CJ."

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

Kalish: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Kalish: "For the third day in a row, I have... I have people from my district... residents from my district coming to make sure I'm doing my job. I'd like to welcome those from Legacy, Symphony, Alton, and ABH Certified Health Management. Thank you for coming. And, welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "Personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Skillicorn: "I just want to invite everyone, next Thursday morning at 7:30 a.m., at Café Moxo, Civil Servant Ministries is going to have their end of the year wrapup and join us for breakfast and some fellowship. And everybody is welcome, thanks. Next Thursday morning, 7:30 a.m. Bye bye."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Meier, for what reason do you rise?"

Meier: "On this beautiful May day, when we think back to when we were younger, we thought of proms. I just want to say that tonight, in Centralia at the Murray Center, our residents in the area CILAs, coming together are having a prom that’s put on for all of our disabled residents in that area. So they can have the same things that we've had in the past. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ammons, for what reason do you rise?"

Ammons: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Crespo: "And please state your point."

Ammons: "Thank you. It is with my greatest pleasure to share with my General Assembly family, my joy and excitement for my son, Aaron Amir Ammons, who is graduating a year early from high school. He graduates this weekend. He is going to college in Champaign-Urbana and he will be studying agriculture. I'm excited for him. He's been just the pride and joy of our family. Of all the things, his interest lie in horse livestock management and also farming and organic growing. And so, I'm just overjoyed to have him in the space with me. He's been so busy this year but he came down to be with us the day before his graduation. So with that, I would love for the General Assembly to welcome him, congratulate him on honors as well as his future, as a future farmer of America. This is our son, Amir Ammons."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morrison, for what reason do you rise?"
Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."
Morrison: "So, sort of dovetailing off of what Representative Skillicorn talked about. So, there is a man, you may not know his name but he's a familiar face. His name is Pastor Shaun Lewis. And he has, for the last 12 years run Civil Servant Ministries. Now, he has a helper who is going to be taking that over, named Curt Fleck. But, for 12 years, Pastor Lewis has visited with many of us, with our staff members and... just as a friendly face, as a listening ear. And, he also has... and that ministry has coordinated efforts for Illinoisans to pray for each one of us. Pray for ourselves, our health, our families, for wisdom. And so, I'm just grateful for his ministry. This morning he led a bible study but he shared with us that he is moving on. He's going to take on a pastorate up in Peoria. He'll probably come back to Springfield now and again. But, I'm going to miss him. I know many of you, really on both sides of the aisle are going to miss him. And so, I just want thank him for his service to the State of Illinois and I appreciate the Body's time."
Speaker Crespo: "Members, we will start off today where we left off yesterday. On page 6 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 1526, offered by Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."
Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, this is a technical Amendment that makes our civil procedure statutes
more understandable to pro se litigants and the public by removing words like 'addendum' and 'prayer for relief' that don't mean a whole lot to anyone other than us lawyers. It does not make any substantive changes. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It's a plain language Bill and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1526 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? Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1536, offered by Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill just codifies... clarifies some language and makes referendums proactive as opposed to reactive. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "I'm not sure she actually indicated that. I thought she indicated the opposite. But, Representative, just real clearly to clarify this for my Members. I think this came up out of a situation where some things were done retroactively
in an adverse manner. Is that correct? Do you want to explain that a little bit?"
Mayfield: "Absolutely, yes. So, they passed a referendum that effected individuals that were currently in office as opposed to those that were prospectively coming into office. So this just fixes that language across the boards and says that if you're going to do a referendum, it needs to be prospective not retroactive to purposely harm one individual. That's not the way we do things."

Batinick: "Right. So my understanding is that someone was a trustee and he was not part of the majority, he wanted to run for mayor but everybody else passed something that if you're a trustee for this long, you can't run for mayor. Blocking out democracy is essentially what happened in that instance, correct?"
Mayfield: "That's exactly what happened."
Batinick: "Okay. I just wanted to clarify that for my Members. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."
Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicates she will."
Skillicorn: "Thank you, Representative. I think you just cleared up the intent of this Bill, but one thing that I'm looking at, could this change the will of the people if, let's say, a community passed the referendum for a term limit? Could this change the will of the people, actually change the terms of that referendum?"

Mayfield: "I don't believe so. I believe that what this does, it actually clarifies to the people what they were voting on.
The fact that there was not true transparency that the individuals who put the referendum out there in the first place, were trying to harm one individual rather than protect the citizens. And I think that's what this Bill does. It just clarifies it, you know, makes sure that going forward there's not a play on words or with language and that the intent is clear to be prospective, not retroactive."

Skillicorn: "What if the people of the community wanted it to be retroactive? Wouldn't this undermine what their intentions are?"

Mayfield: "I don't believe that the people wanted it to be retroactive. The particular cases that have come forth, they've all been... they've not been clearly articulated that it would affect this individual or that individual. It was just... when you start talking about term limits, everybody gets excited about term limits. But it really does need to be prospective and not retroactive. And it needs to be clearly defined. If they want retroactive, then the wording in that particular referendum needs to state, you know, clearly and, there needs to be more information out to the taxpayers."

Skillicorn: "Well, I'm not so sure voters really want it to be not retroactive. I think most voters probably would want it to be retroactive and... but, that's okay. I mean... I thank you for your time there. I do see... when I'm reading over in the legislation that preempts Home Rule, does this require a supermajority?"

Mayfield: "I don't believe so."

Skillicorn: "May I make an administrative request of the Chair, if this requires a supermajority vote?"
Speaker Crespo: "Representative, we'll get the answer for you."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Chair."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wehrli is recognized."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So this Bill is actually agreed upon language with several municipalities that have already implemented term limits. This also follows the doctorate in law that you cannot make something illegal in retrospect. This Bill is a good Bill. It's intended to allow term limits to exist if they're already in place. What it simply says, is that under Federal Law, you cannot and shall not impose a law in arrears. This is a good piece of legislation. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn, according to the parliamentarian, it only requires 60 votes. Representative Mayfield to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1536 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 100 voting in 'favor', 16 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 1568, Representative Bennett. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bennett."
Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1568 basically deals with deaths that are being ruled as Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, SIDS is another way... what you've heard it often, and when unsafe factors were present at the scene where an infant has passed. And by just putting SIDS on the death certificate, potentially valuable information is being left out that could help prevent infant death. So this legislation is being introduced to require crucial details to be part of the death report. Aden Lamps Foundation is the one that suggested this. And I move for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1568 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all rewarded... 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 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1571, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1571, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill simply cleans up some antiquated and outdated language in the Code of Civil Procedure, which provides for periodic payment to be elected for judgements for future damages. It's simply not a structure that is utilized and we're happy to take any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1571 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all
opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have Senate Bill 1571... back track, Senate Bill 1581... sorry about that, folks. Senate Bill 1580, Representative Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1580, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill simply amends the Counties Code to permit DuPage County to adopt reasonable ordinances and regulations concerning the operation of an adult entertainment facility. It is an initiative of the DuPage County State's Attorney and it simply codifies the doctrine used by the United States Supreme Court concerning the use of a prompt adjudication process to address this type of regulation. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1580 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 113 voting in 'favor', 13 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
Bill 1582, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read
the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1582, a Bill for an Act concerning
public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1582 makes a
technical change to the Pension Code rated MWRD. We lost the
race in the Senate, with the Senate on this Bill so we have
to do it over here. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is,
'Shall Senate Bill 1582 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all
opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all recorded...
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Mr. Clerk... Villanueva... Mr. Clerk, please take the
record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0
voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. Senate Bill 1583, Representative Harper. Mr. Clerk,
please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1583, a Bill for an Act concerning
criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to present Senate
Bill 1583 which means that Cook County arrest warrants issued
for violations of probation, conditional discharge, or
supervision for an underlying conviction of theft, retail
theft, or possession of a controlled substance shall only
remain active for 10 years from the date. I encourage an 'aye'
vote."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicates she will."
Batinick: "Two things, Representative. It's a little loud in here so I could barely hear you, but that was probably a little bit short of an explanation of what the actual Bill does. I see there was lots of opposition in the Senate and in committee. Why don't you start by quickly describing the Bill again, so hopefully I can hear it, and then get into specifically what the Bill does and what those objections are."
Harper: "Sure. So this Bill is an initiative of the Cook County Sheriff's Office and it is an attempt to lessen the negative effects of warrants such as the immediate arrest, loss of employment, or disruption of families for people who may have warrants out but are longer than 10 years. So what this Bill does is, it will basically make that warrant not valid anymore unless the State's Attorney... Sheriff's Office or the State's Attorney objects to that."
Batinick: "So what are the statute of limitations on some of these crimes for the warrants? I imagine they are more than 10 years and some of them may not have statute of limitations, correct? So basically what we're doing here is, we are... what's the time limit on warrants now? Representative?"
Harper: "I'm not sure of that but I can find that out for you."
Batinick: "Okay. My understanding is there is no time limit on warrants, so... I guess I'm going to go ahead and go straight to the Bill. There's no time limits on warrants now. If you do something wrong, I don’t think you should be able to just
time out of it because of a certain period of time went by. For those reasons, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicates she will."

Guzzardi: "Representative, we had this Bill in the Criminal Judiciary Committee, so I just wanted to ask a few follow up questions based on the discussion that we had in committee. So, we're talking about... can you describe the kinds of offenses that we're talking about with these outstanding warrants?"

Harper: "Sure. We are only talking about theft, retail theft, or possession of a controlled substance."

Guzzardi: "Okay. So these aren't outstanding warrants for people who have done... committed any violent offenses... any offenses... serious felony level offenses?"

Harper: "Correct."

Guzzardi: "Okay. And we're talking about warrants that have gone more than 10 years. Meaning that this person hasn't had any interaction with law enforcement in 10 years, right? Because if you get arrested for some other offense, that warrant is going to get flagged. Is that right?"

Harper: "That is true."

Guzzardi: "So we're talking about people who committed minor offenses, more than 10 years ago, who have... had no interaction with law enforcement, who may not even know that this warrant is out. And they get pulled over or stopped and all of a sudden their whole life gets upended for simple theft that they committed 15, 20, 30 years in the past. Is that right?"
Harper: "That is correct."
Guzzardi: "Okay. That seems like a bad practice and one that we ought to fix. Now the Cook County Sheriff's Office is in favor of the measure. Is that right?"
Harper: "Yes, it is their initiative. This Bill came from the Cook County Sheriff's Office."
Guzzardi: "And why do you think that the Sheriff's think this is a good idea?"
Harper: "Well, because they were realizing that... that people being caught for warrants that had expired or warrants far from the date of whenever they violated probation was really just a detriment to their lives."
Guzzardi: "Right. And it seems to me also, and we heard from the sheriff's office, that given the limited resources that the sheriff's office has, pursuing these very, very old warrants for these very minor offenses is an unnecessary and wasteful use of their resources, wouldn't you say?"
Harper: "That is correct."
Guzzardi: "And I would imagine that in jurisdictions where the sheriff's office have even less resources than Cook County, in some of our smaller sheriff's offices in downstate communities, that these would be even more burdensome for their sheriff's office, wouldn't you think?"
Harper: "That is correct, yes."
Guzzardi: "To the Bill. I believe this is a simple measure. We are talking about people who have committed very minor infractions a long, long time ago. Have had no interaction with law enforcement at an intervening time. These old, outstanding warrants are very disruptive to their lives. They
are very disruptive to our sheriff's offices who are trying to enforce these warrants for no good reason. There is no threat to public safety here. This is a commonsense, decent Bill. I appreciate the Representative bringing it forward and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bryant is recognized."
Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we take this off Short Debate? Are we on Short..."
Speaker Crespo: "The Bill's on Standard Debate."
Bryant: "Thank you. To the Bill. It appears to me... maybe... let me ask the Sponsor on this. This looks like it's only for Cook County. Is that correct?"
Harper: "Yes, that is correct."
Bryant: "But you believe that this is good for everyone?"
Harper: "Perhaps they will follow suit, yes."
Bryant: "But, once again, not... no due respect, but we're once again passing... trying to pass a law that only applies to Cook County. I'm a little bit troubled by some of the Bills that we have going through because, honestly, it kind of looks to me like the folks that are out on the streets that are making the arrests are not being backed up once it comes to the Cook County Jail. I do not believe that this is a good practice. If you have an outstanding warrant, there is due process. I think there are some attorneys, maybe on our side here, that are going to speak to that issue. But there is a process to take care of this and just totally ignoring them is not good for any of us anywhere. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers is recognized."
Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicates she will."

Flowers: "Representative, I'm sorry. It was kind of noisy in here and I did not hear you. Did you say that this Bill is only applicable for Cook County?"

Harper: "Yes."

Flowers: "And did you also say that this Bill was brought to you by the Cook County Sheriff's Office, Tom Dart?"

Harper: "Yes."

Flowers: "Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. First of all, as one of the previous speakers spoke and said on this side of the aisle, that the warrant is for... and the Sponsor stated, that the underlying warrants are for theft, retail theft, and possession of controlled substance. And, currently, there are some counties that have sent the warrants to the wrong information... I mean, I'm sorry, sent the warrants to the wrong address. Or people have moved or people probably just didn't know that there was a warrant out for their arrest. But in the meantime, the most important thing is that they have not been arrested for these offenses in the last 10 years. So chances are they have not committed a crime in the last 10 years. So what this Bill is merely saying to all of us, especially those of us in Cook County, because we are the taxpayers. We are the ones that’s paying for these people to be incarcerated for things that should have been probationable in the first place. So at the proper time, I would urge an 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 1583 on behalf of the taxpayers of Cook County. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Connor, are you speaking in favor or against the Bill?"
Connor: "In favor."
Speaker Crespo: "Okay. According to rules of Standard Debate, we allow three to speak in favor, three against. We have already reached the three."
Connor: "Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Windhorst, are you speaking in favor or against the Bill?"
Windhorst: "I'm speaking in opposition."
Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."
Windhorst: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicates she will."
Windhorst: "Does this Statute only apply to those who have been convicted of a probation violation or conditional discharge violation?"
Harper: "Probation, conditional discharge, or supervision."
Windhorst: "And probation or conditional discharge means that that individual has been convicted of the offense, isn’t that correct?"
Harper: "Yes."
Windhorst: "So these are not people who have… are presumed innocent. They are, in fact, guilty of what they're accused of, would that be accurate to say?"
Harper: "You could say that. You could say that."
Windhorst: "One of the offenses listed is possession of a controlled substance. Is that true?"
Harper: "Yes."
Windhorst: "And that is a felony offense. Is that correct?"
Harper: "Some of them are, yes."
Windhorst: "In fact, there is a Class 1 felony, possession of a controlled substance. Isn't that true?"

Harper: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And Class 1 felonies are punishable at 4 to 15 years in prison?"

Harper: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And that would involve possession of drugs greater than 15 grams, often?"

Harper: "Yup."

Windhorst: "So you have someone who possessed, let's say, cocaine greater than 15 grams. They were... received probation rather than going to prison for 4 to 15 years and then they violated their probation, so that's why this warrant would exist. Is that true?"

Harper: "Yeah, it could have been a minor violation, but yeah."

Windhorst: "Could have been. But it also could mean they never reported to probation, never appeared at probation. In fact, never complied with the conditions of probation, would that be true?"

Harper: "So for 10 years they... they just escaped?"

Windhorst: "Or as we often call it in the system, absconded from probation. Meaning they never reported, never were involved in the system, never had to comply with the court order."

Harper: "For 10 years?"

Windhorst: "For 10 years, that's right. Didn't abide by a court order for 10 years."

Harper: "But probation officers have addresses on file, they should be able to find people within 10 years. So after 10
years, apparently, they weren't really on their priority list."

Windhorst: "But that would assume that the person gave a valid address or a correct address or didn't move and avoid process."

Harper: "Also, I think it's important to know that the State's Attorney can file a motion to extend the warrant as well. So, if there were any question or any doubt, they still do have that right to do that, to extend the warrant."

Windhorst: "That's correct. And I think that is a good provision is this Bill that doesn't make it completely intolerable. But I don't think that overall the Bill accomplishes a good goal. I want to ask you this, one of the things mentioned in the committee was the fact there are many thousands of warrants in Cook County and it's hard for the Sheriff's Department to track those warrants, was that what was said in committee? Do you recall that?"

Harper: "Perhaps. I don't recall verbatim, but it's possible that that was stated."

Windhorst: "So, that would also be then an imposition on the State's Attorney's Office to have to track thousands of warrants to make sure one didn't slip through the cracks that they wanted to have executed. Would you agree with that?"

Harper: "Can you repeat that question?"

Windhorst: "Yes. The sheriff's department is tracking these warrants but in order to comply with this legislation, the State's Attorney's Office will now have to check with these warrants and keep track of them, thousands of warrants. It's
possible then that some serious warrants could slip through the cracks. Would you agree with that statement?"

Harper: "If the State's Attorney is doing their job, then it shouldn't slip through the cracks."

Windhorst: "To the Bill. Your Honor... Sir, we're speaking about thousands of warrants that could be nullified simply because we are enacting legislation on warrants that, in fact, should be enforced. These could be serious offenses, possession of a controlled substance is a felony offense. In fact, possession of a controlled substance could be a Class 1 felony, 4 to 15 years in prison. For that reason, I think that this deserves a 'no' vote... encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Costa Howard is recognized."

Costa Howard: "I move for Extended Debate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Crespo: "Granted."

Costa Howard: "I yield my time to Representative Connor."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As any of the former prosecutors in this room have been on warrant review know well, oftentimes, at least in Will County, when we went in for warrant review, the judges would ask us, what steps have you taken in order to apprehend this person? Have you searched for them? What has the sheriff been instructed to do in order to find this individual? And, if our answers, at least in my experience in Will County, if our answers were, we haven't done anything, the judges would not extend these warrants. And it oftentimes was left to the judge's discretion as to the types of offense. But basically, what Representative
Harper is introducing here is just a codification of what should be a standard practice in any courtroom. Of a judge asking the State's Attorney's Office and law enforcement, what specific steps have you taken in order to find this individual. Because if finding this individual and taking them into custody is not a priority for you, it's not going to be a priority to this court. So, I don't believe that what the Representative is doing in setting a 10 year limit is anything that would change what standard practice should be in any courtroom. Which is a judge should not extend a warrant if the state has taken no steps to take someone into custody. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1583 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting in 'favor', 45 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1584, offered by Representative Ortiz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1584, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ortiz."

Ortiz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body. Senate Bill 1584 is a technical initiative of the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund and is supported by the Chicago Teachers Union
and Retired Teachers Association of Chicago. Senate Bill 1584 seeks to increase the number of days a retiree can return to work by an additional 20 days before their service retirement benefit is cancelled. Current statute mandates that the number of days a retiree can return to work before their pension is cancelled is 100. Senate Bill 1584 provides retirees with a little bit of flexibility while they seek varying avenues to increase their incomes. I'm happy to answer any questions. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I think we had this through our committee. I want to clarify some things that are... that are important to me, personally. My understanding is, that if anything, this doesn't add to the unfunded liability of the Chicago Teacher Pension Funds. This may, if anything, shrink it because when retiring teachers come back to work, they are not compensated for retirement benefits that way. Is that correct?"

Ortiz: "That is correct."

Batinick: "That’s all I wanted to clarify. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "So is this... is this specifically in areas where there is a shortage of teachers? I..."

Ortiz: "That is correct."
Davidsmeyer: "So, it's just when there is a shortage of teachers. It's not, they can bring back teachers they really like who retired. There has to be a shortage, teacher shortage or they can't find..."

Ortiz: "There is a teacher shortage in Chicago."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, there's a teacher shortage almost all over but I'm sure that some districts don't have this problem. Could they allow a teacher to retire and still come back even if there is not a teacher shortage?"

Ortiz: "This only applies to Chicago."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... I'll say we already passed a Bill just probably... no, I think it included everybody but... it should have included everybody. I could be mistaken. If this is an add-on, I appreciate what you're trying to do. Is there a sunset on this?"

Ortiz: "No, there is not."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Speaker's staff required me to put a sunset on a Bill that I passed three times in the last six years. Why is there not a sunset on this... this Bill?"

Ortiz: "I just believe... I believe that there's a huge shortage of teachers in the City of Chicago and I think that is the reason why there is no sunset on this Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "So, if we clear up... it there is plenty of teachers out there, is this something that will automatically be reviewed or what will happen?"

Ortiz: "I'm sorry, can you repeat that?"

Davidsmeyer: "I said is this something that will automatically be reviewed? Without a sunset even if there is not a teacher shortage if you find enough teachers and administrators and
all that, this will still be in place. So they can still bring
back... show preferential treatment towards some teachers and
not others?"

Ortiz: "And this has nothing to do with preferential treatment,
so."

Davidsmeyer: "It could. I just wanted to make the point that it's
interesting that on my Bill that has passed three times in
the last six years, I was required to put a sunset. It does
the same thing this does. But on your Bill, that only affects
Chicago, there's no sunset. I will be supporting your Bill,
but I think there's kind of a double standard going on here."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Good morning, Representative. So just going off the
previous debate here, is this specifically for shortage
situations. Is that correct?"

Ortiz: "It's designed to address that, yes."

Skillicorn: "Okay. What page and section does the Bill have any
reference to shortage in it?"

Ortiz: "That was my intention behind the Bill."

Skillicorn: "Okay, what... yeah... so what page and section of the
Bill addresses shortage?"

Ortiz: "The provisions of the Bill address the shortage."

Skillicorn: "So when I do control F when I'm looking at the Bill,
I don't see the word 'shortage'."

Ortiz: "Again, the provisions are to address the shortage."

Skillicorn: "Okay. To the Bill. If we actually go read the Bill,
which I suggest everyone do, there is nothing about shortage
in here. All this does is... let someone double dip. This is a
double dipping Bill, that's it. It's just for Chicago. There's
nothing about shortages in here. Read the Bill, people. This
is not what has been represented."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ortiz to close."
Ortiz: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1584
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
there... on this question, there are 98 voting in 'favor', 16
voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill,
having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. Senate Bill 1599, offered by Representative Buckner.
Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1599, a Bill for an Act concerning
business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Buckner."
Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1599 amends the
Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act in
relation to the dissemination of criminal record information
and provisions making it an unlawful practice for persons or
an entity that publishes for profit, a person's criminal
record information to fail to correct an error in the
individual's criminal record. This is basically aimed at the
fact that errors in background checks can be a barrier to
employment. With the expansion of Illinois laws which expunge
and seal records, businesses should update criminal
information regularly. I urge an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1599 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, there are... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1601, offered by Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1601, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1601 is an initiative of Senator Elgie Sims and it requires the teaching of Illinois history in the school curriculum. I'd ask any... answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bourne is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "Indicated he will."

Bourne: "Representative, I know that we had this conversation in committee but could you answer, do we have in any of our learning standards, Illinois history stated specifically?"

Martwick: "So my understanding is, is that as part of the Illinois Learning Standards that there is Illinois history instruction included but it is not in statute so it's not required."

Bourne: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. We certainly all appreciate the need for our students to learn Illinois history. I would
argue that all schools are teaching this. This is yet one more mandate that we've talked about before. It's already listed in fourth grade in the Illinois Learning Standards and we know that there are many tests throughout a student's career in school where they are tested on Illinois history. Certainly, there's value to it, but please stop adding mandates on our school districts. Let's trust them to teach what's best. Thanks."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Martwick to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1601 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 74 voting in 'favor', 42 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1610, offered by Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1610, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1610 is a cleanup of the Judicial Admonishment Statute in the Code of Criminal Procedure. There are no opponents. In 2004, the General Assembly enacted what is commonly referred to as the Judicial Admonishment Statute. It required trial judges to advise all defendants before a plea of guilty that a conviction may have collateral consequences for persons who
are not U.S. citizens, such as a denial of citizenship or deportation. We did this to ensure that all defendants understand this before pleading guilty to misdemeanors or felonies. Unfortunately, a tortured Illinois Supreme Court case essentially ruled that 'shall' really didn't mean 'shall' but 'may'. Because we didn’t include a consequence for a court's failure to give the admonishment, it was not interpreted as mandatory. This Bill addresses that and ensures that this becomes mandatory.

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Batinick: "Representative, this is a fascinating Bill for me to review. And I was having a couple people talk in my ear as I was listening to you at the same time, which is a skill I have not mastered yet. What's fascinating about it..."

Cassidy: "You need to have a twins, that helps."

Batinick: "It says it's identical to SB3276 of the 100th General Assembly. Which passed the Senate unanimously but failed in the House by a vote of 51-64, which means several of your colleagues must have voted against this last time. Yet, it went through committee 17-0 this time. So, that’s a whole bunch of stuff I don't normally see that... those... I'm seeing... usually I see red flags or green flags, I usually don't see both. So can you tell me what's different in 2019 versus whenever this Bill passed before... failed before 2017, 2018, or so?"

Cassidy: "So, actually this will be the third bite at this apple. Each time it has gone through committee unanimously. Each
time the Senate has passed it handedly. There were some confusing questions from folks about whether this was some new protection for folks based on their immigration status. And, in spite of all efforts to alleviate that confusion and let folks know that this is not a new standard at all but rather clarification based on the desire of the court to get it clarified, we just weren't able to overcome it. My hope is that third time's the charm."

Batinick: "Okay. So, let's go right to where the confusion was. I'll read you a line in my analysis here, 'Provides that if a court fails to advise a defendant that they may be deported, be excluded from admission to the United States or denied of naturalization under the laws of the United States after their conviction, the court, upon the defendant's motion, shall vacate the judgement and permit the defendant to withdraw the plea. The admonishment is already required by statute.' So, it's extra... so it's already required by statute but this is extra clarifying it."

Cassidy: "Right."

Batinick: "So basically what happens is, if somebody plea bargains and then they find out on the basis of that plea bargain they get to undo their plea bargain if they are concerned about being deported. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "So, what it means is before they enter that plea bargain they have to be admonished in court that there could be a consequence. That's been in place for quite some time. What's new in this is that there is... there is a consequence to the court if it's not given. But they have been making that admonishment for years."
Batinick: "And the consequence to the court is?"
Cassidy: "The vacation of the plea."
Batinick: "The vacation of the plea. Okay. So we're required to do something, but if they didn't do it there was no punishment?"
Cassidy: "Exactly."
Batinick: "Now, if they don't do what they're required to do the plea is vacated?"
Cassidy: "Or a consequence, not so much a punishment, but a consequence."
Batinick: "A consequence. Okay. Thank you for the clarification."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Thapedi is recognized."
Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "Indicated she will."
Thapedi: "Representative, just a little clarification. I think that you said at the... at your opening that the statute actually reads 'shall' but the court interpret it as permissive?"
Cassidy: "Yup, because of the absence of a consequence, the court interpreted that as making it permissive rather than mandatory."
Thapedi: "Could you explain that a little bit more? And the only reason why I ask is that if we are putting 'shall' in mandatory language in statutes and courts are ignoring the fact that we're making them mandatory and somehow interpreting them as being permissive, what can we do legislatively to ensure that we're crafting Bills properly?"
Cassidy: "In this instance, the adding of an enforcement clause is what was missing. So, ensuring that we actually have a 'what if' in place. Is..."

Thapedi: "Okay."

Cassidy: "...is what the court found lacking in our original statute."

Thapedi: "So again... and this is not my area of expertise, not even close on any criminal stuff and when I see that Senator Sims is involved, I trust that everything is being done properly and I'm definitely voting for the Bill. I just want to make sure that I just understand how the court actually reasoned that. That when we have a 'shall' in a statute and they put some additional limitation on there or some additional requirement on behalf of... in additional to us saying 'shall' that they're saying well no, you've got to go one step further otherwise we're going to deem it to be permissive."

Cassidy: "I... the only analogy I could offer is when I tell my kids they shall be home by eleven but I don't do anything about it when they get home at midnight."

Thapedi: "Understood. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Representative..."

Cassidy: "Hi, neighbor."

Gong-Gershowitz: "The failure to give that admonishment is often seen as an ineffective assistance of counsel. Isn't that right?"
Cassidy: "Actually, that was one of the reasons given by the prior Floor Leader for not supporting it. That that was really... that it represented more of that than a failure of our statute."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Well, it's my understanding that the reason why courts have addressed it as a failure of assistance of counsel is because if the courts ignore it and the defendant was not advised of the consequences of the plea that the defendant did not have the requisite information necessary to accept the plea and, therefore, the necessity of this statute would also enable defendants and State's Attorneys to be sure that pleas were freely given with all available information and give certainty to the criminal process."

Cassidy: "Absolutely. And it is very likely that having this in place will reduce 6th Amendment claims and appeals."

Gong-Gershowitz: "And reversals of pleas?"

Cassidy: "Yes, absolutely. Yup."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Gong-Gershowitz: "To the Bill. This is a good Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "As I said, third times a charm. I ask for your support."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1610 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 84 voting in 'favor', 32 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, Senate Bill 1614, offered by Representative Meyers-Martin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1614, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Meyers-Martin."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this legislation streamlines small heirship claims process and allows heirs of deceased property owners to submit a Capacity to Claim Affidavit with the Treasurer's Office rather than having to submit certified copies of wills and other court documents for unclaimed property claims valued at less than $100. This is a Bill that passed the House earlier. And so, I am asking for your support because this is one of the biggest complaints that people have with the unclaimed property process is that there is so much paperwork for small claims under $100."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1614 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 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1623, offered by Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1623, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Smith."
Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1623 does two things. It gives lienholders on a mobile homes an ability to receive funds after the sale of the property. And it also requires park owners to store any household goods or personal property for 30 days after the final judgement. There is no opposition to this Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1623 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Have all recorded who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1627, offered Representative Halpin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1627, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that would allow a defense or mitigating circumstances based on postpartum depression. It doesn't change any substantive law, it’s a trailer Bill to a Bill we passed last year. But it moves the actual mechanism for asserting this right from the Post Hearing Conviction (sic-Post-Conviction Hearing) Act over to the relief from judgements provision in the Code of Civil Procedure. I will... it's unopposed, as far as I know."
And I will provide vague and defensive answers to your questions. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1627 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 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1630, offered by Representative Batinick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1630, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Automatic Contract Renewal Act, removes school districts from the list of entities that could be excluded from the definition of the term 'parties'. Mainly what that means is that when... before something is automatically renewed, school boards have to be notified, like everybody else. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no further debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1630 pass'? All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill
1636, offered by Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1636, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Arroyo."
Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1636 caps the amount that an owner may withheld from a contractor until the contractor or the subcontractor completes his work. Commonly referred to as retainage amount. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wheeler is recognized."
Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Wheeler: "Representative, this is a Bill we took up last year, if I remember right."
Arroyo: "Yup."
Wheeler: "And at that time there were opponents, mainly the Illinois REALTORS. They're no longer in opposition to this version of the Bill. Is that correct?"
Arroyo: "Correct."
Wheeler: "So... okay. So, is there any other opposition to the Bill?"
Arroyo: "No."
Wheeler: "Thank you very much. I know this is a lot of good organizations that are supporting it. I urge its passage. Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Thapedi is recognized."
Thapedi: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Thapedi: "Representative Arroyo, you've been working on this for quite some time and I want to commend you on your hard work on this. I know that it took quite some time, we've been working on this for a few years, so I want to commend you on a job well done and getting this over the finish line."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Arroyo to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1636 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 98 voting in 'favor', 13 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1641, offered by Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1641, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. SB1641 attempts to reduce the high rates of hunger on college campuses. Under this Bill, MAP Grant eligible students will be notified that they meet... may be eligible for SNAP benefits. The student would still have to apply for SNAP through IDHS. There is no opposition. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Hammond: "Representative Smith, does your legislation in any way provide automatic SNAP benefits to college students?"

Smith: "No, not at all. This Bill simply notifies students that are already receiving MAP, that they are in fact eligible for SNAP benefits."

Hammond: "So, that is the population of students that, perhaps they are an independent student that if they were in the community they would be eligible for these same benefits or they are the child of a family that is indeed eligible for these benefits?"

Smith: "Yes. They would have to meet all regular eligibility requirements for SNAP benefits."

Hammond: "Thank you for your indulgence. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Smith to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1641 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And 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', 14 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 1651, offered by Representative Villa. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1651, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Villa."
Villa: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1651 expands Downstate Forest Preserve Districts the ability to grant licenses and easements to include licenses and easements for renewable energy. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1651 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... Barbara Hernandez. Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting in 'favor', 8 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1657, offered by Representative Walker. Out of the record. Next, Senate Bill 1658, offered by Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1658, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Crespo. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 1658. It’s a simple Bill. It's a school safety grant program. The Bill has no opposition. I want to thank the Showman Group for working so hard to bring this Bill to an agreed measure. It was agreed with the Illinois State Board of Education. And what it would do is provide grants if there is a capital Bill possibly for schools. I ask for the support of this Body to protect the schools in Illinois."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Batinick: "Representative, I noticed there's a few 'no' votes in committee and I don't think I really got from you what the grant money is going for. Can you explain that a little bit?"
Ford: "Well, it would be up to the school districts to apply for grant money to do window safety. I think yesterday, the Leader on your side passed a Bill to ask for safety for locks on doors. It could be used for Leader Brady's measure that he passed yesterday. It would be up to the schools to provide the measures necessary for their safety."
Batinick: "And they can't do this without legislation?"
Ford: "Well... I mean, I think that what we want to do is have school safety on the minds of everyone in the State of Illinois. And this Bill will make sure that, if there is a capital Bill, that there is a grant program set up for school safety grants."
Batinick: "Okay. So, basically, you're saying if you get the grant, it has to be used for specific things. And you are listing the specific things and..."
Ford: "That's right."
Batinick: "...it's along the lines of what Leader Brady passed his Bill on yesterday, correct?"
Ford: "Exactly."
Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much for the answers."
Ford: "Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Costa Howard is recognized."
Costa Howard: "Representative, would this Bill..."
Speaker Crespo: "Sponsor yields."
Costa Howard: "Sorry. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "Indicated he will."
Costa Howard: "I apologize. Representative, will this allow schools to purchase guns?"
Ford: "No."
Costa Howard: "Will this allow schools to purchase metal detectors?"
Ford: "They can apply."
Costa Howard: "Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Stava-Murray is recognized."
Stava-Murray: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Stava-Murray: "So, I just wanted to clarify. So when we were in committee, was this where the fire department had come in as well?"
Ford: "I couldn't hear you."
Stava-Murray: "Did the... I think there were... someone from the fire department who was there? Is that something else?"
Ford: "I'm not sure if you're asking if there's opposition, I'll just tell you there is no opposition."
Stava-Murray: "No, no, no. I was just asking was there something in particular for safety here?"
Ford: "Nothing in particular. This sets up a grant in case a school district wants to apply for measures to make their schools safer."
Stava-Murray: "And, remind me from committee, could this pay for a school resource officer, so the police officers who are in the schools?"
Ford: "This Bill does not allow for school resource officers but it will allow for the schools to set up school, sort of like, medical centers where individuals could have a school medical
center so that we could help students with behavior health issues, possibly. So, I think this is a good point that you bring out that it will allow schools to have school safety measures in place for behavior health."

Stava-Murray: "Okay, great. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Skillicorn: "Hello, La Shawn, just quickly looking over your Bill here. I do see here that it is designated for Tier 1 and Tier 2 school districts. So is it... is that your incentive is, schools that can't afford this themselves are the ones who want to get these grants?"

Ford: "Yes."

Skillicorn: "Okay. And just reading through it, it seems pretty simple. To the Bill. You know, professional development, safety related upgrades, metal detectors, x-ray machines, facilities. It also includes school-based health centers. It seems simple and well thought out."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you so much. I hope that we will keep the school safety in mind and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1658 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? Ford. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1665, offered by Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1665, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When our prescription monitoring program was voluntarily, veterinarians were exempt from reporting prescription... opioid prescriptions for pets. When the law... when the program was codified the law required veterinarians to report the prescriptions for opioids for use by a pet. Vets are exempt from this reporting requirement in 30 plus other states and they would like to be exempt from it in Illinois. I know of no opposition and I welcome your questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Guzzardi: "Leader Burke, we had a similar measure to this in my committee earlier this year. So, can... can you just walk us through the requirements that veterinarians are currently under with regard to opioids?"

Burke: "Currently, they're under the same structures as doctors would be when prescribing an opioid for a human. So what they... what they now have to do is report to the PMP on the person who is bringing in the pet for... for which... and these are tiny, tiny amounts, percentages of times that any opioid would be used on an animal outside the clinical setting. And so, they're just asking to be exempt from that. And what they're proposing is, if they suspect that the human who is bringing
the pet in is doing it for some fraudulent purpose that they
would be required to then notify."

Guzzardi: "I think that the concern that we had in committee was
that the owner... the pet owner might be doing some venue
shopping trying to find opioids for themselves, right?"

Burke: "Sure. And I suppose there is no limit to the ingenuity of
humans in trying to find this, but, you know, to visit the
vet is an expensive proposition and to... it just sort of defies
logic that someone would spend the time and money that would
be required for a vet visit to obtain an opioid prescription
for a... that's dosed for a small animal. I think I understand
your concern, but I don’t think it's realistic."

Guzzardi: "I appreciate that. Thank you. Just because it didn't
come up in committee, I wanted to ask you about it. Appreciate
your answers."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "To the Bill. And the only reason I am speaking up is
I noticed that one of the opponents is Dundee Animal Hospital
which is not only in my district, they're one of my neighbors.
This is a good Bill and looks like I'm going to have to call
them up and let them know what exactly it does. But, frankly,
there is a loophole with HIPAA and such and this fixes a
loophole. It's a good thing. It's better for veterinarians
and it doesn’t do any harm to the opioid crisis. So, I urge
an 'aye' vote. And I have a phone call to make after this."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ugaste is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Ugaste: "Is this Bill the same as it was when it went through committee?"
Burke: "Yes, it's the same."
Ugaste: "Okay. So, it addresses, actually, any amount of opioid, not just the small amount as well. Is that correct?"
Burke: "It... yes, there's no limit on... there's no discussion of what the dosage is."
Ugaste: "And veterinarians are allowed to give out large doses of opioids and not just small doses. Is that correct?"
Burke: "I don't know all the specifics, but obviously, there's a range of sizes of animals that veterinarians work with."
Ugaste: "Okay. To the Bill. I understand the intention of trying to achieve deregulation. It's something I usually am very much in favor of, not having one of our business owners have to go through extra steps, but we have an opioid crisis in this state and in this country. And right now what we're saying is that one of the mandatory reports that has to go to the state so that we can track this and make sure people are not actually getting opioids they shouldn't is going to go by the way side. And, I understand that the... the Sponsor is saying that people will not go through an expensive process just to get opioids and logic does, in fact, defy that. But, having practiced worker's compensation for 31 years, I can tell you that people will go to extreme lengths and spend extraordinary amounts of money just to get narcotic medication. I would ask for a 'no' vote on the Bill. Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative McAuliffe is recognized."
McAuliffe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

McAuliffe: "Representative, I have some figures from the American Society of Veteran Medicine that shows for an emergency visit to see a veterinarian would be like $350. Do you think that if somebody was going to abuse or use opioids that they would go through... would fake that their dog, or cat, or animal was hurt to do something like this?"

Burke: "No, I think you bring up a great point that for that amount of money there is other ways that someone could find their way to opiates. And, I will point out that if the... that... this Bill would require the vet, if they did suspect that the human was using, you know, the animal as a ruse to have a prescription for opiates, that they would be required to report that."

McAuliffe: "Okay. And again, I would think that if it was like for a dog, if he broke his leg or something like that or injured her leg, that the opioid that they would be prescribed would be a small dosage, not a huge one."

Burke: "Exactly, dosed for the animal."

McAuliffe: "Okay. I'm in favor of the Bill. I don't see this... we know that there's people out there that will do just about anything to try and get opioids but I have not seen or we haven't witnessed that here in Illinois. So, I think it's a good Bill and ask for it's 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Flowers: "Representative, does this close the loophole in regards to veterinarians being able to look at a doctor's medical records or our medical records?"

Burke: "You bring up a great point, Representative, that under this requirement veterinarians are looking or have access to certain parts of human's records and that’s a privacy concern for many people."

Flowers: "And this... will this close the loophole?"

Burke: "Yes, it will."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke: "I think this is a pretty commonsense way to make sure that we're still protected but allow people to get care and access for their animals. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1665 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', 2 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1674, offered by Representative Halpin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1674, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1674 extends the sunset on the Auction License Act as well as makes a few modernization updates to the Act. It corrects a couple of
definitions and defines 'email address of record', among a couple other things. I know of no opposition. It's an important industry in this state. And I will start the bidding at 60 votes. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Martwick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Martwick: "So, I appreciate you opening the bid process, Representative Halpin. Is there any chance we can get you to read your Bill in an auctioneer's voice?"

Halpin: "Well, do I have a commitment to you to vote for this Bill?"

Martwick: "If you can be convincing then you will have my vote."

Halpin: "Well we got there 61, 61. Do I hear 62, 62? Who'll give me 62?"

Martwick: "That'll work."

Halpin: "That's it."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halpin to close."

Halpin: "I ask for many, many 'yes' votes."

Speaker Crespo: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1674 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cassidy, Ortiz, Zalewski, Williams. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill
1694, offered by Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1694, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1694 is an initiative of the Illinois AFL-CIO. This Bill provides that school districts with grades 9 through 12 may include, in its high school curriculum, a unit of instruction on workplace preparation. Workplace preparation must cover legal protections in the workplace, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination. Again, this is a permissive Bill. I'm not aware of any opposition to it. This is an important topic that school districts should include in their curriculum. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1694 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? Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1699, offered by Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1699, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative West."
West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1699 is a clarification Bill, which prohibits the publication of mug shots on social media prior to a conviction of the crime unless public safety demands it. Senate Bill 1699 amends the Section on arrest reports under the Freedom of Information Act to prevent a law enforcement agency from publishing booking photographs or... also known as mug shots, on a social networking Web site rather than on its social media, a term undefined by Illinois law. I would appreciate... I will entertain any questions, but I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Batinick: "Does this... if somebody personally gets a hold of like... if you or I get a hold of a mug shot, we can't post it on social media until the conviction or is this the police department? Who does it restrict from being able to post that mug shot?"

West: "It is for law enforcement."

Batinick: "Okay. So, law enforcement can't release any mug shots until there's a conviction?"

West: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. But if somehow individuals get a hold of it, there is no... nothing... they're not doing anything wrong, according to the language, correct?"

West: "Yeah, it's only for law enforcement. It's not really changing the law, it's just clarifying the word 'social networking' compared to 'social media'."
Batinick: "Okay. I appreciate the answers to the questions. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn seeks recognition."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Skillicorn: "Quick question. Will this exempt FOIA from providing the photograph to an individual?"

West: "This is... the main focus of this Bill is about publishing on social networking Web sites. That’s the focus for this particular piece of legislation."

Skillicorn: "Okay. So I understand the intent there. Now, I don’t see how the 1st Amendment would, you know, it would... would allow that to be the case but we could change, assumingly, FOIA to prevent the photograph from going out. So, that’s where the specific I’m..."

West: "If we... if we prevent FOIA from doing it, then that limits the Freedom of Information..."

Skillicorn: "Yeah, that’s correct. So, if an individual FOIA's this, gets a photo, the 1st Amendment allows them to put it onto a social networking site or social media site, I would assume."

West: "This... this piece of legislation is only prohibiting that from the law enforcement agency, not from individuals."

Skillicorn: "Oh. So the law enforcement agency will not be putting a photograph on their site. Is that what it is?"

West: "Correct."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Thank you very much."

West: "Yup."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative West to close."
West: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1699 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bennett, Hernandez, Rita, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1712, offered by Leader Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1712, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1712 is a change to the Freedom of Information Act, and it is in response to a...something that happened with a school district where there was an Attorney General opinion that they had to release their credit card numbers, bank account numbers, and some other very sensitive financial information in response to a Freedom of Information Act request. So, I don't think that that's something we really want out there. So the...the Bill would provide another exception to the Freedom of Information Act for credit card numbers, debit card numbers, bank account numbers, FEIN numbers, security codes, passwords, and similar account information. I ask for an 'aye' vote and welcome any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "Indicated she will."
Skillicorn: "Good afternoon, Representative. So just a couple brief questions here. And I'm just quickly citing the Illinois Constitution, specifically about reports, records, and obligations for public use of funds that should be available for public inspection for the public according to law. So, how does redacting this information comply specifically with making the public records available for inspection?"

Burke: "So the actual statements and documents will be able to be produced, but the sensitive information such as credit card numbers, debit card numbers, bank account numbers, FEIN numbers, security code numbers, those would be redacted. I think it puts public body's financial assets and financial information at risk to be putting these specific... this specific amount of information out there."

Skillicorn: "And... although I might agree, we do not want FEIN numbers, we probably do not want the full 16 digit credit card numbers out there, you know, for people to do whatever with. Isn't there a situation here that we cannot actually identify each statement, I mean theoretically, we could have duplicate stations... statements if there's two different credit cards, two different credit card numbers? Yet, if the numbers are redacted, we cannot identify the actual statements. So, specifically I'm just curious if... the idea seems fine, but I think we still need some identifying features there. So, I meant specifically to a credit card, it's very common to have like the first 4 digits are shown and then the others 12 digits are redacted out. Is it a possibility to do something similar here?"
Burke: "This was a change that was recommended by the Attorney General's Office in response to this... in response to this situation. I think it's prudent and I think still protects the public's right to view the financial... you know, the actual account activity and numbers... account activity but not what the number of the account is. With identity theft and financial fraud so rampant, I think you are really putting a public body's and the taxpayer's finances at risk."

Skillicorn: "Well... and I completely understand that, but what I'm asking your for is that there be some identifying feature on these statements because if there are multiple credit cards, it would be very, very easy to pull the wool over other people's eyes by redacting all the numbers. And Federal Law actually addresses this, is that Federal Law specifically says that partial information is allowed in the sense, it encourages that so that there can be some accountability. So, I thank you for the measure. I could possibly support it, if there was a way we could identify it. But as is, I see this as a loophole and I'd like to address that. Thanks."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morgan is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Morgan: "I just wanted to thank... to the Bill. I just wanted to thank the Sponsor for bringing this legislation. As a Body, we've taken a number of steps to protect against identity theft in legislation and through actions through the Attorney General's Office. And I believe this legislation addresses a real concern that businesses might have their bank accounts stolen as well. And I think this is an appropriate legislation
to make sure that we are protecting the financial systems for these companies and these organizations. So I strongly support an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "Indicated she will."

Halbrook: "Yeah, will this apply to Trump tax records?"

Burke: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? I didn't hear you."

Halbrook: "Would this apply to Trump tax records? Was he to release them?"

Burke: "I have... I have no idea. We'll cross that bridge when we come to it, if we ever see them."

Halbrook: "So, the important question of the day here is, how we know that we have unique statements... if you eliminate all 16 digits, how do we know that we have all 16... or the proper statements? You could put a better statement in lieu of one that didn't read so well. And how are we going to be able to sort that out?"

Burke: "Well, it would have... and it would have all other identifying information on there and I... I'm pretty certain people would be able to discern which account is which based on the name and the activity in the account."

Halbrook: "Yeah. So, would you explain that a little bit farther when you say all other identifying information? I'm not sure how we can..."

Burke: "So the account holder, the financial institution where it's held, the date, the actual... whether it's a credit card statement, so the actual charges, the actual payments. All..."
if it’s a bank statement, the activity, that will all still be public."

Halbrook: "Yeah, I... with all due respect, I think that’s a weak argument because... then why do we have account numbers if we can just use all those other indicators that you're talking about?"

Burke: "So, Representative, I think there was a presumption that this information was already protected and it had been routinely redacted. And it was only in response to one situation where the entity wanted it disclosed, took it to the Public Access Counselor and the public access counselor determined that, even though it had been practiced for entities to redact this information due to its sensitive nature, that there was not an explicit exemption within the Freedom of Information Act and that's why this was created with the input from the Attorney General's Office."

Halbrook: "Yeah, well... I'm not sure that's exactly right. Let me just... to the Bill. The Federal Credit... I'm sorry, the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act does not prohibit publishing partial credit card numbers. The Illinois Banking Act does not prohibit a unit of a local government from releasing its credit card numbers. The Illinois Personal Information Protection Act does not prohibit the release of credit card numbers on a unit of local government. And the list goes on, and on, and on here with there is no prohibition on this. We believe that we have to have unique identifiers. The last four digits are important. Any time, if you were to write me a check, I have your account number on that check. So we
believe this is the wrong Bill, the wrong time. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Connor is recognized. Okay, we'll take it back. Leader Burke to close"

Burke: "With financial fraud and identity theft and all other manner of electronic... of electronic thievery out there, I think this is a prudent... a prudent step. I think it's something that has been the accepted practice but now we're making it explicit. So I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1712 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? Hoffman, Moeller, Walker. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting in 'favor', 10 voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1715, offered by Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1715, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1715 has no opposition. As a matter of fact, the proponents are the Illinois State Medical Society, the Pharmacists Association, NAMI, and various substance abuse and mental health providers. What it does is allow pharmacists to continue to administer long-acting opioids for the treatment of substance abuse that are prescribed by a physician and have been
initially administered by a physician. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1715 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? Cabello, Harper, Smith. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And next we have Senate Bill 1724, offered by Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1724, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Crespo. It's an honor to do two Bills with you, today, as Speaker. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 1724. It is an initiative and the hard work of the Illinois Environmental Council. And what it does, it makes water rates affordable for all, it sets up a tool for the state to study the rates of water across the State of Illinois and the different communities. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 1724."

Speaker Crespo: "Rep Ford, the pleasure's all mine. Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Batinick: "So, I... and I think I just wanted a little bit of clarification, Representative. So, UIC, a government finance
research center, subject to appropriation, is just going to make sure our water rates are fair, even, up, down and are they including base rates or what municipalities... tell me a little bit more about specifically what they are trying to do here."

Ford: "So the water rates setting gives the state a tool to understanding how water rates are being set. So we can now understand how to make water more affordable for everyone. So it's going to study how the water rates are being set. There was a Tribune report done or story written in a series, where it talked about how the variation of water rates to the users of people of Lake Michigan water across the state varies. And the report showed that certain communities, mainly poor communities, tend to pay more for water. And so, what we want to do in Illinois is make sure that the basic human right of having fresh and clean water is available and affordable."

Batinick: "Okay, well I'm guessing here, but some of the poorer areas probably have less real estate value in their area, so they have to find tax revenue in a different way and municipalities... this was where I'm going... the municipalities then jack up the water rates in order to pay for other services. So, it feels like we are mixing kind of environment with tax policy into a new soup. Are we more concerned about the safety of water or everybody having access to water or are we more concerned about just the structure of the cost of water throughout the area?"

Ford: "I think the Illinois Environmental Council, they're concerned about all of that. And you have to start and work with each issue as you have it. This is a great opportunity
to work with the university to study the rates and this is some work that has been worked on for a number of years. And it is part of making sure that we have fresh and clean water for the people..."

Batinick: "Okay. Do you have an idea what the report will cost?"

Ford: "I mean, it could cost up to maybe 300 thousand or it could be a..."

Batinick: "Okay. I mean, I did a similar Bill that was going to be about 300 thousand, similar study. And who is paying for that? It's subject to appropriation or am I..."

Ford: "It's subject to appropriation."

Batinick: "Okay, all right. Thank you."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In regards to water, there are certain things that we cannot live without and water is one of them. And it shouldn't be predicated on your zip code. It shouldn't be predicated on your income, whether or not you can have the availability of something that man did not make and have no responsibility for, other than trying to keep it clean. So, I would urge support for Senate Bill 1724 because everyone should be entitled to the right to have water. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ford to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1724 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 108 voting in 'favor', 8 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1731, offered by Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill.

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1731, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1731 is... let me back track. Last year, in the General Assembly, you all passed a Bill requiring all licensed school personnel and administrators who work with students in K-12 to be trained at least once every two years to identify warning signs of mental illness and suicidal behavior in youth, and to be aware of appropriate intervention and referral techniques. This Bill, Senate Bill 1731, is a trailer Bill. This legislation provides that a school district may utilize the Illinois Mental Health First Aid Training Program in order to meet that requirement. I would entertain any questions and I would appreciate and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1731 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? Davidsmeyer, Edly-Allen, Moeller. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we
have Senate Bill 1735, offered by Representative Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1735, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker. All of us are concerned by financial challenges faced by families in Illinois. I introduced Senate Bill 1735 to help facilitate research to better understand those challenges and potential policy solutions. This Bill will encourage more evidence-based policy making in Illinois. And it will allow for people who are participating in anti-poverty programs to maintain their public benefits. I welcome any questions and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Batinick: "So, Representative, I don't think I caught this in your intro. Basically what this is doing, if somebody's being compensated in some way, shape, or form for some sort of trial program, that income or benefit does not affect their base benefits. Is that correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Batinick: "So, what is... can you give me some of the scenarios... I mean, to me... to me the point would be, if we're going to try something new, wouldn't the point be to try... if that's going to fix things, then wouldn't that be the only program that they need?"

Ramirez: "So, actually, this is a pilot program that's going to help us evaluate what poverty looks like and how we can..."
address it across the nation. It is a $20 million investment of private dollars. There... so for example, there is a program that will be able to benefit from this where there will be $20 million of private funds coming to the State of Illinois, and they will be providing a gift to 500 families in the State of Illinois of a thousand dollars a month as they are researching how going from receiving this gift and maintaining their public benefits, people can go from poverty to wealth creation. And so, this... the participants in this program, specifically within my legislation in this program, it'll be about 300 people that will be able to maintain their public benefits. That is it. However, the State of Illinois will get private, private $20 million of investment."

Batinick: "Okay. Just to be clear, that investment can be made with or without this legislation, correct?"

Ramirez: "They will not make that investment without this legislation. This is a program, it's an anti-poverty pilot program that is going to... it's a national program where they've selected two areas, Texas and Illinois, to be able to test this anti-poverty pilot. They will not come to Illinois if the individuals who are participating in the program are at risk of losing their public benefits as a result of participating in the program."

Batinick: "Okay. So these individuals are going to get their public benefits and they're going to get... there's a term for it that's escaping me because you may be surprised, I'm not a socialist..."

Ramirez: "I'm not a socialist either."
Batinick: "The base pay, what's the base pay that's being pushed? The idea of giving..."

Ramirez: "Universal Basic Income, is that what you're saying?"

Batinick: "Universal... so, basically, what we're... is that what we're testing here, Universal Basic Income while keeping the public benefits?"

Ramirez: "They are going to be testing and they are going to be evaluating the individuals in the program to see what happens when people have a basic income and how their trends move, how they're able to move from the day to day poverty across the State of Illinois into actually creating wealth. So that is correct, through private dollars, all it is, is testing it. It is a five year program of which, for three years individuals will receive a gift. Two years after that, the researchers will continue to follow the families to see where they are. And at the end of five years they will provide a report that is national, with University of Chicago, University of California, and other universities to demonstrate if this idea, in fact, works and how we could look at that as possible, you know, methodology to look and consider as we are looking at anti-poverty work across the nation."

Batinick: "Okay. No, yeah. This is great. I'm glad we're really figuring out what the Bill does here. So, how long will they get the thousand dollars a month for?"

Ramirez: "And again, this is not my Bill. My Bill is about protecting public benefits, but, thankfully, I know a lot about that program. So, they will be receiving a thousand dollar a month, for 3 years, totaling $36 thousand that will..."
go into 9 counties in the State of Illinois that would actually be bringing economic development to 9 counties, correct. For 3 years."
Batinick: "Nine counties, so it's twenty million dollars of a public... a private..."
Ramirez: "Twenty million dollars of private dollars coming to the State of Illinois."
Batinick: "...private program that’s dependent on this legislation, correct?"
Ramirez: "That is depending on this legislation."
Batinick: "Okay. So, basically, this is... it opens the door for us to test Universal Basic Income, correct?"
Ramirez: "It opens the door to test anti-poverty programs and it is not limited to just Universal Basic Income."
Batinick: "Okay. All right. Very much appreciate your answers. Thank you."
Ramirez: "Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ramirez to close."
Ramirez: "All of us know that we have a poverty problem in the State of Illinois and certainly in the country. This initiative can really put Illinois at the top as we are looking at how to address it and be innovative and go from poverty to wealth creation. I can't reiterate enough, an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "And the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1735 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? Edly-Allen, Evans, McCombie, Smith. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there
are 74 voting in 'favor', 41 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And welcome me... please join me in welcoming our Attorney General Kwame Raoul. Hey, Kwame. Next we have Senate Bill 1744, offered by Representative Greenwood. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1744, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. Senate Bill 1744 states that upon release this is to assist in determining Medicaid eligibility and provides assistance with the application for... upon the release of an inmate. I'm asking for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1744 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Edly-Allen. Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please 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, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1746, offered by Representative Greenwood. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. Senate Bill 1746 is an initiative of Cahokia School District
and the School Management Alliance. This legislation is in response to Cahokia School District 187 and its need to expand its bonding capacity. Currently, the Bill has an immediate effective date and I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Batinick: "Representative, I had Members on your side of the aisle telling me that I don't ask any questions on your Bills. So I figured I'd hit my button here. How about that?"
Greenwood: "Okay."
Batinick: "No, seriously. This increases the amount of indebtedness that a school may take on for working cash purposes, correct?"
Greenwood: "Correct."
Batinick: "Okay. That seems a little scary to me. Why are we doing that?"
Greenwood: "The district is looking to increase bonding ability as a result of the new funding formula."
Batinick: "Well then... my concern is exactly that right there. I guess after this year, we'll be putting over a billion dollars versus where we were just a couple of years ago. If you go back to the prorated formula, its well over a billion dollars of new money into the formula. Yet, we have schools, and I assume that this will be a Tier 1 school, that needs to increase its indebtedness for working capital. That sounds like we're giving them more money and things are going in the wrong direction."
Greenwood: "I believe the current statute provides that the money in a district's Working Cash Fund may be used by the school board for any and all school purposes. This requires that, in addition to that, that the Working Cash Fund may be transferred again in anticipation of the state funding received by the school district."

Batinick: "Okay. I guess it's... I'm still missing the bridge between what you just said and why they need to increase their indebtedness. I guess... I'll go straight to the Bill. We have a situation where we are putting a lot more money... and we are a state, certainly, that isn't flushed with cash. But, one of the things... good things that we have done is we've invested a lot more money into our K-12 education. On this particular Bill, I'm concerned about increasing the limit of indebtedness because, although it's brought by one school district, I believe this law isn't just for that one school district. This would be... affect everybody in the state. For those reasons, I have to urge a no vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Greenwood to close."

Greenwood: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1746 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bennett, Meier, Parkhurst, Scherer, Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we
have Senate Bill 1750, offered by Representative Bristow. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1750, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1750 makes it an aggravating factor in sentencing when a defendant leaves the scene of a car accident that resulted in death without reporting it to law enforcement and at the time of the accident the defendant was driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs or using a cell phone. By making the offense an aggravating factor, the court is required to give weight in favor of imposing a more severe sentence. This Bill is the initiative of the Madison County State's Attorney's Office, as an attempt to address the issues that have been contributing to drivers fleeing the scene of an accident without reporting to the police. I would appreciate your support and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1750 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? Guzzardi. Lilly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1765, offered by Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1765, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, colleagues. This Bill is identical to House Bill 2884, which passed this chamber unanimously. It's technical cleanup language to the Chicago Teacher Pension Fund. Our colleagues in the Senate, in their infinite wisdom, chose to replace the language in that Bill with something entirely different. So, here we are running a different vehicle here in the House. I appreciate your consideration and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1765 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? Martwick. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 4 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1778, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. Next we have Senate Bill 1787, offered by Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1787, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Crespo: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1787 is identical to House Bill 2455, which passed out of committee 10 to 0, here in the chamber. It's an Amendment to the Illinois Secure Choice Savings Program Act. It changes a couple of the definitions to broaden the options for investment for the Treasurer. And it establishes
deadlines for payment of payroll deductions to the fund. And it allows the Treasurer to enter into an agreement from residents of other states to participate in the program. And it will also require the Treasurer to prepare annual reports on the benefits provided by the program and post the report on the program Web site. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Moeller is recognized on the Bill."

Moeller: "No, not for the Bill. For a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "We'll come back to you. There being no further debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1787 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? Greenwood. Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1788, offered by Representative Bennett. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1788, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr... appreciate that very much. If you look at your analysis, you'll notice that the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor have the same last name. That is not a misprint. That is on purpose so that you know us. But we are glad to have this Bill, Senate Bill 1788. It
provides the program board created to administer the grant program is to be comprised of 11, rather than 21 members. As an initiative of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Board of Higher Education is a proponent of this Bill. And the Illinois Board of Higher Education is requesting to reduce the membership to ease the process of attaining a quorum. So, I move for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1791 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'... let me back track. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1788 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 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 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 is granted. Leader Harris on the Motion."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that the following Bills can be held... can be heard in committee this week. In House Agriculture & Conservation Committee, HR398. To Appropriations-Capital, HR394. To Elementary & Secondary Education: Schools Curriculum & Policies, SJR40. In Health Care Licenses, HR386. In Human Services, HB3840, in... HR390, SJR16, and SJR35. In International Trade & Commerce, HR385. Revenue & Finance, HB2079. In State Government Administration, House Resolution..."
390. In Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges, House Joint Resolution 78, in... also Senate Joint Resolution 24. And in Veterans' Affairs, House Resolution 391."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Harris has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Representative Moeller, for what reason do you seek recognition?

Moeller: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "State your point."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I am happy to welcome my district... one of my district interns, Irving Moran. He's here with us, today, in Springfield. He just recently graduated from Elgin Community College and will be spending time at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He is a former intern for U.S. Senator Dick Durbin, and all around fantastic human being. So if we could give him a warm welcome to Irving Moran to Springfield."

Speaker Crespo: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Weber, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Weber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to see if I could be recorded on SB1735, I intended to be a 'no' vote on that."

Speaker Crespo: "Be reflected on the Journal. Next we have Senate Bill 1791, offered by Representative Hernandez. Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1791, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hernandez."
Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will open the door for more job training. Our current SNAP employment and training program mandates participation for over 300 thousand individuals as a condition of receiving SNAP. However, our employment and training program is under-resourced. There are only 3 thousand monthly employment training slots for those 300 thousand people. We're asking people to jump through a hoop that isn't there. I can answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Demmer is recognized."
Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Demmer: "Representative Hernandez, thanks for that explanation in this Bill. I just wanted to clarify a few things. I'm obviously in support of it, I've signed on as a cosponsor. I just want to clarify, does this do anything to change the federal work requirement for the SNAP program?"
Hernandez, B.: "No, it does not."
Demmer: "And does this have any fiscal impact to the state?"
Hernandez, B.: "It does not."
Demmer: "Okay. Thank you. I encourage a 'yes' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Hernandez to close."
Hernandez, B.: "I ask for a 'yes' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1791 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? Ammons, Caulkins, Murphy, Sommer, Weber. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting in 'favor', 10 voting 'against', and 0
voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1800, Representative Marron. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1800, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Marron."

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senate Bill 1800 is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Revenue. It simply increases the threshold for paying estimated tax from five hundred to a thousand dollars. I know of no opposition and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1800 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? Flowers, Lilly, Ortiz, Sommer, Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1806, offered by Representative DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1806, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1806 is a cleanup initiative of the Illinois CPA Society. It removes outdated accounting and auditing definitions and terminology from the Government Account Audit Act, the
Counties Code, and the Municipal Code. I'll be happy to run through all the definition changes and minor terminology changes if anyone wishes. But I ask for a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1806 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? Bennett, Brady, Meyers-Martin, Ugaste. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1808, offered by Representative Robinson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SB1880 requires numerous state agencies to enter into an inter-agency agreement for the purpose of providing prevention services to youth in care of the Department of Children and Family Services and young adults who are aging out or have recently aged out of the department's care. The intent of this Bill is to intercept and divert youth in care from experiencing homelessness, incarceration, unemployment, and other similar outcomes. I ask for an 'aye' vote on SB1808."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1808 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? Guzzardi. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1831, offered by Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1831 is an initiative of the Associated Beer Distributors of Illinois. This is basically some cleanup legislation. It codifies existing interpretations from the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and it makes changes to the Liquor Control Act in six specific areas. I'm not aware of any opposition to this cleanup Bill. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1831 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? Have all voted who wish? Gordon-Booth, Halbrook, Miller. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1839, offered by Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1839, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1839 is an initiative of UPS that creates a license for third-party logistics providers, defined as a company that contracts with a prescription drug company to warehouse or distribute prescription drugs that does not own or sell the drugs. UPS and other companies frequently contract to ship Illinois manufactured prescription drugs to other states. However, recently UPS has begun encountering problems with certain states that require a home state third-party logistics provider license. That is why this legislation is required and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1839 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1841, offered by Representative Unes. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1841 simply states that anyone working as a massage therapist needs to be licensed as such by IDFPR. I know of no opposition. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1841 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Carroll, Connor. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1857, Leader Gordon-Booth. Leader Gordon-Booth and 1857. Out of the record. Representative... Leader Harris is recognized."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Yingling is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Crespo: "Next we have Senate Bill 1862, offered by Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1862, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and all of the Members of the Assembly and all those listening. This is a very, very special piece of legislation because what the General Assembly is about to do now is send a message to all of our first responders and all of our police officers, our security officers, our sheriffs, everybody that's out there working on these streets and on these dangerous roads, that we not only care about you, but we want to protect you. And we want to send a message to all of the motorists that when you are going past a first responder who's working diligently out in the field that you must respect them and you must protect them..."
and ensure that they get home to their families. Since 2002, you know, we've had the slow down and move over law which was named after... it was named as Scott's Law, and, you know, we still have the senseless killings of our first responders and it must stop. This Bill... this Bill is in memory of Lieutenant Scott Gillen, Trooper Brooke Jones-Story, Trooper Christopher Lambert, and all others who have paid the ultimate sacrifice while serving in the line of duty. The current law right now, the current Scott's Law, without any of this new legislation, makes it crystal clear that you must move over and protect our first responders. It is called the Scott's Law, after a Chicago Firefighter, who was hit on the expressway in 2000. It's been a law since 2002 and he's... he'll never be forgotten. This new Bill strengthens the law by increasing the fine, establishing a fund for educating drivers 'cause it's all about education through the Secretary of State. And the goal is simple, we want to eliminate, not reduce, but eliminate first responder death and I believe this language takes the first step. Getting into the specifics of the Bill, it adds clarifying language that allows individuals to make a left lane change from left to center on a two-lane expressway to avoid an accident with a stationary authorized vehicle with an oscillating lights. First responders, IDOT workers, law enforcement officers, and individuals that are authorized to be on our expressways. Under this Bill, the fine will be no less than $250, and a second and substantive violation, which we hope would never happen, will be no less than $750. There will be a $250 assessment upon the Scott's law violation that will be deposited into the Scott's Law Fund, which will be
administered by the Secretary of State to educate our drivers. I'm available for questions. I request your support. And I'd like to thank... but before we move on to questions, I'd like to thank all of the cosponsors. We have a myriad of cosponsors but definitely Leader Hoffman, Representative Butler, Representative Cabello, Representative Jones, Representative Hurley for their leadership in this space. And I'd like to thank, again, Representative Hoffman for allowing me to usher this through because I've talked to my local law enforcement and on every level and they are very grateful the General Assembly, again, want them to return home to their families. So, I request your support."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Thank you to Chairman Evans for shepherding this legislation through and doing a great job of explaining it. And before I give a few remarks, I really want to thank Leader Hoffman. I don’t see that he's on the floor right now but there was a phone call that both Representative Cabello and I received a few weeks ago before the break. And Representative Hoffman called us after Trooper Jones-Story and Trooper Ellis had passed away about working together to how we can better strengthen Scott's Law. And I give Jay a lot of credit and I give both the House Democrats and both caucuses of the Senate a lot of credit for working on this Bill in the way we should work on legislation, in a bipartisan, collaborative manner that does good things for the people of Illinois. I personally think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we're going to consider this spring. We've seen what has happened to our
troopers on the side of the road. We just had tow truck accident, a tow driver accident here in Sangamon County just east of town. Luckily, no one was hurt in that. But we all drive a lot of miles in our jobs here in the State of Illinois. We see people that do not get over, that do not move over when they see people on the side of the road. We do not... we see people that don't pull over when emergency vehicles are on the side of the road. The idea behind this piece of legislation, what we're doing to Scott's Law, move over law, is to correlate it with our construction zone laws. To make it very simple for people to understand when they come upon a construction zone or when they come upon a Scott's Law situation, they're going to know that these are severe penalties that are... that are in place. And I really appreciate the work on this. We have a second Bill that will be coming up later on. We've still got one more Amendment to add to it that will create... it will add a little bit to the... to the pool of questions for the Secretary of State, but also create a task force that will work very quickly for more answers on Scott's Law as we move forward. So, I just want to thank you, Marcus, for your work on this. Representative Cabello's been a big part of this and Representative Hoffman as well. This is a good Bill and I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie is recognized."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

McCombie: "Thank you. Thank you for all your work on this Bill. I had an Amendment that I had given to Representative Butler
on his Bill that he had prior to this that was amending the speed limit, decreasing it to 20 miles per hour under the posted speed limit. I think there was oftentimes concern whether or not just saying slowdown, reducing speed was enough and whether or not that was actually making it clear. And I don’t see that in this Bill and I was wondering why?"

Evans: "I've had this Bill for a little while now, so we've had no discussions about an Amendment. So, I'm not... the Bill I passed it in committee. At no point did we have any discussion about an Amendment."

McCombie: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Swanson is recognized."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank everyone who helped work on this piece of legislation. And on behalf of Lucy Kuelper, who you may remember was my Page here a few weeks ago, the one who started the Move Over for My Dad campaign. This means a lot to her. Means a lot to all of our emergency personnel. So, thank you for looking out for those who care for us."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins is recognized."

Caulkins: "I... to the Bill. I want to thank you very much. I want to recognize the gentleman from our House District, Chris Moore, who was run over on the side of the interstate while trying to retrieve a car. This Bill has been very important to all of us and I appreciate this Bill coming forward and look forward to being able to support. Chris has been up in the gallery day after day, there he is up there in the gray t-shirt. His life was changed when someone ran him over, a
hit and run, never to be found. This Bill is very, very important to us and thank you to the Sponsors.

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morgan is recognized."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to thank the Sponsor for the work on this, also Representative Butler and others who have been working on Scott's Law for the last number of years. As we all know, we have lost a number of State Troopers and I just want to specifically mention the appreciation of... from me and from our district for the loss of Christopher Lambert just a few months ago and how important this legislation is. And I very strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First responders of Illinois, the message is clear, the Illinois General Assembly wants you to make it home safely. I request your support."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1862 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 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1868, offered by Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1868, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill continues a trend by the Illinois Legislature, which allows survivors of clergy
sex abuse access to court. This Bill codifies the Wisniewski decision to provide that plaintiffs have a tool to overcome statute of limitation when it can be shown that situations... institutions have fraudulently concealed causes of action arising out of childhood sex abuse. So it's simply closing another loophole in the bar to plaintiffs going to court for clergy sex abuse and things of that nature. Happy to answer..."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1868 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Carroll, Connor, Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1872, offered by Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1872, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1872 is the renewal of the Real Estate Licensure Act. It's an agreed Bill between the realtor industry and the Department of Professional Regulation. Extends their professional Act for another 10 years. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1872 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? Andrade, Bourne, Martwick. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1882, Representative Connor. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1882, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this august and venerable Assembly. Senate Bill 1882 is to address an issue with attorneys using potential conflict of interest allegations as a method to identify confidential informants in drug prosecutions. In contravention of Illinois Supreme Court Rule 412(j)(ii). I know of no opposition to the Bill and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1882 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? Davis, Miller, Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1888, Representative Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1888, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Clinical Social Worker... Work Practice Act. As we're all aware, the state is... we don't have enough social workers out in the field. And what this Bill allows is if you are in a master's level program, in the last semester, it allows you to sit for the test. That way there is going to be less of a delay by the time you pass your exam, graduate from your master's program, and can actually get integrated into the community providing these vital services. There is no known opposition. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1888 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? Halbrook. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1889, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1889, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm here on Senate Bill 1889. Back in 2015, the General Assembly passed legislation to create a simulation training academy through the University of Illinois at Springfield to train our frontline DCFS child protection investigators using experiential learning, which is proven to be more effective
than traditional classroom teaching. This Bill acknowledges the progress made by the academy over these last few years and, subject to appropriation, expands their training to include not only new hires but also seasoned investigators, and expands laboratory training facilities to include mock medical facilities and forensic interview rooms. DCFS will also arrange for an independent evaluation of the training academy to continue through June of 2021. I think this is an excellent expansion of the work they're already doing and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1889 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? Guzzardi, Lilly, Morrison. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1894, Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1894, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Senate Bill 1894 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code, provides that children and step-children, in addition to the spouse and parents of a police officer or fire fighter who has died in the line of duty, may be issued a special license plate. I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1894 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? Jones, Kalish, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1902, Representative DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1902, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1902 is an initiative of the Capital Development Board and any new contract renewal in the amount of $250 thousand or more in a fiscal year allows for the chief executive officer, the... or his or her designee, and the agency's chief legal counsel or his or her designee, and the chief fiscal officer or his or her designee. And it allows that to prevent some contracts from being delayed and any extended absences. Be happy to answer any questions. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I'm... quick question. Is this a totally new law or is this raising the amount of the existing contract that they can sign off on?"
DeLuca: "I don't believe there's any change in the amount. I believe it just has to do with allowing for another person to be able to... another authorized signatory."

Batinick: "Okay. So, right now who can sign for contracts under these circumstances?"

DeLuca: "Either... from what I understand, its either the chief executive officer, the agency's chief legal counsel or the chief fiscal officer."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. Thank you very much."

DeLuca: "You are welcome."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Halbrook: "yeah, just... we had this question in committee. Just want to make sure that this is just allowing for one designee for each of these three people?"

DeLuca: "That is correct."

Halbrook: "Okay. Thank you. No further questions."

DeLuca: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1902 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? Lilly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
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passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1907, Representative Halpin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1907, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1907 applies to public universities and community colleges in the State of Illinois. It requires them to consider military and individuals receiving VA education benefits to be deemed in-state residents for tuition purposes. This is a Bill that makes sure Illinois complies with Federal Law. Although, I would say this is something we should be doing anyway, even if Federal Law didn't require it. It is unopposed. And with great patriotism, I will answer any questions and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1907 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 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1915, offered by Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1915, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Stava-Murray."
Stava-Murray:  "Yes. Senate Bill 1915 is an initiative by the Illinois State Police. Among other things, it’s a statutory cleanup, as well as a rebranding for one of their divisions. The… unfortunately, initialed DOA, will now become the DJS, the Division of Justice Services. And the things that they've already been doing are just being put into statute."

Speaker Crespo:  "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1915 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? Costa-Howard. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1917, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin:  "Senate Bill 1917, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo:  "Representative Hurley."

Hurley:  "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is also an Illinois State Police initiative. They're seeking to expand the authority to apply for raffle and poker run licenses for statewide associations and other law enforcement officials. So, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. And its Hurley-Manley, Leader Manley wanted me to mention."

Speaker Crespo:  "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1917 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? Have all voted who wish? Evans, Hernandez,
Turner. Lisa Hernandez. Okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1919, offered by Representative Walker. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1919, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "I'm delighted to present Senate Bill 1919, which, along with two companion Bills, sets up a robust employment and apprenticeship program across the state. It will involve three things. One is a planning process where apprenticeship programs that include employers, community colleges, and high schools will get together, form a program where the soft skills are taught by the community college, the hard skills are taught following guidelines of the employer and the... a given number of the students we expect to be hired by the employers. It also... this Bill forms, not only a grant program for those programs, but also a board from the community college board that will administer these programs over time. It is subject to appropriation. We don't expect any hard costs to come to this program until the following fiscal year, not this coming one. So, I ask for your support. I might say that we looked at a lot apprenticeship programs around the state and a lot of the Bills related to apprenticeship programs, tried to take the best of all. The reason Representative McCombie is co-chief Sponsor is one of her Bills was about
this issue and we thought that had good ideas in it, so I wanted to give her credit for that as well."

Speaker Crespo: "Okay. There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1919 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? Meyers-Martin. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1938, offered by Representative Greenwood. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1938, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. Senate Bill 1938 authorizes five land transfers of state property. One parcel, currently owned by IDOT, and four other parcels owned by DNR. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1938 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 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1941, offered by Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1941 is similar to House Bill 2084, which recently passed the House. They were identical Bills, however, the Senate version, we have added an Amendment that was requested by ISBE that kind of cleaned up some technical language. This is the Bill that creates the Safe Schools and Healthy Learning Environments Grant Program. It is subject to appropriations. I am not aware of any opposition to this Bill that we've had a lot of work on. Several proponents, including CTU, National Association of Social Workers, IEA, and the Illinois Association of School Social Workers. But most importantly, the organization VOICE is very... worked very hard the last couple of years to get us to this point. And I would ask for approval and reward them for their hard work."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1941 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? Meyers-Martin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1952, offered by Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1952, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... or Mr. Speaker, sorry. Today, I have Senate Bill 1952 with House Committee Amendment #1. It gets rid of the basic skills test. It makes it optional to pay student teachers. It refunds the EdTPA if it's a Tier 1 school and the Amendment deleted the three to six percent retirement. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1952 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? Butler, Feigenholtz, Spain, Wehrli, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting in 'favor', 23 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1965, offered by Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1965, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1965 is identical to House Bill 3061, which we did pass out of this chamber. The Senate beat us in the process, so we're back here, again, with Senate Bill 1965. This Bill is a reentry initiative that will help us address our recidivism rate here in the State of Illinois. The Bill allows returning citizens with backgrounds that are seeking jobs in the health care industry to apply for the health care
waiver that they need earlier in the job interviewing process. Myself, along with Senator Sims worked very closely with the Illinois Department of Public Health on this matter. They understand what the issue is and they're dedicated and committed to working with returning citizens to begin the waiver approval process earlier. This is a great reentry Bill. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1965 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? Bailey, Davidsmeyer, Edly-Allen, Grant, McCombie, Scherer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting in 'favor', 35 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1993, offered by Representative D’Amico. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1993, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative D’Amico."

D’Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1993 is an initiative of the State Police and the Truckers Association. Corrects a drafting error from a previous Bill which eliminated a requirement for the State Police to perform random, unscheduled emission inspections. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1993 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? Jones. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2024, offered by Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2024, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill pertains to apprenticeship programs in the State of Illinois. We all know how incredibly important these programs are in getting young people trained and skilled for the jobs of the future. However, we also know that we need to expand apprenticeship programs. The programs that we have are currently limited to a very narrow set of fields and we want these programs to be available and accessible to people across the State of Illinois. For instance, only 28 percent of apprentices today... registered apprentices... are people of color and only 4 percent of registered apprentices in Illinois are women, 4 percent are women. So, we know we can do better to expand apprenticeship programs to people across the State of Illinois. So, this legislation would start us on that path. It would create an apprenticeship study that will be conducted by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. They will report to us by June 1, 2020 and give us detailed information on the apprenticeship programs that exist and the possibilities to expand those programs into new fields and to bring in a more diverse set of apprentices in the future. I
know of no opposition. It's a very popular Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2024 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? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Gordon-Booth, Lilly, Morrison. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2026, offered by Representative Mason. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2026, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mason."

Mason: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2026 is a similar Bill to House Bill 4165 that passed last Session but was vetoed by Governor Rauner. It prohibits the state from applying for a federal waiver that would reduce or eliminate protections of health coverage required under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act unless approved by the General Assembly via a Joint Resolution. So, that includes protections for coverage for pre-existing conditions and coverage for essential health benefits. I... happy to answer any questions. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Batinick: "Representative, I see the Department of Insurance is opposed to this Bill. Is that correct?"
Mason: "I believe so."
Batinick: "Okay. And what's the nature of their opposition?"
Mason: "Yeah. So they indicated in committee that they want to be able to have the flexibility to reduce benefits below those required in order to save money and not have to wait for a Joint Resolution from the General Assembly."
Batinick: "Okay. Well, it's changed benefits I assume too, right? Just... things can be different. I mean, sometimes I hear people use the word lower benefits and sometimes it's just different in reality. Who has this authority now, essentially? What branch of government has this authority?"
Mason: "No, no, no. So, it's not the same for changing, this prohibits reducing."
Batinick: "Right, I understand what the Bill does. Who has this authority now to seek a federal waiver?"
Mason: "So, CMS. Yeah."
Batinick: "Okay, CMS. And..."
Mason: "Or HFS."
Batinick: "...what elected officials is in charge of CMS?"
Mason: "Excuse me?"
Batinick: "What elected official is in charge of CMS?"
Mason: "The Governor."
Batinick: "Right. So, the Governor. So I guess what we are saying... we are taking power away from the Executive Branch because... that's what we're doing here essentially, right?"
Mason: "Well, the intention is not to take away the power. The intention is to protect people's rights to certain health benefits that are covered under state insurance."

Batinick: "Right, but you are shifting that power from the Executive Branch to the Legislative Branch?"

Mason: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. So, that is... that is what you are doing. I mean, we elect Governor's for a reason. A lot of these things shouldn't be caught up in the minutiae of the General Assembly and caught up with other things. We know how this works. I certainly recommend a 'no' vote on this. There are times where... where change is necessary and I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Demmer is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Demmer: "Representative, I know you mentioned... or answering a question previously that the Department of Insurance is opposed to this. Have you spoken to the Governor's Office?"

Mason: "Yes, I have."

Demmer: "And what's their position on this?"

Mason: "They are neutral on this Bill."

Demmer: "They are neutral on it, but an agency that reports to the Governor is opposed to it?"

Mason: "Yes."

Demmer: "That’s an interesting dichotomy. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. We've seen similar initiatives to this in previous administrations. At the time, we oppose it because we thought there's a separation of powers issue here. That's exactly
what we have here today. I know that I'm not in the political party that the Governor is today. I was a couple of years ago. I opposed it then, I opposed it now. This is not good policy. The proper function of the General Assembly is not to pass... is not to restrict the power of the Executive and make them get a Joint Resolution in order to proceed with a power that's clearly delegated to them. This General Assembly has the power to act through public acts, through prescribing the authorities to the Executive Branch, but not by putting artificial barriers in the way of them carrying out duties that are delegated to them by both Federal Law and by the Constitution. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morgan is recognized."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think what we're missing here is that we already have a process through health care where we seek waivers from the Federal Government in a number of different ways over the last few decades. This is an explanation and an assertion of policy that we, as a Legislative Body, as the State of Illinois, believe in protecting pre-existing conditions. That's what this legislation does. It says whether we have Governor Pritzker or a future Governor who seeks to reduce and limit the health insurance coverage for pre-existing conditions or essential health benefits and to seek a waiver from the Federal Government that we wouldn't allow that. And I think that's wrong. I don't think that's what the State of Illinois wants and I really support the Sponsors legislation. I think we all know there are a number of times where, as a Body, we take positions about where we go with health care for the State of
Illinois. This legislation will make a clear statement and make it clear that as a state, as a Legislature and an administrative and Executive Branch, we're not seeking a waiver from the Federal Government to cut pre-existing conditions. We won't do it. Vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."
Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Skillicorn: "Just want to clarify here a couple of questions. I hear one defense here. What are these waivers for again?"
Mason: "The waivers reduce or eliminate protections against benefits outlined in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act."
Skillicorn: "And that's it. Specifically... so we're talking about pre-existing conditions, right? And that's it?"
Mason: "Pre-existing conditions and coverage for essential health benefits."
Skillicorn: "Okay. Now... what if the Act actually says any federal waiver?"
Mason: "Any federal waiver that would reduce or eliminate any protection or coverage required under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act."
Skillicorn: "And who should really have that power, Legislature or the Executive Branch?"
Mason: "Well, what I'm saying in this Bill is that the Legislature needs to approve any reductions. So that answers your question."
Skillicorn: "So, the Executive Branch should never again have that power? I mean, I understand how Governor Rauner... I mean
Pritzker is not well liked by anyone in this chamber. But... shouldn't maybe future Governors have this power? I mean, they do currently have this power."

Mason: "You know, first of all, that's highly inappropriate and I don't think you should be speaking for anyone on our feelings based on our Governor. Secondly, this is not taking away the Governor's power. It is protecting coverage from going below a certain standard and requiring the General Assembly to... to agree to that."

Skillicorn: "But if we do nothing and Governor doesn't ask for a waiver, nothing changes, right?"

Mason: "Correct."

Skillicorn: "So, we're basically inhibiting the Governor from, you know, maybe something that we don't conceive, could be coming up and we ask for a waiver. It would take that power away from him or her?"

Mason: "Only if the waiver is reducing benefits covered under the Affordable Care Act."

Skillicorn: "All right. Thank you very much. To the Bill. I urge a 'no'."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mason to close."

Mason: "Thank you. This is a good Bill that protects people covered under state insurance, including the State Employee Group Health Insurance Act, the Illinois Insurance Code, and the Illinois Public Aid Code. We certainly hope that this will never have to be used. We hope that our Governor, whoever it shall be in the future, will respect the rights of people to have coverage for pre-existing conditions and for essential health benefits. But should a future Governor
request a waiver to be excused from those mandates, then I think it's the right of the General Assembly to either approve or disprove it based on the circumstances at the time. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2026 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 75 voting in 'favor', 41 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2030, offered by Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2030, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2030 amends the Chicago Firefighter Article of the Illinois Pension Code, stating that the age stated in a fireman's application for appointment as a member shall be conclusive evidence for his or her age for the purposes of providing all benefits under this Article. This is a minor technical cleanup that is designed to provide clarity for a situation in the past. It's also something that's being fixed going forward. And I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Batinick: "I'm going to try real hard to clarify this for everybody. So what we had here is a situation where we need to add in something and we're only allowed to add it prospectively, so that the birth certificate is what counts. But you can't do that retroactively, according to the law, correct?"

Martwick: "That's correct. So going forward, the birth certificate is the definitive evidence of a firefighter's birth. But before we passed a law that said that, there's confusion about what should be determinative. And so, for the purposes of this, it just creates clarity. It's not any massive change. It doesn't really cost anything in terms of benefits. It just..."

Batinick: "So, this removes ambiguity going forward, which is the only thing we are able to do here, correct?"

Martwick: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2030 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? Ammons, Bailey, Bennett, West. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting in 'favor', 2 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2037, offered by Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2037 is an initiative of the Secretary of State, establishes licensing requirements for notary public remittance agents. It's pretty much a technical Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."

Batinick: "I... I almost didn't get to my light quick enough, Representative. Can you explain that a little bit louder and a little smidgen more detail? What is that... what are we actually doing here?"

Kifowit: "Licensing requirements for notary public remittance agents. There are nine associations that act as remittance agents for notary applications and these individuals are really a middle men between the Secretary of State and the notary applicants. And so, we are establishing requirements for them. Do you want me to read the requirements for you?"

Batinick: "I see them here. I'm good. Just wanted to catch that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kifowit to close."

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

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2037 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? Carroll, Connor, Demmer, Guzzardi, Lisa Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bennett, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bennett: "For just a moment, Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to do is have my vote on Senate Bill 1952 marked as a 'yes', please."

Speaker Crespo: "We'll make sure the Journal reflects that. Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Dan Brady is excused for the rest of today."

Speaker Crespo: "It will be reflected as such. And next we have Senate Bill 2050, offered by Representative Edly-Allen. Out of the record. Next we have Senate Bill 2068, offered by Representative Caulkins. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2068, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No opposition. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no further debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2068 pass'? All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Conroy, Gabel, Grant, Hernandez, Martwick, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting in 'favor', 6 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Guzzardi, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Guzzardi: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Guzzardi: "On Senate Bill 2030 I was recorded as voting 'no'. I'd like the record to reflect that I voted... I intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 2030. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Make sure the Journal record reflects that. Representative Willis, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Willis: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Willis: "Members of this Assembly, you have a responsibility to explain your Bill. I think that is the very least we can have. It' fine if you... we don't have debate and there's not... no opposition. But if you cannot tell us in one sentence what your Bill is, you do not deserve an 'aye' vote. I am very disappointed in what just happened."

Speaker Crespo: "Next we have Senate Bill 2076, Representative Swanson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was brought to me by the Department of Military Affairs. What it does, it brings the Illinois Code of Military Justice in line with the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2076 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford. Harper. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2085, offered by Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2085, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2085 mandates insurance coverage for benefits delivered through a psychiatric Collaborative Care Model, determined to be medically necessary and provides the codes to be used for such benefits. The mandate applies to group and individual policies of accident and health insurance, mandated... managed care organizations that provide mental health benefits and Medicaid. Applicable policies may still deny reimbursement where medical necessity is not proven. There is no opposition and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2085 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? Have all voted who wish? Carroll. Davis, Hammond, Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting in 'favor', 4 voting 'against',
0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2087, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2087, a Bill for an Act concerning persons with disabilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 2087 is actually identical to House Bill 3115, which we passed in a bipartisan fashion back in April. It creates the Customized Employment for Individuals with Disability Act to create a five year, customized employment pilot program in the Department of Human Services to make sure that our individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities have an opportunity to seek employment. We know, currently, that they are underemployed and unemployed at very high rates. And we want to see what we can do to help improve that situation. I would, once again, appreciate your support of this proposal."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2087 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? Ammons, Davidsmeyer, McSweeney. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we
have Senate Bill 2124, Representative Caulkins. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2124, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins, if you can elaborate a little bit."
Caulkins: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. This amends the School Code. It adds pneumatic guns, spring guns, paint ball guns, B-B guns, and other specified objects that can be brought into school. This was brought to me by the Superintendent of Monticello School District, Dr. Zimmerman. They had someone bring a weapon appearing object to school that did not fit the description of the previous Bill or the underlying Bill. So this is to cleanup that Bill. It amends the Bill so that that won't happen again. It gives the school superintendent the authority to suspend. It gives the school board the authority to override the superintendent. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "Thank you for elaborating on the Bill. Representative Willis is recognized."
Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"
Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."
Speaker Crespo: "Indicated he will."
Willis: "Representative Caulkins, thank you for that very thorough explanation of this Bill. I highly support it and I thank you for that."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morrison is recognized."
Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Morrison: "Representative Caulkins, I just have a question about this Bill. So, what if the student has one of these items in his or her...
Caulkins: "I beg your pardon?"
Morrison: "What if one of... what if a student has one of these items in his or her vehicle in the parking lot? Would that be considered bringing this item to school?"
Caulkins: "I believe this affects the... in the school. If someone were to bring something into school."
Morrison: "So the school... so the school building itself?"
Caulkins: "Yes, that's the intent."
Morrison: "Correct? All right. Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ammons is recognized."
Ammons: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Caulkins. I just want to clarify if the students are expelled from school for a year, are they expelled to an alternative program or are you suggesting they should be out of school for an entire year?"
Caulkins: "This Bill doesn't address that. That is a whole separate, I guess, situation. This..."
Ammons: "Not necessarily for me. It's not a separate situation."
Caulkins: "Well..."
Ammons: "If they are expelled, I understand that there needs to be action from either the superintendent or school board."
Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."
Ammons: "The concern is that I believe, currently, a student that's expelled can be placed in an alternative school setting as opposed to completely out of school for the entire year."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am. This... this Bill doesn't change any other legislation. This only cleans up what is considered an object that looks like a weapon that's been brought into school that can be considered for expulsion. There was a loophole and this clears up that loophole."

Ammons: "So, it clears out the loophole of what they can have?"

Caulkins: "Yeah, it... you can... I mean... yes, the underlying law is that there is alternatives available. This doesn't... doesn't stop that."

Ammons: "So, it doesn't say that, which brings me to my concerning point that if this... if this child has a pocket knife that they fish with their father, like my son does. And he's never been in any situations but he forgets to take his pocket knife out of his book bag, he could be expelled from school for a year."

Caulkins: "I... that has nothing to do this what this Bill does, Ma'am. This Bill only clarifies a loophole in what is considered a weapon."

Ammons: "Okay. I'll go straight to the Bill. My only reservation for this Bill is that a child who's expelled from school without clearly defining in this new law that they can be expelled but to an alternative school program, so that the child is not out of school for an entire year because they have gotten caught with a look alike B-B gun or with a pocket knife, fishing knife, or something that... that they did not do any bodily harm to anyone. I'm concerned about the overarching
reach for students who would be out of school for a year, and it does not address adequately the concern of students being placed in alternative school programs as a so-positioned to them being out of school for a year based on being caught with a pocket knife or a B-B gun or some look alike object or even a real firearm. So I'm concerned about that. The student does not get... whatever the issues are that may arise, they don't get that addressed being expelled from school, especially if they have not been charged criminally with possession of a weapon or any other charges. That is a concern. I think people should be concerned about that, ultimately. And I urge a 'no' vote on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Villa is recognized."

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

Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."

Villa: "So, just following up with some of Representative Ammons' questions. Let's say a student brings a weapon to school unbeknownst to them, they went camping, they had it in their backpack, you know, and then they came to school. They must be expelled for a year. Is that right?"

Caulkins: "This is... the superintendent has the authority to suspend for a year. And I want to address, Mrs. Ammons' concerns. The language in this... it says, 'A student who is subject to suspension or expulsion as provided in this Section may be eligible for transfer to an alternative school program in accordance with Article 13A of the School Code.' So, yes, they are. I also want to clear up a previous comment. This Bill does also apply to the parking lot of a school."
Villa: "Okay."
Caulkins: "So those things are included in this Bill."
Villa: "Well, it is helpful to know that they... that they would be qualified to go to an alternative school placement..."
Caulkins: "Yes. Which currently does not exist."
Villa: "So, my question, though, still is if I... you know, being a school social worker, there were occasions in which students would come to school with something in their backpack that they shouldn't have had with them, but it was an innocent mistake. So I'm just wondering if these innocent mistakes now, it's a mandatory one year expulsion?"
Caulkins: "Right. So, let me try to address that. This gives the option for the superintendent to send the individual to an alternative school. That option, of course, can be changed or not, then the school board has the option of overriding the superintendent. So..."
Villa: "So, would... so would..."
Caulkins: "...this currently does not exist if you bring a B-B gun into school. Currently, the only option was expulsion. We are now adding an additional protection to... for that student so that they may go to an alternative school."
Villa: "Okay. And would the school board be able to listen to the case and determine that is was a mistake and that they don't need a one year expulsion?"
Caulkins: "Yes. Yes, Ma'am."
Villa: "Okay. Thank you."
Caulkins: "Thank you for your questions."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative McCombie is recognized."
McCombie: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
McCombie: "Just to clarify, on the current law the way that it reads it says, or any other object that if used or attempted to be used to cause bodily harm including look a likes of any firearm. Is that correct?"
Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."
McCombie: "Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bourne is recognized."
Bourne: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, from my understanding this stems from a case in your hometown. Am I correct?"
Caulkins: "I beg your pardon?"
Bourne: "This stems from a case in your hometown where..."
Caulkins: "In the district, Ma'am."
Bourne: "And really the flexibility should have been there for the case that you're talking about?"
Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."
Bourne: "To the Bill. This is pretty simple. Right now, they do not have the flexibility to send a student to an alternative school, this allows that. I think this is a good Bill. I think this is important, not only for the district that you represent but in cases where flexibility is important, this is what that Bill does. This came out of committee unanimously. I think it offers another tool for school districts to be able to send the student to an alternative school instead of a one year expulsion. Please vote 'yes'."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield is recognized."
Mayfield: "I'd like to yield my time to Representative Ammons."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Mayfield. I just want to make sure that we're clarifying clearly on the record what we're doing here."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Ammons: "What we're doing is providing an option for a superintendent or a school board to take on a case by case basis, if a student is caught with any of these things or a look alike of any of those things..."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Ammons: "...that the school does not have to necessarily expel that student without an alternative. They have an alternative process that will still be in place for these students, as well as they could, by case by case basis, determine that this was just a mistake on the student's part and not expel them at all."

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Ammons: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure that was clear on the record that students will not be expelled indefinitely for that year to no place."

Caulkins: "Correct."

Ammons: "I wanted to make sure that that was clear."

Caulkins: "This gives the superintendent and if the superintendent decides to do something the school board doesn't like, it gives the school board the opportunity to override the superintendent but it also provides the alternative school solution rather than automatic expulsion with... for a year. Which is how the Bill is now."

Ammons: "And we have that available now?"
Caulkins: "That is not available until now."
Ammons: "Until we do this now?"
Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."
Ammons: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. I wanted to make sure my colleagues understood what we were doing because I did not want students to go home without an option under this kind of Bill. So, thank you so much for clarifying. Thank you for your patience and I do urge a support vote for this measure."
Caulkins: "Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Carroll is recognized."
Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Carroll: "All right. So I have a few questions for you, Sir."
Caulkins: "Yes, Sir."
Carroll: "One of my questions is, as a former special education teacher, not a former federal prosecutor, but former special education teacher, I have a few questions I need to understand about this, okay. So I have a student that brings a weapon to school, that student is expelled by the superintendent. They appeal their case to the school board. Is that sort of what I'm understanding? I guess, I'm sorry... I'm..."
Caulkins: "Yes. That is an option."
Carroll: "So are we going to provide that student with an advocate or a representation of some sort?"
Caulkins: "I'm sorry? You'll have to speak up."
Carroll: "Fred, can you hit the gavel? Fred. He can't hear. So would that student be provided an advocate or some sort of
representation if they go to the school board to present their case?"

Caulkins: "I would presume so. I mean, this doesn't preclude that."

Carroll: "Okay. Because there is a lot of people that don’t understand the law. So this student let's say does what... you know, they do this, and again, this is an egregious violation. I'm not arguing that, but this student gets expelled by the superintendent, they appeal their case to the school board. They're going to need some sort of representation in front of the school board. It is going to be very difficult for them to present their case. Would you agree?"

Caulkins: "I... I guess it depends on their parents, the guardian and how comfortable they feel making the case for themselves. I... you know, many, many parents are great advocates for their children, especially children with special needs, so I guess I missed your point."

Carroll: "Okay. Well, do you understand what the term 'least restrictive environment' means?"

Caulkins: "I'm sorry, Sir?"

Carroll: "Do you understand what the term 'least restrictive environment' means?"

Caulkins: "Certainly."

Carroll: "Okay. Tell me what that means."

Caulkins: "Well it means that an individual is able to be placed in an environment which is... has the least amount of restrictions on their freedom of movement. And... we used it in our group homes. We used it in assisted living."
Carroll: "Okay. 'Cause I think that's one of the big challenges. And again, I just... I want to discuss this 'cause I think that the parents and the student need to understand what the 'least restrictive environment' means. Because in the past, when students do egregious acts like this, they automatically put them in a place that may not be a naturally a perfect fit for them and they need to understand that. Is there a place then, where they can find the information out about where their rights are in this whole process? Does the school going to send those out?"

Caulkins: "I don't know how to answer that question. This Bill is only drafted to allow... or the primary focus of this Bill is to allow the student to have an alternative placement and not an automatic expulsion with no place to go. So, I guess I'm not sure what the relevance of the question."

Carroll: "Well, my relevance of my question is I think sometimes people don't understand their rights. And if we're talking about the future of a child and they don't know their rights and the parents don't know their rights going into this, this could be a very dangerous process for them. Would you agree?"

Caulkins: "I... certainly."

Carroll: "Okay. So, I just want to make sure that we're putting something together where people will know what their rights are moving forward. That's my concern."

Caulkins: "I appreciate your concern."

Carroll: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Kifowit, was your name brought up in debate?"

Kifowit: "No, I have a question of the Sponsor."
Speaker Crespo: "Okay. Typically, you only get one crack at this unless your name is brought up."
Kifowit: "I didn't ask my question."
Speaker Crespo: "He did not answer your question?"
Kifowit: "I didn't get to ask my question. I didn't speak during this debate."
Speaker Crespo: "Okay. My... my apology. I thought you did."
Kifowit: "No, I didn't, but thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Please proceed."
Kifowit: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Kifowit: "Thank you, Sir. I'm reading the language of the Bill and I just want to clarify a couple of things. When... your language change... creates a Section 3 which is on page 8. And what you're doing is you're enhancing, in a sense, penalties for items that might mistakenly come with a child, such as a paint ball gun or a B-B gun, that sort of thing. And in Section 3 you state that the superintendent's determination may be modified by the board on a case by case basis. So, it's only in those cases of a childlike toy, which mistakenly might be taken to school, it's not the other issues that are above it. So, you're expanding the penalty with regards to these items?"
Caulkins: "On a case by case basis, I presume that is correct."
Kifowit: "Well, it says it must, and those that are in a school setting know that if... if they must be removed then the child is immediately removed, then that child would have to wait for the superintendent to weigh in, therefore being out of school. And then, if the school board choses to review this
case, then they have to wait until the next school board meeting. So, therefore, potentially, you could have a student not in school for weeks waiting for this process to play out for an enhanced penalty with regards to, maybe a paint ball gun or a B-B gun. Now you're expanding the application of this existing law which was originally intended for brass knuckles, firearms, shot guns and now you're including, potentially, young youth things such as B-B guns or a paint ball gun, which one can argue... I have been hit with a paint ball, it's not very lethal as it would be shotgun in this Section."

Caulkins: "I guess... Ma'am, I have been hit by paint balls, too, and they could by quite painful that... I think it's the fact that they brought a weapon into the school. Before when someone brought a simulated weapon, a B-B gun, I mean, it's a weapon, they were subject to expulsion period, end of story. Are you suggesting that... that this isn't a good thing, to offer them an opportunity to go to an alternative school?"

Kifowit: "I don't see alternative school in this... in the language of this law to be quite honest. But I'm... I'm saying that what was mentioned in prior discussion is a young teenager could have gone to the paint ball range with their friends, could have accidentally left it in their backpack..."

Caulkins: "Right."

Kifowit: "...and now in your legislation, you are enhancing the definition of a paint ball with... along the same lines as actual gun, rifle, shotgun. And you are only... so the child, if this accidentally would happen, would have to be immediately removed because it's a 'shall' and then has to be..."
reviewed by the superintendent and maybe even the board, which potentially takes this child out of school for many weeks because they might have made a mistake. I can understand the look-alikes because they are an issue. I can understand brass knuckles and actual firearms. For teenagers that I know that do paint ball, this potentially could be just a simple mistake."

Caulkins: "Well, Ma'am... you know, the situation when someone brings that type of a... like say a weapon, use that word loosely, you know the chaos that that cause... the issues that that causes is just as serious as if it were a real gun and the schools react to that in the same manner. And all we're doing is clarifying the language of what is considered... I guess to ask you back, would you prefer that that language not be there? That people are... its okay to bring a paint ball gun or a..."

Kifowit: "I think children make mistakes. I think that sometimes they do do poor... poor judgement. I think a mandatory expulsion for a year is a bit extreme with regards to these non-lethal definitions. I mean, I don't know your experience. I was a substitute teacher for many years. I've... I've seen sometimes the situation kids get into. I'm just questioning, we, as a Body, have looked at expulsion and have tried to minimize it because it takes the children out of school. And here for something that potentially could be a youthful mistake, it seems like the punishment is much harder... harsher and enhanced than it needs to be, so. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."
Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quick question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Crespo: "He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Representative, my understanding is that the current law says that you have to suspend if they bring these things to school?"

Caulkins: "That is correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Look-alikes. So all this does is provide another opportunity for the kid to continue to receive education if they bring this to school, correct?"

Caulkins: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, I... I misunderstood this to start out with. You are not adding these things. You are just providing other opportunities for the kid who have may have left it in his backpack or something of that sort, did not have any ill intentions. You're providing another opportunity for him to continue his education without being fully expelled, right?"

Caulkins: "That is correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you for bringing this forward. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Caulkins: "Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Caulkins to close."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you everyone for your very thoughtful questions. I hope that we've clarified things for you. The record now reflects what this legislation is intended to do. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2124 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? Harper, Jones, McDermed, Pappas, Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'against', and 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 1581, offered by Leader Durkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1581, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1581 is an initiative that came to me from the DuPage County Board and this Bill is an Amendment to the County Code. Currently, under the law, counties are authorized to seek referendum authority to increase their local county sales tax to support various functions and programs. Right now, they can do it for public facilities, mental health, substance abuse, and transportation. The county is asking that that be extended for the use of their criminal justice budget, which is one third of the county budget in DuPage County. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1581 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? Davidsmeyer, Greenwood, Halbrook, Sommer. Mr. 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. Next we have Senate Bill 2126, Representative Mussman. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2126, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am here on Senate Bill 2126, which is an initiative of the Illinois Community College Board and in participation with ISBE. This is actually identical to House Bill 3628, which already passed unanimously out of the House. And I'd like to thank my colleague, Representative Bristow, for her hard work on the Bill. And, basically, what it does is it moves the responsibility for adult education classes under the purview of the Illinois Community College Board. And it adjusts the rates for the students taking the adult education courses. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Ramirez, are you seeking recognition for this Bill? Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2126 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? Gong-Gershowitz, Jones, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 3 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2136, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2136, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield."
Mayfield: "Thank you. This Bill does a couple of things. This is the Senate version of the House Bill that we've already passed. It basically says that if there is a lien on the property at the time of sale for the reclamation district that they will be paid. It also provides emergency powers that allows them to pay for emergency services should there be leaks... I'm sorry... breaks within the pipes during flooding. I'll take any questions."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "She indicated she will."
Batinick: "Did you actually indicate this time, Representative. I think first time you said no. But this is similar to, is it, House Bill 2862? Is that correct?"
Mayfield: "I believe that’s the one I passed."
Batinick: "So, 2862 for everybody on our side. This is... almost... is this identical language to House Bill 2862?"
Mayfield: "I believe so."
Batinick: "2862... I think I've given my side enough time to look back on what they did on 2862. I prefer not to relitigate it..."
Mayfield: "I appreciate that."
Batinick: "...unless you have something else you want to add. Okay. So this is similar to 2862, folks. Thank you."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mayfield to close."
Mayfield: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2136 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? Andrade, Bennett, Chesney, Kifowit, Spain. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting in 'favor', 53 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ramirez, for what reason do you seek recognition?

Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker. For... a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Crespo: "Please state your point."

Ramirez: "Will you let the record show that I am a 'yes' vote on Bill... House Bill 2124?"

Speaker Crespo: "Journal will reflect that. Representative Didech, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Didech: "Please let the record reflect that on Senate Bill 1583 I intended to vote 'yes'. And I want to thank Representative Harper for introducing such an excellent Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Crespo: "We'll make sure the Journal reflects that. Next we have Senate Bill 2146, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2146, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2146 creates the Clean Water Workforce Pipeline Program within the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to provide grants and financial assistance to prepare and support individuals for careers in water infrastructure. The Bill will invest in Illinois
workers and will undoubtedly empower urban, rural, and suburban communities to meet their water infrastructure needs. In many ways this should also be regarded as a major public health initiative, as it will allow us to focus in on replacing our lead service lines and fixtures to keep our drinking water safe and to avoid the catastrophes like we saw happen in Flint, Michigan. As many of us know, all throughout our state, our water infrastructure is in dire shape. Building, repairing, and upgrading our water infrastructure will create thousands of good paying jobs. Senate Bill 2146 will help facilitate job training and creation to ensure Illinois workers can take advantage of these opportunities. One of the significant provisions of the Bill is that it will invest where it's needed most, providing equitable training in the communities that have been impacted, disproportionately impacted, by infrastructure degradation, including moderate and underserved communities. This is a great job training program that will improve our clean water infrastructure. It's also important to note that, as we flush out the budget, this Bill is subject to appropriation. Happy to answer any questions. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Batinick is recognized."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Crespo: "He indicated he will."
Batinick: "Representative, you mentioned some wonderful, lofty goals that are weaved into this Bill. Can you tell me a little bit more though about the objections in committee and some of the costs that some may deem unnecessary? But..."
Slaughter: "I can. And first of all, I do want to thank Chairwoman Ann Williams, Jud-Crim, and her committee always met at the same time so she actually presented and moved the Bill for me, actually twice. So, thank you, Madam Chair. I believe there were... there were issues just around the funding aspect of this and I wanted to just ensure the Body that this is subject to appropriation. One of the things we wanted to look at as it's taking approximately five percent of whatever we're going to invest in water infrastructure projects to set aside for job training. And so, you know, hopefully, you know, whether it's a capital Bill or whatever it is, say we invest a hundred million into these infrastructure projects, we'd be taking 5 million to invest in job training."

Batinick: "Can you give me... so let's... let's talk about that. So, this is subject to appropriation. I'm seeing... what are the guardrails for that job training?"

Slaughter: "What are..."

Batinick: "The guardrails? Meaning, what are the requirements, who's it going to, what purposes, all that..."

Slaughter: "Well, what we are trying to do is target underserved communities. So, a lot of the program would be spent on enrolling people in the program, getting them to the job sites, and rolling out the actual training."

Batinick: "And this is going to be five percent of... of what? You mentioned..."

Slaughter: "That... that... yes, I mean, that's what we would like to do. Preferably."
Batinick: "I... that's a great look. That's what you'd prefer to do, five percent sounds great. But, it is a Bill. If we pass it, we have to do five percent, right? It's not optional."

Slaughter: "One second. Yeah, five percent."

Batinick: "Okay. I see. I'm reading, it sets... and maybe we can ferret this out, sets aspirational goals of training and placing 300 residents or 25 percent of annual jobs created by the State Finance Water Infrastructure projects, whichever is greater."

Slaughter: "Right. So, it's a... it's an aspirational goal, Representative. The five percent."

Batinick: "Okay. Well this says 25 percent. This is referring to the number of jobs. Then 5 percent is referring to the amount of money directed towards job training I presume, correct?"

Slaughter: "The 25 percent is regarding the number of jobs created..."

Batinick: "Right."

Slaughter: "...on these projects."

Batinick: "Correct. And the five percent is the cost."

Slaughter: "The five percent that I referenced earlier is in regards to the amount of resources in funding for the job training program."

Batinick: "Correct. Okay. To the Bill. I think I'm going to go... I'm going to sit and listen to the rest of debate a little bit here. My only concern is that we're directing money actually away from the purposes of clean water and good infrastructure, for that and would love a little bit more clarity on... on how the money is going to be spent, in which way, what the dollar amount, aggregate cost of that is. But
I'll sit back and listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you for answering my questions."

Speaker Crespo: "Well, there being no more debate, Mr. Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we know, our water infrastructure is in dire shape. We've seen what happened in Flint, Michigan. It's important that we leverage those opportunities and provide and bolster our job training programs throughout the State of Illinois. It's a great opportunity for us to do that in Senate Bill 2146. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2146 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? Batinick. Sommer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting in 'favor', 11 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have Senate Bill 2148, offered by Representative Bristow. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Batinick, just want to make sure you're listening. Senate Bill 2148 establishes the Correctional Officer Intern Program. This would allow individuals to undergo correctional training prior to being hired as an
officer. The program would require the same training requirements as established for correctional officers under the current training statute. After undergoing the training, interns will be eligible to receive certification as a corrections officer upon being hired, provided they are hired within two years of completing the program. Then they must meet all the other requirements established by the Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board. The legislation would also give special preference to veterans applying for this program and the Law Enforcement Intern Training Program, which has already been established and is the model for this new program. This Bill is an initiative of the Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board and I would appreciate your support and an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "And there being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2148 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davesmeyer. Hammond. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting in 'favor', 3 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next we have Senate Bill 2153, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2153, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Cassidy."
Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2153 is an initiative of CMS that seeks to make the process of renewing leases slightly less burdensome. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Crespo: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2153 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? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Demmer, Hammond, Keicher, McCombie, Sommer, Spain, and Unes. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting in 'favor', 22 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23 on the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, we have Resolution... House Joint Resolution 4, offered by Representative Evans. Representative Evans is recognized."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope everyone takes a look at this whenever you can. Even now on your free time. The NCI designation is about getting federal dollars here to the State of Illinois. What this Resolution does is it sends a message to Washington, D.C. that we want federal dollars to help solve problems here in the State of Illinois, specifically cancer. As you all know, I'm a cancer survivor. And all of us support the Cancer Caucus, but what's next? The next step is to get those federal dollars to cure cancer and to help all of the folks who are dealing with cancer throughout the State of Illinois. This designation brings millions of dollars from the Federal Government somewhere. Those dollars now are going to the University of Miami because they received the most latest NCI designation. Before Miami, it was the University
of Oklahoma. But where is the... where... what about the State of Illinois? Well, we have two NCI-designated hospitals, the University... both in the Chicagoland area. We have University of Chicago and Northwestern University. We have two, but you got states like North Carolina that has three and states like Pennsylvania with four. We need more. We need more federal dollars, we need NCI-designated facilities, more of them throughout the State of Illinois to make sure that when your patients, whether you're in Central Illinois, Southern Illinois, Northern, or in the Chicagoland area, that if you're sick that you are getting not only good health care but you getting top notch health care. And you're getting the resources to pay those medical professionals throughout the country and throughout the world to come where? To the State of Illinois. So I ask for your support. We have a great University of Illinois Hospital System whether it be the Chicago location or our Champaign location. Our hospital system in the U of I should be NCI-designated. I hope one day that they are. Even UIC, the University of Illinois at Chicago, has locations throughout Central Illinois. They are servicing folks and giving folks the best treatment that they can. This new designation will not only give them the best but give them optimum, the utopian, the best, the top notch health care that’s needed for the State of Illinois. And also, with our large population, it would give what we need, again, which is a NCI-designated health care facility. More dollars, more resources, more development. When you Google NCI-designation and see what happened at the University of Oklahoma, you will see not only that you will see improved
health care but you saw economic development. This is an economic development Resolution. This is an advocating Resolution. This is a cancer healing and curing Resolution. So, thank you all for your time and I request your support and movement. And thank you, Mr. Speaker, for bringing this forward."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Evans moves for the adoption of House Resolution... House Joint Resolution 4. 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. We have House Joint Resolution 23, offered by Representative Evans. Representative."

Evans: "Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This must be the order of curing cancer. You all... and thank you... in the past we've... we've filed this Resolution. And as long as I'm in the General Assembly, I'm going to file this every General Assembly because folks are still suffering from cancer and I'm going to continue, as an advocate, along with you all because this is a team effort here, to send a message to the residents all throughout the country that... and the State of Illinois... that we will find a cure for cancer. Again, as a cancer survivor this is one of my life's missions and I thank you all for joining in and us being a team to send a message to our constituents from Western, Southern, Eastern Illinois, all over that we can disagree about many things but we agree about one thing, that we're going to lead the way in finding a cure to cancer. Right in the heart of the country, right in the middle of the country in the State of Illinois. I've worked with American Cancer Society and many advocate organizations
throughout the country and throughout the state. You all have as well. Somebody suffering with cancer, this Resolution will show them that you're not alone, that the Members of the General Assembly are fighting with your families. To all the caregivers, we're fighting with you. We're fighting with you yesterday, today, and forever. Thank you all."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Evans moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 23. 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. We have House Joint Resolution 29, offered by Representative Welter. Representative."

Welter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 29 designates a portion of the Illinois Route 47 over the Illinois River Bridge from Pine Bluff Road to Washington Street as the 'Patrolman Clarence Roseland Memorial Road'. The Illinois General Assembly is going to pay honor and respect to this individual. Clarence was a Morris Police Department Patrolman. If I could have the Body's attention, please? Thank you. Morris Police Department Patrolman Clarence Roseland's honorable service was tragically cut short when he was killed in the line of duty on February 3 of 1935. As I grew up in Morris, in the community every year we honored our fallen police officers and firefighters. I grew up hearing the story of Patrolman Clarence Roseland. Patrolman Roseland was killed when he and his partner, Ed Garrity, were making their rounds patrolling the businesses in Downtown Morris. Patrolman Roseland was forced at gunpoint to return to his vehicle. When his partner returned to the
squad car, he had found Patrolman Roseland had been shot from behind in cold blood and died almost instantly. The murder of Patrolman Roseland was a tragedy that greatly affected the residents of Grundy County for many years to come. He was a great and noble man who was respected citizen in my community. I ask that we pass this but also for a moment of silence for his family and those that are currently in the community that are related to him."

Speaker Crespo: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Representative Welter moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 29. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution... I apologize for that. 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? Gong-Gershowitz, Harper, Slaughter. Harper. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 'ayes', 0 'nays', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. On page 24 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, we have House Joint Resolution 47, offered by Representative Marron. Out of the record. We have House Joint Resolution 52, offered by Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is House Joint Resolution 52. And forgive me for butchering this, this is the 150th anniversary of Glencoe, the Village of Glencoe. This is the Glencoe Sesquicentennial Day. And I ask for support."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Skillicorn, are you seeking recognition on the Resolution? Okay. We have... Representative
Morgan moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 52. 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 Skillicorn, for what reason do you seek recognition?

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the Journal reflect I intended to be 'no' on Senate Bill 1581."

Speaker Crespo: "The Journal will so reflect. We have House Joint Resolution 53, offered by Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the indulgence of the Body. This is for the 150th anniversary of the City of Highland Park. Again, this is the Highland Park Sesquicentennial Day. And I ask for support."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Morgan moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 53. 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. Next we have House Joint Resolution 56, offered by Representative Mason."

Mason: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 56 urges the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to consider the serious concerns of the residents of Lake County over the recent ethylene oxide emissions due to environmental and public health threats it poses to the people of Illinois. We are urging the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to conduct ambient air monitoring and testing in and around the two known facilities emitting or discharging ethylene oxide...ethylene oxide, excuse me, in Lake County. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Crespo: "Representative Mason moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 56. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution adopted. Next we have House Joint Resolution 58, offered by Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. It is fitting, today, that…"

Speaker Crespo: "Pull it out of the record. I think there is an Amendment. Do you wish to adopt it?"

Chesney: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Crespo: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Chesney."

Speaker Crespo: "Representative."

Chesney: "This is to name the overpass on Springfield Road in U.S. 20. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Crespo: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's… it's fitting, today, that I present HJR58 in honor and memory of Trooper Brooke Jones-Story. She was one of the troopers that recently lost her life on March 28. The recent passage and the enhancements of Scott's Law is one of the many steps we can take to honor great troopers like Jones-Story. We experience many… many
challenges in the General Assembly and we certainly do some many tough things. Probably, one of the most difficult things that I've done in my short time here in the General Assembly is reaching out to the family to discuss how... what is the best way that we can honor great people. And this Resolution seeks to honor Trooper Brooke Jones-Story. And this is where she did much of her great work, on an overpass, in many cases alone, protecting each and every one of us. So, I'd ask for unanimous 'aye' votes on this Joint Resolution. And if you will, Mr. Speaker, everybody added as a cosponsor."

Speaker Crespo: "All of the Members will be added as a cosponsor. The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. 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? Morgan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson on the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 158, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 657, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1139, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1609; recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2124, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2156, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2176, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2383, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2583, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2675,
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2854, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3628."

Speaker Crespo: "The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements of several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Manley on the Motion."

Manley: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that the following Bills can be heard this week in committee. To the House Higher Education Committee, HR371. To House Judiciary Committee, HR379. House Revenue & Finance Committee, HR378. House State Government Administration Committee, HJR74. And House Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee, HJR75."

Speaker Crespo: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following Committee was cancelled for this afternoon. The Executive Committee has been cancelled. Meeting at 3 p.m. is Adoption & Child Welfare, Room 122; Agriculture & Conservation, Room 115; Appropriations-Capital, Room 114; Elementary & Secondary Education: Licensing & Charter Schools, Room 413; Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, and IT in C-1; Appropriations-Human Services in D-1. Meeting a half hour after that, 3:30 is Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculums & Policies in Room 413; Judiciary - Criminal, Room C-1; Transportation: Vehicles &
Safety, in 118; Health Care: Availability & Accessibility in Room 122; and Insurance in Room 114."

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


Speaker Crespo: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'ayes'; all those opposed say 'nays'. 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 Friday, May 24 at the hour of 10 a.m. All those in favor say 'ayes'; all those opposed say 'nays'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Representative Ammons is recognized for a Member statement on Senate Bill 1786, the License to Work Act."

Ammons: "Thank you. Today I’d like to make a statement on record about the ongoing damage done in our state by the use of driver’s license suspensions for non-violent… non-moving violations, the urgent need to pass the License to Work Act to curb this damage. Senate Bill 1786 will improve the lives of 50 thousand people who lose their driver’s license every
year in Illinois for non-moving violations. Given that around 42 percent of these suspensions lead to job loss, there are 400 people who lose or miss out on jobs every week because of suspensions for non-moving violations. That’s 57 people every day. There is ample evidence, thanks to investigative reporting, advocacy, research, and the experiences of many Illinoisans, that these suspensions are harmful to our communities, businesses, and the state as a whole. Suspending someone’s license suspends their whole life, their kids and families lives. We also know there is a national issue with funding government through excessive tickets, fines, fees, and collection measures. The Department of Justice report on Ferguson, Missouri helped us understand this problem. But it exists here, right here in Illinois as well. Suspending the driver’s license of someone who can’t pay off a ticket, fine, or fee is part of a harmful apparatus that extracts wealth from those who can least afford it. It is time to end these suspensions. I’ve worked for many years with my colleagues in the House and the Senate to pass the License to Work Act, which would eliminate driver’s license suspension as a penalty for most non-driving violations in Illinois. It follows national best practices to recommend... recommended by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators. It has broad bipartisan support in this chamber and in the Senate. Driver’s license suspension should be reserved for dangerous drivers. And I'll say that again, driver’s license suspensions should be reserved for dangerous drivers. We cannot afford to so flippantly suspend peoples’ lives by suspending their licenses. Many of these suspensions are due
to unpaid parking and compliance tickets. These tickets are issued at much higher rates in black and brown communities. With rising black outmigration, historical disinvestment in black communities, and disproportionate policing and punishment faced by our constituents, we can't afford inaction. We are ready to move forward and end these excessive, damaging suspensions. We hope that the House of Representatives will move Senate Bill 1786 with due speed in the next few days. Thank you."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 138, Senate Bill 2090. Representative Ammons, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 22. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 527. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 138, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 527, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Committee Reports. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur to is Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2723, Floor Amendment
Representative Harper, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 398.

Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Capital reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 394.

Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1213.

Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & Information Technology reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 178.

Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1525.

Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3086, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3237, Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3584,
Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3687, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 482. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2038. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3511. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2019: recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #3 to House Bill 3113, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 House Bill 3503, and Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #3 to House Bill 3509. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3843, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. First Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."