Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Cory Musgrave who is with the New Beginnings Church in Fairfield. Pastor Cory Musgrave is the guest of Representative Bailey. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Musgrave: "Father, we come to you today and thank you for how much you have blessed Illinois. Throughout history, we can see your hand on this great state from influential leaders that are sons and daughters of Illinois, to the abundant natural resources you have entrusted us within the south, and the industrial capacity in the north. God, you have delegated all of humanity with managing your creation. And the 118 Members of this House, you have raised up with the great responsibility of leading Illinois. God, we thank you for granting us the ability to choose our own direction even though those choices have consequences. All throughout your word it is clear that you give us a choice. God, you even said, 'Today I give you the choice between life and death, between blessings and curses. Now I call on Heaven and Earth to witness the choice you make. Oh, that you would choose life, so that you and your descendants might live.' So, God, I confess here today that I have not always made the right choice, and I thank you for being a merciful God that forgives and restores when we turn back to you. Lord, I also confess, as an eighth generation son of Illinois, that this state has decided to go its own way apart from you. In the same way Nehemiah cried out, I pray, listen to my prayer. Look down and see me praying night and day for the people of Illinois."
I confess that we have sinned against you. Yes, even my own family and I have sinned. We have sinned terribly. God, none of our evil actions have been hidden from you. You see everything. Lord, you have told us those things which you hate and among them are hands that shed innocent blood. I stand here in this House, in this high place in Illinois, and ask you, oh God, creator of Heaven and Earth, if there is any blood more innocent than a baby that is wonderfully being created in the womb. God, those unborn children are not hidden from you. The Psalmist, David, exclaimed, 'You made all the delicate, inner parts of my body and knit me together in my mother's womb. Thank you for making me so wonderfully complex. Your workmanship is marvelous - how well I know it. You watched me as I was being formed in utter seclusion, as I was woven together in the dark of the womb. You saw me before I was born.' So, God, we have made our appeals to the leaders of Illinois this week on behalf of those innocent babies who do not yet have a voice. We have been a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves as you have commanded us. Those appeals were denied but we have one final appeal left and that is to the courts of Heaven. God Almighty, I make an appeal to Heaven today, to you the perfect judge, the one who presides over Heaven's court. I ask you to rise up, oh God, and judge Illinois for the sanction destruction of the innocent unborn. For when your judgements are in this state, the inhabitants of Illinois learn righteousness. In this House, I pray for justice to roll down like water and righteousness like a mighty river. In your judgement, I pray that you would remember mercy, for we know that you, oh God,
do not want anyone to be destroyed. I ask this in the name of your Son, the one who died for a sinner like me, the one who is appointed to judge the living and the dead. In the name of Jesus Christ, I pray, Amen."

Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Butler."

Butler - 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Democratic side of the aisle has no excused absences today. Everyone is ready for duty."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All elephants of the Grand Ole Party are in attendance today. We have no excused absences."

Speaker Turner: "With 118 Members present, a quorum is established. Members, on page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 1438, offered by Representative Cassidy. Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118."

Speaker Turner: "For one hour, Representative?"

Wheeler: "At least 62 minutes."

Speaker Turner: "All right. Republicans will have an immediate caucus in Room 118. The House will stand at recess 'til the call of the Chair. Members, we're going to go back to page 8 of the Calendar. Under the Order of Concurrence, we have House
Bill 1438, offered by Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy.

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Today, I present House Bill 1438 which will create a legal market for adult-use cannabis in the State of Illinois. At its very core, this is before us today because decades of prohibition hasn’t stopped use. Prohibition hasn’t made us safer. Prohibition hasn’t built communities, in fact, it has destroyed them. Prohibition hasn’t created jobs, in fact, it has prevented people from finding work. Ending prohibition will allow us to bring this out of the shadows, impose reasonable and thoughtful regulation, and bring assurance of a tested and safer product. It will give us the opportunity to educate people on the potential risks and benefits. It will create jobs and opportunities for communities in need. It is time to hit the reset button on the war on drugs. What is before us is the first in the nation to approach this legislatively, deliberately, thoughtfully, with an eye towards repairing the harm of the war on drugs. We have an opportunity today to set the gold standard for a regulated market that centers equity and repair. At its core, the Bill will allow adults over 21 to purchase cannabis starting January 1, 2020. A possession limit for residents of Illinois of 30 grams, 15 grams for nonresidents. It will allow participants in the medical cannabis program to grow up to five cannabis plants in their home. It will allow municipalities to opt out and prohibit dispensaries and other cannabis businesses from operating in their communities. It allows employers to adopt reasonable zero-tolerance policies concerning consumption of cannabis.
The Bill incorporates points for labor peace agreements and environmental practices in the scoring system for licensing purposes. Creates a new Community College Vocational Pilot Program to provide participants with the knowledge and skills to enter the industry and access the good paying jobs and career paths. The Bill requires all products to contain warning labels and establishes advertising restrictions to prohibit marketing to children and youth. It does not alter the state's medical program. The regulatory system created under the medical program is one that states all over the country travel to Illinois to learn about so that they can copy what we're doing. The Bill... the proposal deliberately restricts the distribution of new cannabis licenses in 2020 to allow for a measured and thoughtful roll out and growth of the industry with a hard pause so that the disparity study can evaluate the market and proactively address equity when new licenses open up. The Bill provides justice and relief for minor violations of the Cannabis Act. And the Bill provides for tax revenue and licensing fees that will bring much needed revenue into the state. I have said repeatedly, however, this is not about the money. It can't be about the money. States that have passed legalization and have gone about it as if it's a magic ATM machine have failed doubly. They have not cut into their illicit market place and they've gotten less revenue. It is critically important that we're mindful of this as we walk through this process and we have been. We have targeted our tax rates for this product in the low end of the average for the country. Over the last two and a half years, Senator Steans and I, along with Members in
both chambers, from both parties, have held numerous town hall meetings, stakeholder meetings, working group meetings, public hearings, and the feedback from those meetings has brought us to this place where the Bill is before us today includes feedback from proponents and opponents. Everyone that has participated has been a part of making this better. Over the last couple of years we've heard concerns. We’ve made clear that your concerns about home grow have been heard. We've narrowed that back to patients only. We've ensured that the language for employers has been strengthened. We've revised the expungement process to remove concerns there. We've addressed concerns around DUI. We've addressed concerns about reinvestment in communities. We have brought in additional licensing categories to ensure access to the industry. And we've included language about financial institutions provided by Treasurer Frerichs. With that, I look forward to your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we will institute a five minute timer for the discussion. We will begin with Leader Gordon-Booth, for five minutes."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have had the distinct privilege and honor of serving in this chamber for the last 10 years. And two and a half, three years ago, when this work began, one of the issues that stood out to me was what was happening around the country as it related to adult-use cannabis legalization. And what distinctively stood out to me was the fact that people like me, that look like me, were given no consideration when these industries were created. And so, I approached the Sponsor at that time from
that very particular space. There are many actors that have shown up in this arena for many different reasons. But I approached the Sponsor as a black woman living in downstate Illinois who sees and understands the disparities that exist in communities across the state, particularly for people that looks like me. And I told the Sponsor that I wanted to engage her in this conversation to ensure that equity was central to this conversation. And I'm proud to stand here today to say that what we are bringing forth as a Body... because this is not the work of one particular person, but the work of countless individuals, that we had the ability as a Body, to bring forth what is the most socially just, the most socially equitable adult-use cannabis policy in the country. In the country. One of the things that many people often tout about the medical industry is that it is the gold standard as it relates to regulation. And that’s good, in a very important industry like this you need significant regulations. But one of the things that they don’t talk about is the diversity that exists in medical. And they don’t talk about it because it doesn’t exist. And the reason why it doesn’t exist is because this process, not putting language on a ballot and going to referendum... or excuse me, a ballot measure, but taking the painstaking time to say what are going to be our guiding principles for this policy. And if equity is the principle of this policy, equity has to be at the forefront of every single conversation as it relates to who participates in this industry, as it relates to taxation, as it relates to application processes, how should that look. All of that has been not only articulated but it has been stipulated in the
language of this Bill. So, when looking at what many other states that have embarked upon adult-use legalization, many of the problems that we saw in terms of creating a policy that was equitable, some of the things that were missing were things such as having access to capital. A major hurdle for individuals wanting to get into this space. We've addressed that. With a $30 million grant and a revolving loan fund for Social Equity Applicants. As central to the application policy, Social Equity Applicants have a... are 20 percent of the core points of every application. That means that you can't leave social equity on the table. If you do, you won't be participating in adult-use cannabis in Illinois. It is the third highest ranked area within each application process, only behind security and business plan. When thinking about the devastation that has impacted so many of our communities across this state, particularly looking at disproportionately impacted areas, those of us that serve those communities would not be doing our jobs if we did not fight for community reinvestment. And because of the hard work of groups like Chicago NORML and Grow Greater Englewood, and our Chairwoman of Agriculture, Representative Sonya Harper, the Chairwoman of Higher Ed, Carrol Ammons, and all of the other Members that participated in the cannabis equity work group, we have been able to craft a policy that reinvests money in communities that have been divested in for the last 80 years. With specific and targeted resources to be able to reverse the harm of impact that has happened to our communities as a result of failed policies like a war on cannabis. In my time in this General Assembly, never ever have I seen a policy,
words on a piece of paper, and seen myself in that paper. That hasn’t happened in 10 years because we have never, at the central point of any real conversation that we’ve had in Springfield say, you know what, we have… if we are going to do this, we must make central to this policy ensure that black and brown communities that have been divested in, that have been locked up, that have been castigated to the side, have to be central to this policy and that is what we have in this Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Excuse me, Representative. Your time has expired. Representative Mussman, do you wish to yield your time to Representative Gordon-Booth?"

Mussman: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Harris: "Okay. Representative Gordon-Booth for an additional five minutes."

Gordon-Booth: "Many of us… again, the work that we do, we don’t do it in a silo, we do it as a collective. Many of us have worked on expungement policies. Chairwoman Camille Lilly, Chairman La Shawn Ford, Leader Will Davis, Leader Art Turner, Chairman Chris Welch, we have all worked… and others, have all worked on expungement policies because we see the devastating effect of communities that have been calcified in poverty. They have no ability to get financial aid, no ability to get quality housing, no ability to become gainfully employed. And let me tell you, when you live in a community like mine, and the largest economic engine in that city decides that they're going to pick up and move, you know what the jobs are that are left in a community like that? You can work at the school district, you can work at the hospital,
you can work at the county, or maybe a plethora of other small businesses. But you know what many... but you know what 70 percent of the industry in my community demands? It demands that you have a background check. So, if you are wearing the scarlet letter of a conviction, you are now calcified in poverty because of a mistake that... not even a mistake. Because of a choice that many people may not want to admit it, that they partake in too and have always partaked in. But the difference between black communities and other folks is that we're four times more likely to receive a conviction for it. So, I am proud of the Legislative Black Caucus standing in the gap for people who need to have their records cleared or people who need their communities to be reinvested in and for people that are saying, you know what, if we're going to create and industry, you can't do it for us, without us. And that’s what you see in this policy. I want to thank the Sponsor. I want to thank all of the Members of this Caucus, if I did not say your name, I am so sorry. But I want, not just those of us in this room to know, but the folks who may be paying attention to this conversation somewhere throughout this great state of 13 million people, but also in this country. Because what we are doing with this policy is we are setting the bar. We are letting the rest of this country know that if you set equity at the forefront of your policy, you cannot only have a good Bill, but you can have the best policy in the country as it relates to adult-use cannabis. Ladies and Gentlemen, we should all be proud of that. We should all be proud to say that we are creating an industry with intentionality around ensuring that people that have been
castigated to the side, people who have been ignored, people who are oftentimes vilified and otherwise are now lifted up. Not just in theory, not just in rhetoric, but in policy. And I want to end on this 'cause I know I'm going over my time. But I want to let everybody know that the work does not end today. We are really just getting started. This is the first bite. And any of us who have been around here for any amount of time, and we know that we don't get everything that we want in the first bite. We get as much as we possibly can that's passable and we continue to work. I'm committed to continuing that work. The Sponsor is committed to continuing that work. And I know that the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus and the Latino Caucus and the Progressive Caucus and many of our allies in this building are committed to continuing this work. Without necessarily getting everything in one Bill, I am proud to stand here to say that not only are we putting the best possible policy on the table, but it's the best policy around adult-use cannabis in the country and there is no need to shrink from any of that. I ask for your 'aye' vote. I'm proud to stand here with all of you today. Let's get this done."

Speaker Harris: "Chair recognizes Representative Welter."
Welter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Harris: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Welter: "Representative Cassidy, for the purpose of legislative intent, I'd like to ask you a question. Are actions of discipline or termination of an employee by an employer for failing a drug test, including a random drug test, protected from litigation under this law?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Welter: "Thank you for that. Also, another question that I have for you, how long have you been working on this Bill?"
Cassidy: "This particular Bill..."
Welter: "Or the idea of legalization for adult-use."
Cassidy: "So, for the past six years, I have been working directly on cannabis reform within this chamber. Two and a half years ago, we introduced the first version of this Bill and spent that entire time engaged in stakeholder conversations to bring us to this point."
Welter: "So, it's fair to say that these ideas and provisions in this Bill have been probably thoroughly debated for the last two years and discussed in working groups?"
Cassidy: "I would venture to say that I have never worked on a piece of policy that I have done more public discussion of."
Welter: "Thank you for that. To the Bill. Through these discussions and engaging with the stakeholders, I want to recognize Representative Cassidy and Senator Steans for working to engage with myself and several others to try to come up with what is the most palatable or passable legislation that considers many facets. And for me, when I was in the room, public safety was priority number one, along with many other topics. But when we talk about safety, I think it's important that we realize that what was discussed and what's been talked about is the work place protections that we put in this Bill provides employers with what is believed to be the toughest and best policy in the entire country when it comes to enabling a drug-free workplace. So, I want to make sure people understand that as well. We also talked about
DUIs and driving under the influence. This Bill requires a DUI study program with law enforcement to create best practices on enforcement and public policy. A few other items that were really important during the conversation that we had, local control. For me, coming from local government, I wanted to make sure that my locals had the ability to control how this was going to happen in their communities. Whether it's zoning, or just in general local opt out, communities at a municipal or county level moving forward with very little to no restrictions will have the ability to opt out if they don’t want this in their communities. While at the same time, not risking law enforcement dollars flowing back to their communities. This, again, was another topic that was discussed and ended up being negotiated. I just want all of you in this room to understand that regardless, if you decide to opt out in your community or if you are involved in it, the way that the money will be flowing down, it’s not going to be a grant process, it's going to be similar to the Local Government Distributive Fund. So, every municipality that has a police force or county government will see the flowing of local law enforcement dollars to them. I also want to touch on several points that we brought when we talked about the revenue that was going to be generated by this Bill. The importance to myself and several folks involved was to pay back some of our back log of bills. This Bill calls for 10 percent. I wanted to see more but that’s better than not having anything in there. I also wanted to touch on the good ethical language. In this Bill, we have a two year prohibition on General Assembly Members and their families from applying
or owning licenses. We also put in this Bill 20 percent of the revenue to mental health and substance abuse services throughout our state. It is very telling how far we have come in negotiations in that we are the first state to pass legalized cannabis for home grow just to medical patients. I also want to talk about the fact that I believe cannabis should be a personal choice, a personal liberty choice. I believe it's important that we put safe guards in place for our youth, our children, and consenting adults so that people using this product do not end up impacting them. I'm a father of three from a rural district and I'm standing before you supporting this Bill because I do not believe the current policy that we have out there right now is working. Prohibition doesn’t work and we see that. Putting safe guards in place, taxing, regulating it, I believe, provides a better market and a safer market for our state. That is why I'm up here supporting this Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Chair recognizes Representative Villanueva."
Villanueva: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Harris: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Villanueva: "Representative, I have a couple of questions for you. What is the intent behind allowing individuals to petition the courts to vacate their cannabis convictions?"

Cassidy: "As the state legalizes the possession of 30 grams or less of cannabis, it is necessary that we undo the criminalization of that same conduct. Due to this change in the law, these prior convictions should not only be forgiven by a pardon, but the courts should recognize these convictions as no longer legally valid based on the substantive change in
law and allow individuals to have their convictions vacated and expunged."

Villanueva: "Okay, but the Bill also contemplates vacating convictions for conduct that would still be unlawful moving forward. What is the purpose of vacating these convictions?"

Cassidy: "This Bill would allow, but not require, convictions for possession up to 500 grams and for manufacture delivery and possession with intent to deliver up to 30 grams to be vacated by individuals and state's attorneys. On a case by case basis, the courts may conclude that these convictions are no longer legally valid based on the substantive change in the law to legalize adult-use and vacate and expunge these convictions. The passage of this Bill is an opportunity for the State of Illinois to hit reset on enforcement of cannabis related offenses given the substantive change in law."

Villanueva: "And then one final question, because I noticed this as we had conversations about this. Was it your intent from the get-go to make sure that we had as much... as many stakeholders involved in the process?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. As I've said, we stopped counting around 100 meetings, but the intention from the very beginning was to use the time available to us in the last administration to get as much feedback as we could, to hear from as many people as we could, regardless of their position on the issue, because we felt very strongly that that feedback, both positive and negative, would lead to a better policy for the State of Illinois."

Villanueva: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I represent a district on the southwest side of the City of Chicago that
encompasses Cook County Jail. And I had the privilege, and I say the privilege because I think it takes a lot to walk into a jail and get a tour and actually speak to inmates about their situations and their experiences that landed them there. And one of those instances in particular, especially in the women's sections of the jail and having some conversations with some of the female inmates of why they were there and how they ended up being there, really took me aback. One was because there was a large number, at least from the stories that I was told, a large number of women who were in jail because of drug convictions. And second, they did it because of their partners. I bring this up because I think it's important to know that what we're talking about and my interest in participating in having conversations around adult-use has been those experiences, my mother's own personal experience with cancer and not being able to get a medical cannabis card because the hospital that she is seeking treatment at is a Catholic hospital. And again, they are exempt, and that's fine. But as my mother battles her own battle with cancer, her decision to not want to stick to opioids in order to help with the conditions and with the symptoms of the treatment, it would have been a little bit easier to get some relief had she have been able to get her medical cannabis card. And now, it's going to be a little bit easier for people like her to be able to actually seek some relief. I bring up these stories because I think there is going to be a lot of people that are going to talk about the morality of the issue, and I get it and I respect it and I understand, you know, people and their experiences. But I
also implore you to listen out to the experiences of other people and what we're really talking about. It was a privilege to be sitting in these rooms having explicit conversations about the intentionality of this Bill and about the need for equity to be in the middle of everything. And when we're talking about communities that have been ravaged by the war on drugs like my community and the communities that surround it, I think it's important to remember that while we're talking about adult-use, we're also talking about the creation of a new industry that will bring in jobs, but we're also talking about giving people a second chance at life. I urge a 'yes' vote.

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Didech."
Didech: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Didech: "Thank you. You know, something that I think is important, if we are going to legalize adult-use cannabis, is that our local governments have the tools and resources that they need to protect public health and public safety. So, I have some questions for legislative intent. In Section 55-25(2), it states that a unit of local government may both enact ordinances or rules governing the time, place, manner, and number of cannabis business establishment operations and establish civil penalties for violation of said ordinances or rules. In Section 55-25(3), it states that a unit of local government may regulate the on-premise consumption of cannabis at or in a cannabis business establishment within its jurisdiction in a manner consistent with this Act. Is the intent of this legislation to provide local governments
regulatory authority, including requiring a special use permit for the operation of a cannabis establishment over cannabis establishments within their jurisdiction?"

Cassidy: "Yes, so long as the local regulations are not in conflict with the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act and the local government does not unreasonably restrict the time, place, manner, and number of cannabis business establishment operations authorized by the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act."

Didech: "Given that, will local government law enforcement officials have the ability to inspect cannabis business establishment operations to ensure compliance with all state and local laws, ordinances, and rules? Specifically, will they have the ability to ensure compliance with the prohibition of sales to individuals under the age of 21 by conducting spot undercover compliance checks using under age individuals as they are allowed to do now with tobacco and alcohol purchases?"

Cassidy: "Yes, local governments shall have the same rights to ensure compliance of sales of cannabis to minors as they do with tobacco and alcohol."

Didech: "If a local government or its law enforcement officials determine that a cannabis business establishment operation is in violation of state or local laws, ordinances, or rules, will they have the ability to fine or take other enforcement action either temporarily or permanently against the bad actor based on the seriousness of the violation?"

Cassidy: "Yes, so long as the ordinances being enforced is not in conflict with the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act."
Didech: "If a local government official is inside a home completing an inspection for other purposes, such as a final inspection for a permit, can that official report suspected illegal home cultivation activities to local law enforcement?"

Cassidy: "Yes, if a local government official is lawfully inside a home and observes suspected illegal home cultivation activities, the official may report the suspected illegal activity to local law enforcement."

Didech: "Thank you. And one more question. A home cultivation can sometimes involve the installation of fixtures, irrigation systems, and sophisticated electrical heating and lighting equipment. Will home cultivation operations be subject to local building, fire, plumbing, and other local codes, and will local governments be allowed to require permits and inspections prior to the installation of home cultivation operations?"

Cassidy: "Yes, local governments may ensure home cultivation operations are in compliance with any local codes, so long as those local codes are not in conflict with the Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act."

Didech: "Well, thank you very much. And thank you, Representative Cassidy, for your extremely hard work on this Bill. And I look forward to listening to the rest of the debate."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Moylan."

Moylan: "Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Moylan: "Representative, are you familiar with an organization called Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice?"
Cassidy: "No, I'm not."
Moylan: "They represent persons of color and other minorities in the issue of criminal justice. Well, according to the CJCJ, African Americans are twice as likely to be arrested for marijuana in Colorado and Washington. Both states have legalized recreational use and sales. Also, Colorado's marijuana arrest rate for African Americans was nearly double that of Caucasians according to the Colorado Department of Public Safety. Are you aware of these issues?"
Cassidy: "No, I'm not."
Moylan: "Okay. In Colorado, on view arrests are up 26 percent. Blacks were 39 percent more likely than whites, 21 percent to experience on view arrests. Were you aware of those issues?"
Cassidy: "I am aware that across the country, people of color are disproportionately impacted by enforcement of drug laws. I am not familiar with the specific study you are reading."
Moylan: "Okay. Well, that's good. Also, are you aware that the pot industry is targeting minorities much like big tobacco? In Denver, one minority neighborhood has one pot business for every 47 residents accordingly... according to The Denver Post."
Cassidy: "Is there a question?"
Moylan: "Nope, I just wanted to ask if you're aware of that."
Cassidy: "I'm aware that our proposal has very strict placement and limitations guidelines to prevent over concentration."
Moylan: "Okay, but you would agree that The Denver Post is a reputable newspaper?"
Cassidy: "I would agree that The Denver Post is a newspaper."
Moylan: "Okay. The National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that 28 percent of women living in low income areas tested positive for marijuana use during pregnancy."

Cassidy: "Again, I am not familiar with the source that you're reading from."

Moylan: "Okay. Well obviously, these are well qualified and reputable sources. Marijuana arrests nearly tripled after legalization of marijuana in Washington, D.C. according to The Washington Post, another highly regarded newspaper. Is it true that in states that have legalized marijuana, minority youths are showing a much larger increase in use of marijuana than there Caucasian counterparts?"

Cassidy: "I'm aware that in states that have legalized, youth use has declined."

Moylan: "Okay. Well, I would disagree and I have documentation to prove it. And it has also been proven... your claim has been proven false by Político. Is it true that the New York... that New York and New Jersey recently turned down recreational marijuana?"

Cassidy: "I'm not a Member of the Assembly in either New York or New Jersey."

Moylan: "Okay. Well, I can let the General Assembly know that they did. Is it true that Lurie Children's Hospital and every other major health organization has come out against recreational marijuana?"

Cassidy: "I deeply appreciate the input that Lurie Children's Hospital provided that is reflected in this piece of legislation."
Moylan: "Well, let's just talk about their evidence-based position statement. They state that, 'Lurie Children's Hospital opposes efforts to legalize possession and use of marijuana by adults in Illinois because of the short term and long term health risks to children and adolescents.' So, on Section 55-30, page 290, it says that... or states that the applications of dispensing organizations are secret. Is that true and would we be able to find out by using the FOI procedure?"

Cassidy: "Under the medical program, all information concerning ownership of the facilities was exempt from FOIA. Under this proposal, ownership information and other information is made available. The only thing that is protected would be the application data that shows security information that could be utilized by folks with nefarious intentions or competitive information."

Moylan: "But we would..."

Cassidy: "...and private information such as social security numbers and other issues that we would not want available to be disseminated."

Moylan: "Well... right, I agree that we don't need to the social security numbers but you have promised transparency in contrast to medical marijuana. How would we know if the applications are scored fairly if we can't see the applications? I mean, we would like to see the applications."

Cassidy: "Applications are trade secrets, but ownership is not, and that is fully available."

Moylan: "Okay. When it says a person or entity owning a license shall be disclosed, does that mean the individual owners of a corporation will not be disclosed?"
Cassidy: "I'm sorry, repeat your question."
Moylan: "Okay. When a... when it says a person or entity owning a license shall be disclosed, does that mean the individual owners of a corporation will not be disclosed?"
Cassidy: "Anyone with five percent or more ownership will be disclosed as an owner."
Moylan: "And I'm explicitly asking about a corporation because we want to verify minority ownership and verify..."
Cassidy: "Anyone with five percent or more ownership will be disclosed."
Moylan: "So I'll..."
Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan, your time has expired. Representative Carroll, do you wish to yield your time to Representative Moylan? Representative Moylan for an additional five minutes."
Moylan: "So then, we would be assured that we would find out behind the cloak of secrecy that we would know who the applicants are for that corporation."
Cassidy: "I never said that the applicants would be revealed. In fact, I spoke very explicitly about the importance of protecting the private information, the security information that could put people's lives in danger, and the trade secrets. I never said that would be revealed. I was explicit that what needed to be revealed was ownership."
Moylan: "Okay. Well, how would we verify minority ownership and verify that there are no unsafe characters?"
Cassidy: "Because anyone with five percent or more ownership will be disclosed."
Moylan: "Okay. So, local governments can ban cannabis, am I correct?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Moylan: "But if they allow them, may they also allow smoking lounges or consumption areas?"
Cassidy: "Local governments have an option to allow private clubs."
Moylan: "Okay. Now yesterday, we spoke about when we go to a pot shop, there is no registration. Correct?"
Cassidy: "One more time."
Moylan: "If you go... if an individual goes to a pot shop to purchase recreational marijuana, is there any registration?"
Cassidy: "Not for non-patients."
Moylan: "Okay. So, is it true that they can purchase 30 grams at a time?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Moylan: "So, if I go in there at 9:00 in the morning I can purchase 30 grams?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Moylan: "Ten o'clock in the morning I can purchase 30 grams, 11:00, 12:00, and so on?"
Cassidy: "If you are in possession of more than 30 grams, you are operating outside of the law."
Moylan: "Yeah, but that wasn’t my question. Is it possible to go into a pot shop and purchase 30 grams at 9:00, 10:00, 11:00, 12:00, and so on?"
Cassidy: "The answer is that if you are ever in possession of more than 30 grams, you are operating outside of the law."
Moylan: "Yeah, well that wasn’t my question. My question was it possible that you can go purchase those amounts, whether you have them or not?"

Cassidy: "If anyone is in possession of more than 30 grams, they are operating outside the law."

Moylan: "Yup. So again, is it true that you can go into a pot shop and purchase 30 grams at 9:00, come back at 10:00, come back at 11:00, come back at 12:00 and purchase 30 grams each time? What…"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan, can we move it along?"

Moylan: "Okay. Well, I want to get her to answer the question."

Speaker Turner: "She's answered it."

Cassidy: "I've answered your question, Sir."

Moylan: "Okay. Well, I don’t think so. Okay, is it also possible to have a payday loan shop, liquor store, and pot shop in the same block?"

Cassidy: "This Bill doesn’t speak to those issues at all. That is an issue for local government."

Moylan: "Okay, but is it possible?"

Cassidy: "That is an issue for local government."

Moylan: "Okay. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is possible to have a payday loan shop, liquor store, and pot shop in the same block because there's only so much of a distance between them. Recently, you stated that some of the information from the opposition was not dated. Do you believe that the New York Times is a reputable paper?"

Cassidy: "Again, it's a newspaper."

Moylan: "Okay. Well, do you believe that they are reputable? Either a yes or no."
Cassidy: "My opinion of my news sources isn’t relative... relevant to this debate. It's a newspaper."

Moylan: "Well, it is relative because they take an opposing view. Let me just let the General Assembly realize that in The New York Times they are stating, 'Getting Worse, Not Better: Illegal Pot Market Booming in California Despite Legislation.' How about The New Yorker? That seems to be a more leftist leaning newspaper... magazine. Do you agree that they're a reputable magazine?"

Cassidy: "I'm not interested in giving you my opinion on your reading materials, Mr. Moylan. I mean..."

Moylan: "Well, no, it's important because they have taken positions that clearly oppose your statements saying that recreational marijuana is not harmful. Do you believe that hospitals have to report correct information about their facilities according to State and Federal Law?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Moylan: "Okay. Thank you. Well, according to the national... Denver... according to the University of Colorado Hospital, ER visits linked to cannabis use quadrupled after legislation in Colorado. In particular, edibles were linked to a far higher rates of hospitalization and can cause symptoms including panic attacks, mental disorders like sycosis. Would you agree?"

Cassidy: "I would agree that prior to them revisiting their rules and their laws around edibles, they had some problems. Which is why our law, which is... we're here to talk about our law..."

Moylan: "Right."
Cassidy: "...has very strict rules about THC content, packaging, and public education around the use of edibles."

Moylan: "Right, but this is what's happening on the ground in the states that you have said that you're modeling this Bill and other states have..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan, your time has expired yet again. But it looks like Representative Keicher would like to yield his to you, so you have an additional five minutes."

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Please make it brief, Sir."

Moylan: "Thank you, Representative. And I would really thank the House for listening to this important dissertation. To the Bill. Each and every one of us was elected by our constituents to fight for their interests. We are elected to this Body to stand up for our communities, stand up for our kids, and champion policies that will make Illinois a better place to live, work, and raise a family. It is our job to make sure that normal, everyday Illinoisans have a voice. For too long, on too many issues to count, the rich and powerful have had a voice in State Government while everyday Illinoisans, like the plumber in my district in Des Plaines or the single mother in Chicago, have gotten screwed. If this Bill passes, a giant big money industry will commercialize another harmful, addictive drug in our state. What do I mean commercialize? This is not about making it okay to smoke a joint on the weekend, it's about big business focusing on making a profit, now having a license to make more money off the most vulnerable in the state. This legislation will create a new commercial marijuana industry, Big Marijuana. Just like Big
Tobacco did for years with their candy cigarettes and Big Pharma still does by over selling and over prescribing opioids. Big Marijuana will come into Illinois and target our kids, target our poor communities, and hook a whole new generation on this drug. With Big Marijuana, the rich will get richer and every day Illinoisans will be left to pay for it. It would be left to citizens to pay the price on this terrible Bill while Big Marijuana investors get rich off the backs of our working people. Well I say, not in my back yard or our back yard, not in Illinois. Illinois deserves better. First let me make one thing clear. Today's marijuana isn't the same marijuana from even 10 to 15 years ago. Woodstock marijuana was around three to five percent THC. Today's marijuana can be up to 99 percent THC and the effect it has on the brain chemistry, addiction, safety on our roads and our workplace, and even everything else is a serious concern. Study after study is coming out showing the harms of marijuana. I know many of you in this chamber are looking for a long term revenue benefits. With a deficit, it's easy to think marijuana can be the answer to our budget woes. People are already using marijuana, so why not regulate and tax it? The simple fact is, we must not go this route because marijuana will cost our state and taxpayers far more. Law enforcement, who has vocally opposed this Bill, is rightly concerned about traffic facilities, fatalities, and drug driving. Since legislation, marijuana related traffic fatalities have jumped an astonishing 151 percent and overall traffic deaths have increased 35 percent in Colorado. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's no coincidence. Let's stand up for our
kids, let's stand up for our communities, and let's stand up for our citizens. It's what we are elected to do. Vote 'no' on this Bill. Vote 'no' on Big Marijuana. And vote 'no' on commercializing marijuana in Illinois. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Windhorst."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Windhorst: "Representative Cassidy, in your Bill, this allows for adults to possess under 30 grams of marijuana in Illinois. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Illinois residents, yes. Nonresidents would be 15 grams."

Windhorst: "For those under 21, are there any penalties?"

Cassidy: "They're aligned with the penalties for possession... underage possession of alcohol."

Windhorst: "What are those penalties?"

Cassidy: "There is a civil violation and if there is a nexus with driving, there is automatic suspension of the license... or revocation, sorry."

Windhorst: "Are you aware that the penalty for possession of alcohol by a minor is a Class A misdemeanor, not a civil violation?"

Cassidy: "No, I'm not."

Windhorst: "So, it is not the same penalty then for alcohol and cannabis for minors?"

Cassidy: "The possession... the penalty for possession of cannabis in that quantity, generally in our law, is the civil
violation. A juvenile should not be subjected to a greater penalty than an adult."
Windhorst: "Do you hold to that same principle with alcohol then? Because we do treat..."
Cassidy: "This Bill is not about that."
Windhorst: "Well, we do treat alcohol differently."
Cassidy: "But if you Sponsor that, Bill I'd be delighted to cosponsor it with you."
Windhorst: "Well, your representation today and in committee was it was being treated the same as alcohol and it's not. I just wanted to point that out."
Cassidy: "Thank you."
Windhorst: "Is there anything in this law, if it becomes law, that would require parents of those under 18 to be notified if their minor was found with marijuana?"
Cassidy: "Not that I'm aware of."
Windhorst: "So a minor under 18, found with marijuana, would be stopped... could be stopped by the police, receive a ticket, which could be paid over the counter at the Circuit Clerk's Office, and..."
Cassidy: "If a parent... I'm sorry. If a minor is in contact with law enforcement, yes, parents are notified."
Windhorst: "Are you aware that police interpret that provision, when it relates to marijuana, because it's a civil violation, that they do not have any obligation or even ability to notify the parents because it's a civil violation, not a criminal violation?"
Cassidy: "They've not brought that concern to me."
Windhorst: "We discussed in committee last night the issues with field sobriety testing for DUIs related to marijuana and you spoke on that yesterday. There is currently not an accepted chemical field sobriety test for marijuana in Illinois. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Admissibility of technology for roadside testing will be determined by the courts in accordance with Illinois Supreme Court Rule 702. Whether the testing platform that Michigan uses, which we discussed last night, passes that standard, is up to the courts."

Windhorst: "Are you aware of any case currently pending that’s going to resolve that issue before January 1?"

Cassidy: "No."

Windhorst: "So, we could have a situation in this state come January 1 where a person could be stopped for a DUI, in fact, a fatal accident, and there would not be a court admissible field sobriety chemical test, if I'm understanding that correctly. Is that accurate?"

Cassidy: "Just a moment. When we passed the civil enforcement Bill that set our DUI standards and enabled departments to use the field sobriety test, that... the ISP has not begun that process with regard to that. However, according to the State Police, they're operational at the Springfield Lab in the process of acquiring validation and instrumentation for the Chicago Lab with regard to official crime lab toxicology tests."

Windhorst: "So, those tests you're referring to, are they on blood?"

Cassidy: "Also... also urine tests are admissible."
Windhorst: "Urine tests are admissible. Are you aware…"
Cassidy: "And field sobriety tests are statutorily admissible."
Windhorst: "But there is no roadside chemical test that has been accepted by the courts?"
Cassidy: "We enabled that two and a half years ago."
Windhorst: "And we still don’t have it, correct?"
Cassidy: "State Police inform me that they have not done that."
Windhorst: "And the testing with the State Police, do you know if they can test at…"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Windhorst, your time has expired. Representative Severin, do you rise to yield your time Representative Windhorst?"
Severin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I yield my time."
Speaker Turner: "Representative Windhorst for an additional five minutes."

Windhorst: "With regard to the Illinois State Police Lab testing, are you aware if they have the capability inside their criminal laboratory to test for the level of THC which is necessary for a conviction in DUIs?"
Cassidy: "Once again, ISP is operational at the Springfield Lab and in the process of acquiring validation instrumentation for the Chicago Lab."
Windhorst: "Can they test for the level or just the presence? Because those are two important distinctions."
Cassidy: "They are fully operational at the Springfield Lab."
Windhorst: "Let’s discuss the use of drug detection dogs. Currently most, if not all, of the drug detection dogs in Illinois are trained to test for the presence of marijuana. If they alert on a vehicle, they are… that gives a police
officer probable cause to search the vehicle. If this becomes law, do you believe that a drug alert... I'm sorry... a dog alert for drugs on a vehicle will still be constitutionally valid?"

Cassidy: "Yes, these dogs can still be used. If a dog indicates on cannabis, we do believe that it will be probable cause for the officer to conduct a search or extend a Terry stop. We are not changing any laws on what changes probable cause or reasonable suspicion. If the dog's indication can be used as probable cause or reasonable suspicion today, it can be used after this Bill passes."

Windhorst: "What about those canines who don’t alert for the presence of a certain drug, just the presence of drugs generally? Meaning dogs that are trained for opioids, methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana and they just alert to the presence of one of those substances."

Cassidy: "We are not changing any laws on what constitutes probable cause or reasonable suspicion. If the dog's indication can be used as probable cause or reasonable suspicion today, it can be used after this Bill passes."

Windhorst: "Excellent reading. My question, I guess, is how the courts are going to interpret that."

Cassidy: "I can do it again."

Windhorst: "Well, I guess I would just say there is a concern that the courts will not interpret that as valid probable cause because of prior court rulings. Now, you were aware that we just decriminalized marijuana in 2015 in this state. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Low level possession, yes."

Windhorst: "And what is that level?"
Cassidy: "Ten grams or less."

Windhorst: "And to your knowledge, has there been any study conducted about the effectiveness of that policy change in our state?"

Cassidy: "Define effectiveness."

Windhorst: "Well, the number of police stops for marijuana, the number of prosecutions for marijuana, the number of tickets written in lieu of a prosecution for marijuana. Do we have any of those statistics?"

Cassidy: "I am aware that the ACLU did do some research on that, but I don’t have it available to me at this time."

Windhorst: "And again, that law was in effect that gave us greater ability to form field sobriety tests for DUIs, correct?"

Cassidy: "In that same law, we permitted... we set the nanogram standard for THC in blood and saliva and we enabled the use of the field sobriety tests."

Windhorst: "And we still do not have that established for field sobriety tests in our state?"

Cassidy: "To my knowledge, only one department has done a pilot project on it."

Windhorst: "And that has not been tested by the courts for admissibility?"

Cassidy: "I am unaware."

Windhorst: "To the Bill. The National Academy of Medicine, in 2017, issued a 487 page report, The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids. The former head of Centers for Disease Control, Thomas Frieden, said the conclusions of that report show that marijuana, there is way too little known about it, the potential benefits are unproven, some serious harms are..."
definite and many serious risks are possible. Among those concerns, which are summarized, cannabis use can negatively affect adolescents and young adult's health and wellbeing, including their school performance, education level, social lives, future employment, and income. Cannabis use is associated with the development of schizophrenia and other psychosis, loss of reality. The risk is highest for the most frequent users. Heavy cannabis users are more likely to report thoughts of suicide than nonusers. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 2018, 'It is now incontrovertible that heavy use of cannabis increases the risk of psychosis. Of course, association does not prove causation...'

Speaker Turner: "Representative Windhorst, your time has expired. Representative Parkhurst, do you wish to yield your time to Representative Windhorst?"

Parkhurst: "Yes, please."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Windhorst for an additional five minutes."

Windhorst: "Of course, association does not prove causation. However, one by one, alternative explanations have gradually been disproved. Patients do not start using cannabis to self-medicate their psychotic symptoms or side-effects of drugs, but rather use it for the same reasons as the rest of the population, principally for its high. The risk of psychosis remains after controlling for personality disorder and use of other drugs. Some overlap between genes carrying susceptibility to schizophrenia and to drug use has been reported but insufficient to explain more than a fraction of the relationship. A 2010 review of earlier studies by the
Schizophrenia Bulletin found that 27 percent of people with schizophrenia have been diagnosed with Cannabis Use Disorder in their lives. A Swiss study of 265 psychotic patients published in Frontiers in Forensic Psychiatry revealed that young men with psychosis... young men with psychosis who use cannabis had a 50 percent chance of becoming violent. A 2013 Italian Psychiatric Journal examined about 1600 psychiatric patients in Southern Italy and found that cannabis use was associated with a tenfold increase in violence. A 2012 paper in the Journal of Interpersonal Violence examined a federal survey of more than 9000 adolescents and found that marijuana use was associated with a doubling of domestic violence. A 2017 paper, the Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology examined drivers of violence among 6 thousand British and Chinese men and found that drug use, and the drug was nearly always being cannabis, translated into a fivefold or five time increase in violence. If we look at four states, the first four to legalizemarijuana. In Colorado, violent crime rose 20 percent. In Alaska, violent crime rose 30 percent. In Oregon, violent crime rose 21 percent. Nationally at that same time, violent crime only rose one percent. Again, in those four states, Colorado, Alaska, Oregon, and Washington, the first four to legalize marijuana, murders were up 37 percent and aggravated assault was up 25 percent. Those were far greater than the national increase and they accounted for differences in population growth. As was said last night in committee and I'm sure will be said today on the floor, correlation does not prove causation. However, there is sufficient evidence for us to show that there is a
connection between the use, particularly heavy use of marijuana, and the increase in violence in society. We can address the social justice concerns that were raised by prior speakers without legalization. We can do it. We need to make that the effort before we jump off and legalize this substance. This is not ready. This legalization is not ready, particularly when it relates to DUI prosecutions. We need to study what occurred from 2015 with our decriminalization. We need to continue scientific study on the use of marijuana and then we can examine whether legalization is the right policy for our state. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we still have many people seeking recognition on this Bill. Please try to keep your remarks as concise as possible and within the five minute time limit. We will allow you to yield time, but please make an attempt to keep it within the five minute time limit so that we can move on with the proceedings for today. Representative Evans is recognized for five minutes."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Evans: "It was kind of odd asking Kelly Cassidy about Bills like this, because I do believe in you, but I gotta be sure on the record. What can you say or what can you give me to say to people in my community that are concerned about job loss, because many of these companies who drug testing? What can... can you say to that?"

Cassidy: "I'm sorry. I don't..."
Evans: "Job loss due to drug testing. What can you say? What information can you give me to ease their concerns about losing their jobs because of drug testing?"

Cassidy: "The same zero-tolerance policies that are in place now exists... will exist after."

Evans: "Will this legislation impact them?"

Cassidy: "This legislation just affirms the existence and the right for employers to have zero-tolerance policies. It doesn't change the status quo with regard to the ability to have a zero-tolerance policy."

Evans: "I know there's been a lot of health things mentioned. You know I'm a cancer survivor and pain management is an issue for folks throughout this state. What can you say would be the health implications to individuals? Because we call it recreational but I think it goes deeper than that. Can you speak to that?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. The ability for folks who may not be able to access a card because of our incredibly restrictive list of conditions would certainly be a health impact. Folks who could manage conditions that aren't currently included in our medical cannabis program is one. Another health impact on our state would be that by bringing this product out of the shadows and into a tested and regulated marketplace, we can ensure that products aren't contaminated with pesticides, or mold, or heavy metals, or rat poisoning, as we saw with synthetic cannabis in Peoria. There would be no need to access synthetic cannabis laced with rat poisoning under a marketplace like this because you would be able to go to a safe and clean facility and purchase the product whether
you're treating a condition or not. But you could be assured that this was a safe, tested product."

Evans: "Thank you, Representative Kelly Cassidy. And I appreciate your work on this issue and all of the Sponsors. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am a black man from the South Side of Chicago. And if you go through my communities, it's not an opinion, it's a fact, that the war on drugs has ravaged my community. And I've talked to Representative Cassidy about how the war on drugs has personally impacted my own family. How my father, uncles, friends have been victims of the fraudulent war on drugs. And now, we sit here with a piece of legislation that is allowing the commercialization, allowing this drug, this thing called cannabis, to be legal. And all of my life I've seen the impacts and how it's negatively impacted my community. And I asked myself... you know, I have trepidation. I've had trepidation on this process. And we had a Governor who stood up and said I am going to make this legal. And do I jump up and down? No, because all I've seen my entire life is the negative impacts. And... and I see a Sponsor in Kelly Cassidy, if you go through her array of Bills, it's been nothing but make the world a better place Bill. She is fighting for everybody. So, when she gets the Bill, it further... it brings me further complexities because I want to support. I know where Kelly's heart is. I see Christian Mitchell. I see Jehan Gordon my friend, my colleague, and it still gives me trepidation. But then I look at this piece of legislation and I... I'm in this NCSL with the Sponsor in the Senate, Toi, and we've talked about what every state has done. Absolutely nothing when it comes to equity.
Absolutely nothing when it comes to criminal justice reform. Each and every state. And me and Toi would sit in these conferences and I'd say every state has done nothing. The liberal State of California has bypassed my community. They refused to do anything when it comes to legislation. And I look at this board and I see this Bill and as... as a black man, it gets me emotional because finally, finally the State of Illinois is going to look at my community and say something. My community is going to say we want you have to piece of the pie. You know, look at my brothers, my uncles, my father and say we want you to have a job. Because only thing that's going to help my community is jobs. We want you to clear your records. We want to do that. And yesterday, it was... I was just filled with emotion because, finally, there's a piece of legislation that's gonna do that. And I've been here for seven years and I've been in politics nearly my entire life with Christian Mitchell, we were kids when we started, and I have never seen a piece of legislation that's going to address the problems that I have. I was going get..."
do anything when it comes to background. I would have walked out of here and taken my key. When I look at this legislation and I see real results and I didn't believe it. You know, it was no way, because in the years that I've been here, this job is full of false promises. Yeah, we're going to help you out. But we continue... continually get left hanging. And to see this piece of legislation, again, it warms my heart. And I knew it because I know how Kelly Cassidy does things. But it... it's not a trusting business. And when the Governor got up and he was on TV and we're going to do all these things, I did not believe it. I said yeah, yeah, they're going to talk about it and it'll be watered down. This is real. And what I'm hoping is that when we go back to NCSL, and we talk to my colleagues throughout the country, that they use it as a template. It's very... you know, we always use examples of what other states are doing and it irritates me because the greatest state in the country is the State of Illinois. And I want Indiana and I want Missouri... because me and my family members in St. Louis that I care about with criminal records and I want them to get expungements. I want them to get the opportunity to work. There's no 'make the world a better place' organization that's going to solve the problems in my community, but job opportunities and freeing these workers will because I've seen it. I haven't seen it in my opinion. I haven't seen it in no study. I've seen it in my own family. When you give a person an opportunity, you open up a window. You change not only communities but you change generations, because I'm one of those individuals. An opportunity was given to the men before me and that's why I'm standing here. I thank
you, Kelly. And, again, I thank everybody that's worked on it. And I thank the Governor because I did not trust you, I did not believe you. But I do now, because this is real. And again... and I thank all of my colleagues because everything I wanted is not in this Bill, but I think those are the best pieces of legislation. Even my Members on the other side who are on the conservative... who are conservative, I thank you for giving this a chance because this means something in my community. This means something to my family. And again, I thank everybody that worked on it. Marishonta. I mean there's so many across the list. And, you know, I wanted to engage but it was too emotional. This is so important to me because, again, I've seen what happens when an individual is restricted. I've seen the men who cry when they lose their jobs because they didn't want to put on there that they had a felony conviction. I've seen the young folks who were rejected financial aid because they had a background because they had a possession of marijuana. And I've seen the destruction that that's caused to generations. I've seen it up close. And it's a devastating view. But now I can be a part of rolling that back because of some people that I work with who I have a stronger trust for. So, thank you all. And I not only urge an 'aye' vote but I hope that we celebrate this Bill and that we continue to work for. You know, I'm a utopian viewing individual. I've survived cancer. I believe anything is possible. And I want to continue to make this Act better. I want to make sure that the communities like mine are positively impacted. And I want to ask the Sponsor, but I know she's going to do it anyway, I hope that you continue
to work on this issue so that the impacts on our community are positive in every way. So thank you, Kelly Cassidy. Sorry, Jehan, that I didn't believe you because I sure didn't. Again, thank you all that's worked on this issue and I'm proud to be a supporter, and I urge an enthusiastic 'aye' vote on this very important issue, this very important business issue, this very important community issue. And this is a generational life changing vote that I'm taking. I'm holding back my tears because I'm a grown man. But I want to cry. I'll cry when I get in the car tonight... later today. But thank you all. And again, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. To the Bill. This issue has been a very important issue to me. And I've spoke out, you know where I stand on it. I think it's just because of the way I was raised, the decisions that I made myself as I was growing up. It's reflected in how I choose to raise my children and hope that they make decisions a certain way as they grow up. And this Bill moves in the completely opposite direction of the efforts I'm trying to make as a parent. Telling our children, our young adults, basically, that getting stoned is a condoned and acceptable recreational activity. And I just have a real problem with that. And when it comes to this Bill, there's a lot to criticize. Some of it has already happened. But no matter how you package this... no matter how you package this, whether it's revenue, or it's criminal justice reform, or it's just saying that people are smoking it anyway, so just give up. You know, I don't have a crystal ball, but I can
pretty much guarantee you where we're going to be in 10 years, where we're going to be in 20 years, when it comes to this issue. And it’s not going to be good. So, I want to leave an image. I want to leave an image for you. You see this? This is your brain. There it is, folks. This is your brain on drugs. So today, for my family, for my children, for your families, your children, and especially... and especially for African American and Hispanic communities, vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morgan."
Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Morgan: "Representative Cassidy, I would like to add to the legislative record some of the things that we haven't talked about but also to refute some of the... what I call nonsense that we heard, including wasting eggs that should have been used to make a soufflé or something instead of making a ridiculous point that was outdated for 30 years. Representative Cassidy, could you tell us a little bit about the public education that is in this legislation that is going to be meaningful in a way that we have failed to provide our children since the days of the war on drugs with an egg in a pan?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. We have been incredibly intentional with regard to the design of the public education component of this Bill because when we set out to do this, our stated goal was to reduce youth access. We know that youth report 80... 87 percent of youth report that cannabis is easier to acquire currently than alcohol. And we know, quite frankly, that teens
and young adults are capable of making good decisions when provided with good information. The idea that we expect our kids to ace the AP Bio exam but think that putting an egg in a frying pan is going to tell them what it means to take a substance into their body, is ludicrous. And so, we have formed a vigorous approach to public education that includes a Public Health Advisory Task Force that was a request of the State Medical Society, and Lurie Children's, and others that will constantly look at incoming science and make recommendations for how we should approach this but also looking at the studies and the work that's been done in other states. In Colorado, where youth use has dropped year over year, they make it very, very clear and discuss things like neuro-receptors, and addiction pathways, and the impact of THC on developing brains. And as a result, they are seeing excellent results and we want to have that same approach. We want to take it the next step further and make sure that we are constantly vigilant to make sure that this public education campaign is as scientifically accurate and respectful of the ability of teens to make decisions as we can make it."

Morgan: "Thank you, Representative. And a few clarifying questions. As you know, I have a lot of interest and commitment to protecting the Medical Cannabis Program and the medical cannabis patients. My understanding is there are a number of protections in this legislation that protect all privileges and rights for patients that currently exist for the Medical Cannabis Program. Is that right?"

Cassidy: "Yes."
Morgan: "And as we start to roll out the existing medical cannabis dispensaries and transition them to an adult-use program, won't they be required to provide an ample supply and variety of medical products for medical patients the way that they're currently providing right now to protect the supply and protect the patients?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. The beauty of the regulatory system that you helped to build that... that operates our medical program is that these facilities, both the growers and the dispensary operators, know exactly what products are needed for the patient base. And we have put strong language into place to ensure, not just the quantity, but the variety and the availability is guaranteed for patients before any adult-use sales can be made."

Morgan: "And I know that we're taking a kind of go-slow approach in terms of the expansion of potential licenses to make sure we don't have an oversupply, which of course, could mean that they're shortages at the beginning. So, aren't there protections in there? In the event of a shortage, medical cannabis patients will have priority. Is that right?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. Medical patients will always have first priority."

Morgan: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. To some of the comments earlier, we all recognize that statistics and data can be manipulated, in fact, is manipulated. And we're selectively choosing to, really, reinforce a preexisting notion. Correlation is not causation, as one of my colleagues on the other side accurately noted. In some of the nonsense studies that we talked about here on the floor, to me, belong
more in The Onion, and not on the House Floor. When medical cannabis passed in this chamber six years ago, I heard a lot of the same rhetoric. As the state's Medical Cannabis Director, to start this program, I heard a lot of doomsday predictions. Violence would increase in Illinois. Drug driving is going to be rampant. Medical cannabis is going to be everywhere for children in schools. Law enforcement's going to be overwhelmed. Cannabis is going to be diverted. And you know what? Literally none of that happened because we did it right. And this Bill does it right too. I want to really congratulate my partner in crime, Representative Kelly Cassidy, and all the Representatives who worked on this legislation including..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your time has expired. Representative Costa-Howard, would you like to yield your time to Representative Morgan? Representative Morgan for an additional five minutes."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate Representative Cassidy and all those who worked on the Bill, including indispensable staffers. And really indispensable Rose Ashby and Chris Lindsey who put months, and months, and months of their lives into this Bill. I've been working with this outstanding Legislator to my right, a woman who I would literally drive off a cliff with if she asked me, long before I even joined this Legislature. As the first Director of the state's Medical Cannabis Program, I am so impressed with this product. That the core tenets of it, the core tenets of this Bill, reflect the core tenets of what we want as a Body and what we want as a state. This legislation is without a doubt
the most social equity focused cannabis legislation ever passed by a State Legislature and will provide a strong foundation for medical cannabis patients for the future. If you believe in criminal justice reform, vote for this Bill. If you believe that the war on drugs decimated our communities and needs to be remedied, vote for this Bill. If you're concerned about the damage of the opioid abuse and crisis in our communities throughout the state, vote for this Bill. If you want to create new high-paying and strong... strongly trained union jobs, vote for this Bill. If you want to expunge hundreds of thousands of low-level drug crime records, vote for this Bill. If you want to make history in Illinois and put our neighbor states on notice and set the nation's gold standard on cannabis regulations, vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was told earlier today that I was a little emotional. So, I am little emotional because this is a personal issue for me. You know, I will talk about my brother, who as a young boy, got arrested and now carries a felony around because he got arrested for marijuana. He's been married 20 years, he's a good stable family. And when I first heard about this Bill, I heard words like, we're going to try to recapture, or redo, or remake what the war on drugs did to black people in America or in Illinois. Does this Bill do that? We also heard words like expungement, that we're going to expunge the 800 thousand people who got caught up in the war on drugs. And then the expungement process changed in this Bill. So I will, in a later point, ask the Sponsor to
speak on record about the intent of this Bill. So, for people like me who are trying to reconcile we're going to support... I'm going to support this Bill, you know, we have to learn how the process is. And if you think about this in the last couple days and how this Bill has gone, and I want to thank the Sponsor for all that she's done, this is what came out. 610 pages of a Senate Amendment that came out the other day. How many of you have read these 610 pages? We have to be clear of what's gonna happen when we do this Bill, that everything that we say and we give our word on is gonna happen in this process. If that's the case, support this Bill. Now, we had this Bill start off, Senate Bill 7. We had Representative Ammons do House Bill 902. We had House Joint Resolution 3 by Representative Cassidy. And now, we're at House Bill 1438 on the Senate Amendment to concur. So, we have to be sure of what we're doing. Now, will the Sponsor yield?

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Jones: "Representative Cassidy, we started this, we talked about expunging records, 800 thousand records. Can you guarantee me, going forward, no black or brown young men are going to be caught up in the system and have to come back and we have to redo this legislation to ensure that their rights are protected?"

Cassidy: "I'm not sure what you're asking about going forward."

Jones: "This deal with expungements..."

Cassidy: "It does deal with expungements but it's only retroactive. So, I want make sure that we're clear that it... that this is looking at convictions up to this point. The process that exists currently remains in place whereby people
could petition for expungement or sealing. But this... this Bill addresses past convictions and arrest records."

Jones: "Okay. So, when we started this process, one of the things that I talked about throughout this, if our goal was to make sure that the people who are going to benefit off the black... off the backs of the black men that have went to prison in this process, this is gonna create millionaires. So, it's not gonna create too many black millionaires. And I've talked about putting legislation specifically that will deal with creating black millionaires and business men in this process. The Ohio legislation required 15 percent... are you aware of the Ohio legislation that passed, that got challenged?"

Cassidy: "I am. I'm aware that that was held unconstitutional."

Jones: "Well, it was held unconstitutional but in parts of it where the Supreme Court came back, the State Law required 15 percent of all licenses to go to businesses majority owned by economically disadvantaged group. And they specifically said African Americans, Indians, or Hispanics. Why wasn't that kind of language put in this Bill?"

Cassidy: "Concerns over the constitutionality of the... in that case, that talked about the need for a disparity study. And that's specifically what we did in this Bill, was to put in place as many possible pathways for ensuring equity within the licensing process. And then the hard stop so that there would be a disparity study that would then possibly permit us, if those first steps didn’t create those opportunities as we hope they do, by putting so many points on social equity..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jones, your time has expired. Representative Mayfield, do you wish to yield your time to
Representative Jones? She says that she does. Representative Jones for an additional five minutes."

Cassidy: "As we create a new industry to... sorry... where individuals and businesses can profit from the sale of cannabis, we recognize that individuals in certain communities have faced higher levels of arrest and incarceration for violating the prohibition of the sale and possession of cannabis. The Social Equity Applicant Program reconciles this reality by giving additional points to individuals who have been personally impacted..."

Jones: "Representative, I only have four more minutes left. So, let's concise this."

Cassidy: "Okay. All right. So, where... where I was talking about the hard stop, after the issuance of licenses in January 2020 and the first issuance of licenses to new market in July 2020, the Cannabis Regulation Oversight Officer will conduct a disparity study of the market to be completed by March of 2021..."

Jones: "So... so, Representative..."

Cassidy: "...which could then allow us to change that set aside."

Jones: "So quickly, what did that disparity study say about the impact on African Americans and then going forward? And was any of that language in that disparity study put in this Bill?"

Cassidy: "There has... there's not been a disparity study because there is not a... an adult-use marketplace. So, we cannot do a disparity study on a market that doesn't exist and impact that market. So, that's... that's the intentionality here is to
ensure that we do the steps on the front end that will allow us to take further steps if... if these steps don't work."
Jones: "Well, you know, we are the Legislature, we can do anything that we want to make a Bill as good or bad as we want to. So, I would... if you're giving your commitment that going forward, that after we do this for two years and it's not working, that those disparity studies will be done and put in here..."
Cassidy: "You have my word."
Jones: "And... all right."
Cassidy: "And it's baked into the Bill to do the disparity study. And if there are added steps that we have to take, I am right there with you to take them."
Jones: "Representative, I want to point to your attention, I gotta lot of questions, but I will concisely. So, part of your Bill goes to Community College Vocational Pilot Program. It seems like a lot of language in this Bill is waxing-over what we should just put in strong language. Some of that waxing-over is the social equity piece when we should just call it like putting... giving black business owners applications. In this piece, you talk about the Community College Vocational Pilot Program. You don't specifically mention any of the 48 community colleges in this program. Why aren't any of the colleges specifically named in the program?"
Cassidy: "The Department of Agriculture and the Community College Board will pilot... launch this in eight community colleges."
Jones: "What are those eight community colleges?"
Cassidy: "That's to be determined in conjunction with the Community College Board and the Department of Agriculture."
Jones: "So, community colleges have admonished... been admonished by the Federal Government that they're not supposed to have drugs on their campuses. Will this impact the community college and the administrator who participates in this program? Will they be charged in any way if they participate in this program?"

Cassidy: "That's up to the community college. You’re asking if they'll be impacted by... on the federal level, and I don't believe that that's the case."

Jones: "So, no Pell Grants will be impacted? No..."

Cassidy: "No."

Jones: "They won't get a letter saying that you can't have these many students, black students, coming to their..."

Cassidy: "No."

Jones: "So, part of where we are now is that we've been working on this for three years. And we know... I have to go back to my community, born and raised in Ford Heights, where only probably one percent of the people come out of Ford Heights. You know, you were asked earlier about is this gonna have more dispensaries as opposed to businesses in the community. You also asked about, you know, how communities are going to do this on the local level. Can you ensure me that if any community takes the steps to have more dispensaries than jobs? Is there a limit on the dispensaries that a community can put in their... in the local government?"

Cassidy: "Each... each Bureau of Labor Statistics district in the state has a cap on a total number per district. There is a limit on how close together the facilities can be. They can't be less than 1500 feet apart. And there's an overall cap on..."
total dispensaries statewide. Total potential licenses, there's not even a requirement that we have as many as we permit."

Jones: "To the Bill. I will just say that, you know, I am as perplexed as anybody in here about this legislation because how deeply it impacts, not only my community... I have to go back to a community like Ford Heights and tell them the advantages and disadvantages of this Bill and I'm not sure I'm there yet. So, I will continue to listen to the rest of this debate. I want to thank the Sponsor, and thank the Members who have asked questions about this important piece of legislation."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Stuart."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Stuart: "Thank you. I just... I had a few things that I wanted to get a little bit of clarification on. But I first wanted to say I was a cosponsor on the Resolution that Representative Moylan filed. And I think the purpose of that was to do exactly what was done, was to take some time to make sure concerns... and to slow things down and here we are on the last day. So, I think we accomplished slowing down. I talked with Representative Welter and I was very happy to hear of all the input that was put in and all the different negotiations that went on. I think he and I shared a lot of the same concerns, and in our discussion it seems to me he was very satisfied with the path that those concerns took. I do just have one detail though that I do want to ask about that would be troubling for my community and for a lot of other folks. I do
understand that when you originally started talking about this... and I know that this is a years' long process, not just this one Session... there was discussion of not allowing for any local taxation because I understand the concern of over taxation and then not having people go to the legitimate market. But then I understand that that local taxation piece was then put back in, correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Stuart: "So, when I was looking with the information that you shared and when you talked with us, I saw that municipalities can enact a local sales tax of up to three percent. And obviously that's locally determined."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Stuart: "And then there's a county level tax that's allowed, if the county so chooses, of up to .75 percent in incorporated areas, but then I saw that there's also a three percent for Cook County. And I don't represent Cook County. I represent Madison County. I represent St. Clair County. People where I live constantly remind me I don't represent Chicago, and I know that. I don't represent Chicago. I represent a very different part of the state. And I don't think it's fair to my counties, I don't think it's fair for my colleagues in Will County, and Lake County, and all of the other counties... DuPage County, McHenry County, you name it, to be treated at a different level than Cook County. So, I wanted to say to Representative Cassidy that I... I really appreciate you talking with me about that concern. I appreciate your assurances that you're going to fix that discrepancy."

Cassidy: "I am."
Stuart: "That ultimately every county across the State of Illinois will be allowed, if they so choose, to enact up to the same level of taxation."

Cassidy: "That is the intention. Absolutely. We are aware of the need for a trailer Bill and that is one of the items. This was a late addition, and my apologies that you were left out and we will address it."

Stuart: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have been very torn this whole week of whether I should speak on some of these very contentious issues. On this one though, I feel like my constituents really want me to have their voice heard. So, they've been talking to me, they've been calling me. I've heard from them at the African American churches. I've heard from them calls to my office, at the grocery store, at the restaurants. Everywhere I go I hear about this. So, their problem is they don't feel their concerns have been taken seriously and I agree. The Sheriffs' have called me. The Sheriffs' Association from Colorado has called me. The police tell me that they are going to have serious issues trying to monitor the homegrown, that it can be grown in out buildings. They said that the Colorado Sheriffs have told them there's a rise in the cartel involvement. So at the end of the day, there are just too many unaddressed concerns that, perhaps someday, if all these concerns could be figured out and taken seriously, we could take a vote on it. But why it has to be today is beyond me. When I ask questions about Sheriffs' Association and then I'm told that there's research on the
other side to offset that. Well, that could be true but those of us who want to believe the Sheriffs' Association and our physicians, I feel like my constituents have a right to hear the answers to this. Again, too many unaddressed concerns. An OB doctor came up to me and said, I'm very concerned about the risk to babies and the mothers. Another one said they're concerned about the addiction issues. General practice physicians have told me that they're worried about the brain health. I've had the common citizens concerned saying, I'm going to be driving down the road with my baby in the back seat and somebody could be stoned in the car next to me and kill my baby and everything they do is legal unless they get caught. My sister died because someone was texting and driving and didn't get caught. She was only 70 years old. Unless we can take everybody's concerns seriously, I don't feel that it's fair when we say this group of people's concerns count and we'll answer them. This group of people's concerns don't agree with how I feel so they're not gonna be answered. They're gonna just be blown off and say there's research on the other side to offset it. I agree with what Representative DeLuca said earlier. I raised my children to believe that drugs can mess your life up. And I don't know how they're going to raise their children in the same light if it's legal. I have to stand up for my constituents, and my constituents overwhelmingly have asked me to vote 'no'. And so with that, I also urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Weber. Just a moment, Representative. How about now?"
Weber: "Hello. Hello. All right, we got it. To the Bill. First of all, I'd just like to say in my 52 years that I've worked as a laborer throughout my life. In school, I had friends and people I knew that had drug problems. Working construction making $8 an hour for years, I had many people that came to work, marijuana was an issue. Many people throughout there... lost their job. In school, we had people that were suspended. And after I became a business owner for the last... what was it 24 years... 26 years? There's been many people that I've had to let go because of repeated use of marijuana. Had a lot of personal issues over the years, people I know, family members. And the one thing that wouldn't have stopped any of the problems, and it wasn't the cause of the problem, was the fact that it... the problem wasn't that it wasn't legal. The problem was addiction and that's where we're heading today. Today, we stand poised to vote on a Bill to legalize recreational marijuana, the use of cannabis at the state level. No action we take today will change the fact that cannabis is still a Schedule I controlled substance under Federal Law. I'm very appreciative that I've had a lot of local law enforcement, State's Attorneys, State's Attorney Michael Nerheim from Lake County, State's Attorney Patrick Kenneally from McHenry County, Chief of Police Jim Black from Crystal Lake, and many, many others, and we all know that the Sheriffs, the Chiefs of Police are all against it. And these are the people that we have that are there to protect us. And they're wondering how on earth are they gonna regulate something that we're just going to throw at them overnight. From McHenry County State's Attorney Patrick Kenneally, he
sent me a diagram stating that between 2013 and 2016, violent crime in Colorado and Washington had been both increased since legalization due, in part, to drug cartels setting up operations, due to permissive cultural adversaries created by legislation. To quote the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, 'This proposal is a public safety risk that jeopardizes the security of your neighborhoods and the safety of our roadways. Law enforcement has been clear. Illinois must not repeat the mistakes of other states that have jeopardized public safety.' And they are still opposed. The new language filed today... or filed days ago, do we actually know what we're going to bring in in revenue? I would say, no, we don't. There's a lot of guesses out there. But what we do know is that we've seen alcohol related costs total over $185 billion, while federal and states only collect 14.5 billion. Similarly, tobacco use costs over 200 billion but only 25 billion is collected by states and federal in taxes. These figures show that the cost of legal alcohol and tobacco is more than 12 times that of what is collected and that the costs of legal tobacco are about eight times the cost to our society in health risks. Earlier in this Legislative Session, there was some people that came from Colorado and came from California. And every one of us, all 118 of us, had the opportunity to go down and listen to a pediatrician, and an emergency room technician, and other doctors, and police and law enforcement. I think there was maybe eight State Representatives I saw in the room. Maybe eight. I'm... I'm actually being generous. So, I'll just end with a statement. One of the pediatricians from Colorado that I met stated that
the legalization of marijuana did nothing to eliminate the sale of illegal drugs or to eliminate drug dealers. The only difference is now that the drug dealers are wearing three piece suits."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

McCombie: "Thank you. I didn't think I was up yet. There's been a lot of polls out there, and depending how you look at them, about 75 percent are concerned with impaired drug driving, and I know that you are as well. Like we spoke about last night in committee, I see the THC limit is going to be taxed differently on how that limit is. Is there any THC caps put into this legislation?"

Cassidy: "The Department of Agriculture is tasked with setting an appropriate cap."

McCombie: "Do you have any recommendations as the director of the Bill?"

Cassidy: "At this moment, I do not."

McCombie: "Okay. Do you think that you will sit in on any of those meetings or hope to?"

Cassidy: "I tend to be a pretty hands-on Sponsor, even after passage of a Bill. I like to see that when my babies leave the nest, they can fly."

McCombie: "And do you have any recommendations personally?"

Cassidy: "At the moment I do not."

McCombie: "Okay. We all have major concerns, you as well, with youth... with youth consumption. Is there any charge for an adult to give marijuana to a child?"
Cassidy: "Pulling that up, and at the same I will say we've aligned with the Parent Host Law, where where parents who host parties that where alcohol is served. We've aligned with that with regard to cannabis, and then there are others. The people that are charged with selling the product have risks as well, of course, if they intentionally sell to a minor. Someone who knowingly authorize or permits consumption of cannabis by underage invitees is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. And if it results in great bodily harm or death to any person, it's a Class 4 felony."

McCombie: "Okay. And so, if a parent..."

Cassidy: "Then there's also contributing to the delinquency of a minor. There are other things that aren't specific in this law that are in our underlying law that would apply as well, such as that parent host piece."

McCombie: "Okay. Will minors be prohibited from entering a dispensary with an adult?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

McCombie: "Okay. Is there on site consumption at dispensaries?"

Cassidy: "No."

McCombie: "All right. Is social sites allowed in cities, villages, and counties?"

Cassidy: "If they so choose."

McCombie: "And can you define what... explain for some a social site?"

Cassidy: "It would be akin to like a hookah lounge or a cigar club."
McCombie: "Okay. All right. And is there any... in state definition or in these rules here, is there any restriction on how many can be in a city, village, or county?"

Cassidy: "There are. The state is divided into Bureau of Labor statistics districts and there are caps per those districts which allows a little bit of latitude in terms of distributing them to ensure that they are evenly distributed around the state. So, there are caps on that and then cities are able to put their zoning restrictions in place. They could set greater distances between them, for example, as a way to limit the number that could be available."

McCombie: "So, there's caps on these social sites through that Bureau?"

Cassidy: "That is... that is for the locals to determine on their own. They are complete... they are only empowered to do so within this law, they are not required to do so. And so within that, they are able to do it in any way they see fit."

McCombie: "No, but through the Bureau itself, there's an initial cap or a..."

Cassidy: "That's for dispensary licenses."

McCombie: "Oh, for the licenses. Okay. But the not the social sites?"

Cassidy: "Not the social sites. That is 100 percent under the control of the locals."

McCombie: "Okay. Okay. And that would be through their city council or village board or..."

Cassidy: "Exactly."

McCombie: "Okay. All right. The resident limits are in line with other states, per testimony last night, at 30 grams. Correct?"
Cassidy: "Yeah, most... most states do the 30 and 15, or something close to that. But that... that's what most of them do. And they pretty much all have a lower possession quantity for non-residents."

McCombie: "Okay. Does that include the additional no more than 500 milligrams of THC and cannabis infused product and 5 grams of cannabis concentrate?"

Cassidy: "No, that would be the equivalent thereof combined. So, you can't have that, and that, and that. It would be a cumulative amount."

McCombie: "So, you're saying 30 grams total includes the 500 milligrams of THC and includes..."

Cassidy: "So it's 30, or 500, or 5, or any combination thereof. And the point of sales systems kind of do that in other places. This is also very similar to how it's done in other states."

McCombie: "I'm gonna get someone..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McCombie, your time is expired. Representative Marron, do you wish to yield your time to Representative McCombie?"

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I will yield my five minutes to Representative McCombie."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McCombie for an additional five minutes."

McCombie: "Thank you. Okay. So... I'm sorry. Again, can you say... so that's 30 grams is total and that could be in combination of all of that?"

Cassidy: "Inclusive of... a combination."
McCombie: "Okay. Okay. And do you consider in time that we may come back to this General Assembly and increase that 30 grams?"

Cassidy: "That's not my intention. However, in every Session I've been a part of, there has an alcohol related Bill. You know, this is... this is something that I anticipate folks will want to make changes in both directions on in each year and it's up to us as a Body to determine whether it's the appropriate policy to adopt for our state."

McCombie: "Okay. So with alcohol, we've... we've lowered the level for drunk driving and we've increased the level of the age of smoking. So, it could be that maybe we would lower even from 30 grams to... if it's not working. You're saying it could even lower."

Cassidy: "It could go in either direction. We see Bills all the time. It's a question of, you know, if a majority of us determine that it's good public policy."

McCombie: "Okay. We have 55 medical dispensaries and IDFPR may award 75 new dispensaries May 1, 2020. And may do an additional 110 in 12... 2121 and you've said a couple of times... Last night, I thought it was upon market but with Representative Jones, and then you just said it again, it's through the Bureau is going to go ahead and decide. So, it's really not about the market need, it's really about... Is it more about geographical location or is it really about market need?"

Cassidy: "It's demand driven. But those breakdowns of geographic... those geography breakdowns are an overlay for the entire
licensing mechanism. The... the up-to number on each of those waves is determined by demand."

McCombie: "Okay. Okay. To the Bill. Even if you agree with legalization, and I believe many do in theory, the overall structure of the Bill offers much concern to many. The process for... to secure a craft grower license and processing license, they're not gonna be able to compete in the Illinois market and I'm not sure that is the intent. I have real concerns of how the tax revenue is going to be dispersed. Also, with the expungement guidelines, we can... we could do better as a state on expungement guidelines. We've just had a Bill just here that is held up in the Senate right now to help with DUI past crimes. This expungement guideline is going to allow a person with a past previous felony to apply now for a FOID card. So, somebody with a previous felony will be able to apply for a FOID card. This gives preference to also folks who was once convicted to possibly having a felony. Up to 500 grams will be given preference to having a dispensary license. But the number of dispensaries also is a big concern for me. We've all seen over the state the number of video gaming license that have popped up all over the state. And I just believe the overall impact on our local communities, our state, and our law enforcement is really going to be too much that we can handle with this... with this kind of impact. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Connor."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Connor: "Representative, within the revenue section of the Bill, it looks like about 45 percent is going to be either the
Triple R Program or going to mental health and substance abuse treatment, both of which I think are fantastic and admirable. I have some communities that are gonna qualify in terms of arrests and communities of color, but they're obviously a lot smaller than those in Cook County. And can you explain in any way how I can reassure the residents down in my district that that 45 percent of the revenue is not going to hit any hurdles on its way down from Cook down to Will County?"

Cassidy: "In the case of the mental health prevention and substance abuse, that's going to be administered by DHS and with assurances that it... that it's spread in a way that's representative of the state. With regard to the Three R Fund or the R Three Fund, that will be the... the designation to the R Three Board is very explicit about assuring representation, and that board is how that money will be distributed."

Connor: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. And I think, coming from a prosecutorial background, my position may be a little counterintuitive so I feel like I have to discuss it today. And I want to first thank the Sponsor for taking a meeting back in December involving two of my local police chiefs, who are part of the Illinois Chiefs of Police Association, at which we brought up the issue of home-grows. The chiefs that I brought to the meeting did not want any home-grows at all and I think the position on the other side was home-grows for recreational users. And I just want to thank the Sponsor, we came to a compromise position during that meeting that I think was fantastic. And this was going back, you know, more than seven months, of limiting the home grows to those who had been medically licensed. Because the intent of the home grows
was compassionate as far as the cost of medical cannabis purchased from a dispensary. So, I want to thank the Sponsor very much for that position. As a prosecutor who worked in the courtroom that handled expungements in Will County, I just kind of want to highlight some of the experiences that I went through in terms of handling those. And I want to try to help the Body understand some of the disparities that went on, that jumped out at me as a prosecutor. So, if you can kind of picture the irony of I'm working on a domestic homicide or a gang murder. And in between my preparation as the court calls going on, I have to tell a nurse's assistant or I have to tell a plumber pipefitter from the union that under State Law in Illinois, I can't expunge their cannabis conviction, so he can't work at the nuc plant and she can't apply to be an RN, because they decided to have a joint in the Cook County Forest Preserve back in 1985. That's a tough position to be in when you're dealing with violent criminals and someone comes in who's kept their nose clean for a decade or more and they say, hey I just want to make some more money for my family. I just want to, you know, get a couple extra Christmas gifts for my kids and in order to pass this background check for the nuc plant or in order to get my RN's license, I have to get this conviction off my record. And you have to tell them, I'm sorry. I can't do it for you. I'm a prosecutor. I'm bound by what the law is, today, in Illinois. And the law in Illinois, today, is you got a conviction. And it doesn't matter that you kept... that you've been a great law abiding citizen for the last 10 years, for the last 15 years, you're gonna leave today empty handed. And you're going to
have to go back and tell your family I'm sorry I tried but I couldn't get it done because the structure wasn't right. To our credit here in Illinois, we have taken great steps to fix that problem. But when I was handling it, I had to turn a lot of people away and explain to them I'm sorry, the law doesn't allow the relief that you are asking for. So, the reason that I am strong 'yes' today on this program is to make up for those years that I stood in a courtroom and had to tell person after person who had made a dumb mistake with cannabis, I'm sorry. There's no room at the inn. You... you can't get the help that you want. You can't help your families. And we have a lot of time to make up for. And I think that is a very...

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your time has expired. Can you just make your final remark?"

Connor: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a lot of time to make up for. This is a chance to do it. I would strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On HB1438, there's clearly a difference of opinion on this issue on both sides. And I do want to say that I am open to persuasion on this on this issue. Although, I am glad nobody is trying to persuade me on the theory that this is actually going to bring more revenue to the state because when you start factoring in the cost, it clearly won't. And I am old enough to remember the Illinois Lottery being our financial salvation as well. Now, I have had residents from my district, many of whom are under the age of 21, want legalization, precisely because they are concerned that a conviction on their record would have long
term negative repercussions for their future. But I've had many more call to say stop further legalization. And in fact, one set of parents from Oakbrook were absolutely devastated by the negative impact that cannabis had on their daughter, who has now required long term psychiatric care. Another told me about how his first experience with marijuana came at the age of 14 when his mother wanted someone to smoke with and it took him over a decade to break free of a drug culture. And an employer told me he couldn't hire people for good jobs. Not because of criminal records, but because federal contracts require people to have drug free pasts for certain tasks. Parents have also told me that they fear their children are going to be targeted under this law with products, with edibles, in particular. And these high potency products, we're not putting any limit on potency, are actually going to be far more dangerous than what people may have experienced back in the 1970s, or even in the 1990s, or earlier. My local State's Attorney, my DuPage County Sheriff, they're opposed to this. They've told me about all of the lives they've witnessed who have been ruined by cannabis use. The DuPage County Health Department estimates for every dollar in promised revenue, it's going to cost at least 4.5 dollars to give additional support to those who wind up having problems with cannabis. We also got the historical precedent of Colorado, which includes an increase in homeless populations, and the Bill doesn't prepare for or solve that. It's not going to solve the criminal record concerns because, of course, everyone still faces liability at the federal level. This Bill doesn't resolve safety concerns. And in fact, if a
pharmaceutical company tried to distribute and sell a drug product this way, the FDA would keep them off of the market as unsafe. And, in fact, let's also think about another product that the FDA did say was safe and effective for certain uses, opioids, that have now devastated entire regions in this state. The Bill is still going to require a big law enforcement presence. We're going to have DUIs where people will die, and we don't have a good field test to even address this issue. The oral clear gum is touted online as a way to fool the cheek swab salvia test. The Bill doesn't have protection for property owners. If a home grow operation starts driving down property values, what remedy do neighbors have? In my district, some homes are separated by only 10 feet. What rights do those neighboring homeowners get against neighboring cannabis users? But when it comes to... some other specifics in the Bill, number one, we actually are putting our community colleges at risk. On the accreditation side, the Higher Learning Commission Practice 7(a) obligates colleges offering certification programs to warn students of all the risks and consequences that may result from the program. Are we going to actually start hiring lawyers for them? The Higher Learning Commission Assumed Practice #10 requires legal compliance. You can't violate Federal Law. And now we're encouraging them to do so. Accreditation criteria 2(a) also requires operation with ethics and integrity and, again, you can't say that with a program designed to help violate Federal Law. On possession, the definition of a person, on page 15, lines 12-16, is not just an individual. It includes businesses, corporations, limited liability
companies. That's a problematic definition because all of the possession limits that you've set are defined, not by an individual, but by a person. So, you can have one address with 50 different LLCs, each owning 30 ounces. So, those limits that you put into the statute are affectively meaningless. And on the social equity component, I want to be clear, it's highly likely in litigation. Most, if not all, of the social equity components will fall under constitutional challenge. But I would also like every Member who's counting on that Social Equity Applicant status as your way to get the piece of the pie to look at the Bill, because on page 17, where it's defined, starting at line 24 through page 18, line 18…"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your time has expired. Representative Chesney, do you wish to yield your time to Representative Mazzochi?"

Chesney: "I do."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mazzochi for an additional five minutes."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. Page 18, line 10, the way Social Equity Applicant can qualify is, you just have to be someone who has 10 employees, 51 percent of whom currently reside in a disproportionately impacted area. No history of time residing in that area. No requirement that you're actually truly living there fulltime and investing money. You just have to have established residency. So just to be clear, 10 white frat guys from Indiana can form a corporation, become employees of their corporation, and so long as 6 of them rent an apartment in that disproportionately impacted area, they will qualify as
a Social Equity Applicant. So, if this is in fact supposed to be a critical goal of the Bill, criteria #3, you better fix it because that definition essentially nullifies it. Anyone gets to eat a piece of the pie. In the end, this state is opening an entirely new product line that will have impacts known and unknown to us today and I think we have an obligation, at the very least, try to foresee as many challenges that we can prepare for and make sure we have the funding base in place to deal with the consequences. We don't. We aren't there yet. And the length of the Bill, given the time the Members have had to actually look at the Bill, we haven't had time to go back to our constituencies to actually make sure they're okay with all these provisions. The Bill's not ready yet. And ultimately, since these brownies are just not ready for baking at this time, given this Bill, and given where my district is, I cannot be in support today. Thank… and I am happy to yield my time back to Mr. Chesney. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Welch for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Welch: "I see that a labor peace agreement is a component of the scoring metric, Representative. And that is important to me because labor can help guarantee the cannabis industry has good, well-paying jobs, with benefits and offer worker protections. But I want to make sure, for legislative intent, that we're clear. Can you elaborate on your intent for
organized labor's roll in the cannabis industry? My time is ticking."

Cassidy: "Sorry. So, the intention is that there's five points associated with having a labor peace agreement. And I think the words you used about the importance of the worker protections and good paying jobs is really what was in my heart when including that."

Welch: "On page 13 of the Bill, it is your belief, Representative, that that language will guarantee good well-paying union jobs in this industry. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Welch: "If the efforts to achieve social equity that's been discussed here today are unsuccessful, will there be any remedy to ensure us an avenue towards social equity?"

Cassidy: "Yes. After the issuance of licenses to current medical dispensaries in January 2020 and the first issuance of licenses to new market entrance in July 2020, the Illinois Cannabis Regulation Oversight Officer will conduct a disparity study of the market. The study will be completed by March 1, 2021."

Welch: "What is the purpose, Kelly, of the disparity study? Why did you include that in the Bill?"

Cassidy: "The disparity study will examine the Social Equity Applicant Program and other measures intended to infuse new entrance into the market. It will determine how many businesses could have applied to be Social Equity Applicants and would have been qualified to participate in the adult-use cannabis industry. It will then look at how many of the licenses were awarded to Social Equity Applicants. The study
will then compare whether that number matches the participation level that you would expect to see given the number of available businesses in the market."

Welch: "Will the disparity study examine the medical market as well?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Welch: "Will the disparity study also look at how many businesses are owned by minorities, women, veterans, and people with disabilities?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Welch: "What will the state do if there is a disparity in the number of businesses owned by Social Equity Applicants or the number of businesses owned by minorities, women, veterans, or people with disabilities?"

Cassidy: "The licensing agencies have the authority to modify their application processes and scoring criteria to address any disparities that are identified."

Welch: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I want to commend the Sponsor for her years of labor on this issue. I've been here seven years and I know she's been passionate about this the entire time I've been here. I want to thank her for collaborating with Black Caucus Members, Leader Jehan Gordon-Booth, and Representative Sonya Harper, Senator Kim Lightford, and Senator Toi Hutchinson. They worked extremely hard to put this Bill together. The Social Equity Applicant's piece in this Bill, that is extremely strong, Ladies and Gentlemen. The criminal history relief program is extremely strong. The opportunity for black and brown ownership is real and the opportunity for good, well-paying union jobs is solid."
I don't know how anyone could be against that. I urge a 'yes' vote on this very important economic development Bill in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we still have many people seeking recognition on this measure. Going forward, we will no longer yield time. You need to fit it into a five minute time period. Representative Villa will be recognized. Representative Villa for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Villa: "Are there studies that cannabis causes psychosis or is there a correlation due to the self-medication to calm the symptoms of psychosis?"

Cassidy: "Studies that I have seen have explicitly stated that there is no evidence of causation."

Villa: "Currently, is medical marijuana prescribed for PTSD?"

Cassidy: "PTSD is one of the allowable conditions, yes."

Villa: "To the Bill. We must stop stigmatizing people with mental health issues. We need to stop criminalizing people who are self-medicating due to their symptoms. We need to increase mental health services, which is addressed in this Bill. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Frese for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Frese: "Thank you, Representative. Just a couple of questions regarding the expungement, and I know there's going to be costs in these expungements. Is there provisions in your Bill
to recoup some of those costs by the circuit courts, clerks of the court, and such?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Frese: "Okay. Can you expound on that and tell me how that's going to be handled, please? And... go ahead."

Cassidy: "Yes. So, there's funding to the AG, the AG Equal Justice Grant, to deal with these civil... the legal aid component of it, grants to the Illinois courts, and grants to local State's Attorneys.

Frese: "Okay. Grants to Illinois courts, does that include the... the clerk of the court?"

Cassidy: "The clerks? Yes."

Frese: "It will?"

Cassidy: "Yes, it does include the clerks. We are very mindful of the... intensity of the labor involved. We want to make sure that we're... that we're taking care of that."

Frese: "Okay. So, also arresting agencies, if they're ordered to expunge their record..."

Cassidy: "Yes, law enforcement has money as well."

Frese: "Okay. And it could be different levels of law enforcement, correct? I mean, it could be the arresting agency and the arresting agency could turn it over to the State's Attorney. The State's Attorney may...

Cassidy: "Everyone who is involved has the ability to recoup their costs."

Frese: "Does the court have to make that ruling?"

Cassidy: "Make what ruling?"

Frese: "Make that ruling to each agency to say you must expunge the record or does this Bill, just by its presence, require..."
that? Or does it require a judge to actually look at each case and say, yes, this agency..."

Cassidy: "In the automatic ones, the judge... it's brought before a judge, yes. And then the other layers, the individuals go before a judge."

Frese: "And the judge is going to decide..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Frese: "...which of those layers? Okay. Thank you very much. That's all I got."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bennett for five minutes."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. I appreciate the conversation and the opportunity to have this dialogue. There's a lot of issues going on here today and I appreciate that. I try to visit a lot of schools and I ask this question here lately. And the question I ask is, what do you think about legalizing marijuana? And the class I was talking with, a few students smiled, and smirked, and laughed. But then a young lady in the middle of the front row said this. She said, why? Why? Why legalize recreational marijuana? Today's marijuana is more dangerous than ever. Today, the drug is up to 20 times more powerful than it was in the 70s. The medical literature is consistent in this message, marijuana is addictive, both psychologically and physiologically. There's a direct association between the frequency of marijuana use and the THC potency with the development of mental health issues. And we heard some of these earlier: psychosis, depression, anxiety, suicide, reshaping the brain matter, and addiction. Chronic adolescent
marijuana use has been correlated with cognitive impairment and a decreased ability to do well in work or in school. A study of 30 thousand Americans showed that participants who use marijuana were 2.6 times more likely to abuse prescription opiates. And yes, it's a gateway. Other various health effects of marijuana are there: difficulty thinking, making decisions, solving problems, distorted perceptions, impaired balance and coordination, problems with learning and memory, irregular heart rhythms, respiratory problems and greater risk of lung infections, and paranoia, acute psychosis, including hallucinations, delusions, and loss of identity. A number of things there just to mention a few. Next point, dangers of drugged driving have increased dramatically after legalization in other states. Colorado. Washington State. There's no roadside test for marijuana. We talk about concerns for heavy equipment companies. They have big concerns. And marijuana legalization will not solve Illinois' budget problems, friends. Colorado, Alaska have not reached their targets. And the illicit market is there, and it is still there, and it has not gone away. There's a number of organizations I do want to mention that are not in support of this, including these. American Academy of Pediatrics, they're against this. The American Medical Association is against this. American Society of Addiction Medicine is against this. American Heart Association is against this. American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psych... Psychiatry... there you go, try that one, is against this. There's a number of those. In additional, the Illinois Chapter or the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Illinois Society of Addiction
Medicine, the Illinois Association of Chief of Police, the Illinois Drug Enforcement Officers' Association, the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, the Illinois Catholic Bishops, the Illinois Farm Bureau, with Chicago Crime Commission, the School of Resource Officers Association, and this list goes on beyond here. Friends, these are groups that are concerned about health and safety of Illinoisans, and they're raising serious concerns about this Bill and about marijuana in general. Please think about what we're doing today. My friends, we're not the experts and there are many experts that are against this. If we pass this, we'll be impacting millions of Illinoisans. And with this Bill, the genie will be out of the bottle and you won't be able to get it back in. It's time to stand up and protect the people of Illinois, friends. In other words, with the young lady that said in the district, the student, she said, why? Why are we even contemplating this today? Is this the best we can do for 12 or 13 million Illinoisans today? Is this the best we can do? I move for a 'no' vote, please. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes... excuse me. Mr. Clerk, Rules Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1863, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1881, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1932; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2540, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 2627. Representative Harris
also reported on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1863."
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick for five minutes."
Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Reick: "Kelly, I got a couple of questions for you to establish legislative intent. I... we kind of know that Oregon kind of overshot the runway on its production and price has gone down leading to a possible gray market in the product out there. Articles 30 and Section 20 of the Bill refers to the Director of Agriculture... oh, first of all, I'd like to ask you a question. What are the parameters by which you are going to establish emergency rules on this... on this law, please?"
Cassidy: "So, the emergency rule making is related only to things that are time sensitive, such as the pieces that have to be put in place before January 1."
Reick: "Specifically, Article 30, Section 20 of the Bill refers to the Director of Agriculture determining a new craft grow and cultivation licenses based on a supply and demand technology. I want to ensure that it's the intent of this legislation that the Director of Agriculture, through emergency rules, has the authority and will only issue new permits for cultivation space based on Illinois' current market demands. And I also have the same concerns about new dispensary licenses. We want to ensure the IDFPR, through emergency rules, will only increase dispensary licenses as needed through the transparent methodology for determining
the number of... and location based on current market demands. Is that your intent?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Reick: "Very good. Thank you. To the Bill. Let's consider what it is we're talking about here. The House Sponsor of the legislation has said herself that our goal is to destroy that illegal street market that makes our communities less safe. Our goal is not to bring in some massive fortune that's going to solve all the problems of the world, because it's not. She said that today on the floor. That being the... said, we are in a state... in a condition where, reducing or removing penalties for cannabis possession without regulating production and sale, simply rewards the one group that is most able to rush in and fill the demand. The elite very criminal element that we're trying to eliminate. In an article published in March in National Review, the author makes some pretty good points that, 'Free market capitalism unleashes awesome forces. The quest for ever greater profits stimulates innovation in products and production processes, yielding a wider range of cheaper and more effective products in which consumers can indulge - and sometimes over-indulge. That is a blessing in the case of 99 percent of the products, but not all.' The article goes on to say that an intermediate step between allowing full blown open market would be to issue licenses for production and sale to nonprofit entities or co-ops with boards constituted to protect public health and with charters that limit their mission to meet existing demand, thus undercutting the illicit market but not promoting greater consumption. Legalizing a for-profit industry is a one way
street. Once we do it, there'll be no going back and we run the risk of opening up a whole new set of problems. Prudence dictates that we run... walk before we start to run. Legalization is not a binary choice. There are varying degrees along which we can legalize production and sale without putting it in the hands of companies whose sole reason of being is to expand the market for their product. An intermediate step is fully called for and can fully be done. Even though Colorado has had legal sales since 2012, their still establishing baseline evidence to determine the effects of legalization. There's a cautionary note in the October 2018 report from the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice that states, 'The information presented here should be interpreted with caution. The majority of the data should be considered baseline and preliminary, in large part because data sources vary considerably in terms of what exists historically. Consequently, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the potential effects of marijuana legalization and commercialization on the public safety, health, or youth outcomes.' This suggestion would... I would think argue in favor of a sensible middle way. I want to see this illegal market shut down as well, but I believe a well-constructed and enforced regulatory scheme that limits its reach to doing it would be a pretty good way to do it. After 10 years or so, let's see what happens and then decide whether to go full legally. What..."

Speaker Turner: "Final sentence, Representative."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If after 10 years or so of hard evidence we find that our fears of increased use with all the
intended social fall out that accompanies it have been unfounded, then we can expand for a for-profit market. After all, what is the rush? I urge, at this point, a 'no' vote because of this one issue alone. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to be brief as possible. You know, this is not about criminal justice reform at all. And anybody who says that it is a liar. I'll tell him or her to their face. About criminal justice reform, you don't have to have revenue tied to it. If the administration of this Body was serious about criminal justice reform, they're a lot of Bills that could have passed this Session that have not, related to housing and other things. This is about money, period. I find it offensive, absolutely offensive that in light of all that law enforcement has done and been the front line of on the war on drugs, which is really a war on black people, brown as well, but primarily black people, to come in and then say they want eight percent premium off the top. Nothing to tell us how much money they need relative to implement this program, but instead there's a 100 million in revenue, we want $8 million; a billion, we want $80 million in discretionary funds. It's absolutely offensive. The only people that benefit in these situations are white people, primarily rich ones. Let me be very clear about that. With the war on drugs, black people went to prison primarily. And you know who benefited from that? White people in rural communities. I know, I visit prisons. That's where my cousins and friends are often. That's who benefits. And then now, criminal justice reform has been held up for long enough for
primarily rich white people to have a market to invest in and now all of a sudden it's okay. Now it's okay to expunge records. And not enough, by the way, at all. But now there's a market, now it's okay. That's a problem. That's offensive to me as a black man on the South Side of Chicago, quite frankly where I was born and raised. I've seen what this has done to our communities. I have no real faith in trailer Bills and things like that to make this program better. I have faith in Christian Mitchell, quite honestly, another black man, who gave me his word that we will work on this stuff going forward. The reality of it is, this is absolutely a travesty to suggest that we truly care about criminal justice reform when we've had 50 damn years to work on the issue. Nobody... nobody saw fit to do it. And then all of a sudden when there's an opportunity to make money from the same things that decimated our communities, all of a sudden it's about criminal justice reform. It's offensive and I mean, quite frankly, if it were not for you, Christian, I promise you, I would have no support for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Robinson."
Robinson: "Will the Speaker... excuse me, will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Robinson: "Representative Evans, I, too, had reservations as much as I love and respect Representative Kelly Cassidy and Leader Booth and wanting to support our Governor, who is putting Illinois back on the right track after four embarrassing and devastating years. Friends, when I ran for office, it was because of what I have seen right outside of my home and my business at 51st and Indiana that has been ravaged by the war
on drugs. There are, sadly, many other neighborhoods in my district like 51st and Indiana. I personally cannot leave my home or business without somebody asking me for a job. I always ask them for their story and their story generally is about a drug conviction and how this is a barrier for getting a job to take care of their family. And they go on to say that they don't want to be on the streets in order to survive. Well, I'm honored that we, in this Body today, are making a first step, just a first, to remove this barrier. I want to thank my dear friend, Kelly Cassidy, for all her blood, sweat, and tears on this Bill. I want to thank Representative Sonya Harper, who also has spent countless hours working on this Bill to make sure that brown and black people have shown up in this Bill. I also want to thank Leader Booth for bringing me to the table to make sure, as a freshman Legislator, that we make sure that true equity is in this Bill. Lastly, I would like to thank Leader Lilly and the Black Caucus for pushing the Governor and his staff to do more. Friends, our work is not done. Representative Cassidy, Governor Pritzker, I look forward to continuing to make sure we not only create jobs, but we create business owners who, like me, will hire within their own communities to be able to bring back resources and wealth to their communities. I look forward to not only funding our neighborhood schools and our community organizations, this, my friends, will stem the violence that we are seeing every single day in the City of Chicago, where I am so honored to represent. I ask not only for this Body to vote 'yes', but we continue to fight for communities like
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."
Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And we've already covered, I think, child safety, which I am deeply, deeply concerned about, highway safety, neighborhood safety. So, I want to focus on workplace safety. This Bill allows for zero-tolerance at work but Illinois is going to have even more difficulty finding workers who will meet this standard. I want to share with you some recent headlines. Wall Street Journal headline, 'Legalized Marijuana Creates Headaches for Some Hiring Managers'. Companies... 'Companies facing a shortage of employees from health care workers to forklift operators are confronting a new challenge: finding candidates who can pass drug tests in states that have legalized marijuana.' New York Times headline, 'Economy Needs Workers, but Drug Tests Take a Toll'. From that article, 'Indeed, the opioid epidemic and, to some extent, wider marijuana use are hitting businesses and the economy in ways that are beginning to be acknowledged by policy makers and other experts. Were it not for the drug issue, said Mr. Krueger, who served under Barack Obama on the Council of Economic Advisors, workers trapped in low-wage jobs might be able to secure better-paying, skilled blue-collar positions and a toe-hold in the middle class.' The Toronto Star, 'High employees mean... High meaning under the influence. 'High employees mean higher costs when pot is legalized'. CEO Kevin Nuevo said this, 'It's more difficult to find new recruits, typically young men, who can pass pre-employment drug tests. Even during the
recruitment phase, where we warn them we're going to do a test, a surprising number still tests positive.' This is from USA Today Network, questions and answers on medical marijuana laws in Ohio, 'You don't want the worker to be in a safety sensitive position. Even if he's sweeping the floor, if he doesn't have his wits about him, and he is near a press or another piece of machinery, he could get hurt, which would be worker's comp. If it's an injury to a coworker, it's worker's comp. If it's a third party who's hurt, that is a lawsuit.' And finally from Occupational Health & Safety, headline, 'Marijuana's Negative Impact on Workplace Safety and Productivity', 'Marijuana use has been linked to an increase in job accidents and injuries'. And the National Institute on Drug Abuse notes, 'that the short term effects of marijuana include impaired body movement, difficulty with thinking and problem solving, memory problems, and an altered sense of time'. That doesn't exactly sound like good consequences for the State of Illinois when we do have employers who have good paying jobs we need to fill but we can't because we don't have workers who can fill those jobs. I want to say in summary, this Bill undermines our efforts to make our state safer for adults and kids to ease the burden on our human service providers. In Chicago, I attended a Human Services Committee hearing where an executive director with an addictive services organization said, you're going to increase the burden on us. You're going to increase the burden on our social safety net. How are we going to pay for that? This Bill is being rushed through. It is way too
comprehensive. There are pieces of it that I could support but on balance, I ask for a strong 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant for five minutes."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to honor that five minutes for sure."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you."

Bryant: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative, you answered a lot of questions last night and I just came up with one I don't think got answered, but if it did I missed it. It is in regard to the community college pilot program. There are seven sites..."

Cassidy: "Eight, actually."

Bryant: "Eight? Thank you, there are eight. I don't know that it was ever answered how those eight locations are going to be determined."

Cassidy: "That's up to them. It's up to the community colleges to choose to engage... between... the program itself is administered by Community College Board and the Department of Ag, but they will volunteer to participate."

Bryant: "So, there will be an application? What's your intent? Is there to be an application process? Is there..."

Cassidy: "That'll happen in Rules through an application process, yeah."

Bryant: "Okay. So, let me just share with you, 'cause you know that we have this upstate/downstate thing going on and I just want to be able to assure my constituents in this afterwards. There's always this... there's X number of community colleges
in Chicago and we just want to make sure that there might... that there will be a regional approach at least to it."

Cassidy: "So, one of the things that Rules has to consider is the geographic diversity of the applicants. I will tell for my... again from me, as someone who works with you regularly, I will tell you that the way that the industry is spread across the state, I believe the job pipeline should be as well."

Bryant: "Okay. So then, one more on the community college issue then. So, the age for this is 21. So, if a community college has this pilot program then, would the students that would be participating in this pilot program have to be 21 as well?"

Cassidy: "We do specifically allow students at 18 to participate but we also explicitly require, just as we do within the facilities themselves in terms of seed to sale tracking and weighing waste, every bit of product that is created within the community college program must be destroyed within... approval and oversight by the department. So that... there would be... they would have no access to take product. And again, this is up the community colleges to choose to participate in."

Bryant: "But a community college could make, as a part of this rule, that you could not be under 21 to participate?"

Cassidy: "I believe the school could decide to do that, yes."

Bryant: "Okay. Okay. So, let me go... let me go then to the Bill. Thank you for answering the questions. So, there are a couple of things I just want to make sure that I say today because... First of all, I want to say to my colleague on the front row who brought a skillet and an egg with him today, and was then later demeaned by a Member of your own party on your side...
you know, on your side of the aisle about that, I am of the age group that that particular advertising campaign went forward. And I can tell you that those who grew up in my generation, that did make an impact. When you did see an egg frying in a skillet, it did make an impact. And although it's over 30 years old, what works in one generation doesn't automatically be a failure just because some other years have gone by. So, I thank you for bringing that in again today because I have used that with my own children. That being said, on this, the other statement was made that the medical marijuana program has been successful, and I do want to say that I'm in full support of the medical marijuana program. We'll continue to do that. And I believe later today there'll be a vote on that to make it permanent and I will be voting 'yes' on that Bill. Because I believe what we did right in that was make it a pilot program that was four... over four years long, actually, and we did that right. So, because my time is running out, I want to make sure that I say this today. I don’t care what color somebody is. They could be black, brown, green, purple, yellow, white. I do not care. Know what I care about in this? I care about my four grandchildren. I care about my four grandchildren who, 20 years from now, are going to be coming into this Body, or close to it, and trying to figure out what we've been trying to fix for the last couple of years in here and that was what the generations before us did wrong with tobacco. In 20 years from now, my grandchildren and your grandchildren are going to be looking at us and saying, what were you thinking? I urge a 'no' vote."
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Swanson."
Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Swanson: "Thank you. One quick question and I've got some other comments here. But first, I'd like to... I know you opened your statements out with saying money doesn’t matter in this but I think it does. What are some of the expected revenues that we can project from this Bill?"
Cassidy: "The anticipated revenue in this first year is 58 million. We anticipate over the course of about 5 years getting to approximately 500 million.
Swanson: "Five hundred million..."
Cassidy: "In a mature marketplace."
Swanson: "Okay. 'Cause I noticed... I just checked Colorado. They're... they're just now at $1 billion in sales and they've taken in $200 million in tax revenue. So I don’t know, we may have some extremely different calculations with our legislation but they're right at 200 million and they've been doing it for quite a few years. So, what was that number, again, please?"
Cassidy: "They tend to have a lower population but a higher use rate. We've looked at population and usage rates in every state to do these projections."
Swanson: "Okay. What was that number again?"
Cassidy: "Which one?"
Swanson: "The first... the expectations and growing up to..."
Cassidy: "Fifty eight to just north of five hundred."
Swanson: "Okay. So, based upon 500 million, you anticipate an additional 100 million going to mental health then? Because
I believe that's 20 percent of this would go to mental health."

Cassidy: "That's... yes."

Swanson: "Okay."

Cassidy: "That would be an estimate, but yes."

Swanson: "Okay. To the Bill. Some of the numbers I've seen coming out of Colorado on some of the revenue brought in by recreational marijuana in Colorado compared to the expenses of growing and mental health issues, growing social service issues, is anywhere from three to four dollars. So, it was mentioned that possibly bringing in $500 million in revenue, that's $1.5 billion in additional costs to a budget such as ours that's struggling already. I would like to point out an article I found. The Colorado Springs Gazette was the initial author of this and it was repeated in the Galesburg Register-Mail on the first of September. It says, 'Marijuana advocates can no longer claim legalization is devoid of catastrophic results.' The Denver Post analyzed federal and state data and found results so alarming they published a story last week under the headline, Traffic fatalities linked in marijuana are up sharply in Colorado. Is legalization to blame? Of course legalization is to blame. It ushered in a commercial industry that encourages consumption and produces an ever increasing supply of pot, substantially more potent than most users could find when the drug was illegal. The Post reported a 40 percent increase in the number of all drivers impaired or otherwise involved in fatal crashes in Colorado between 2013 and 2016. So, I looked at this article and I thought that's pretty extraordinary, a 40 percent increase. So, I
called my local car insurance salesman and I asked him, I said, hey, let's run some numbers. I said, what would my car insurance rates be in Colorado compared to what I pay in Illinois? He told me he was just happen to be working with a 22-year-old girl who had just recently been in his office who was going to go to school in Colorado so he ran the numbers for her. If she moved her residency to Colorado, her insurance rates would go up $85 a month. Eighty-five dollars a month. Quick math on that puts it a little over north of a thousand dollars a year just for one car for one young lady. So, those of us who have cars, with that 40 percent increase in fatalities, expect larger premiums and just be prepared for those extra costs. And I would request a verification. Mr. Speaker, request verification, please."

Speaker Turner: "Your verification request is acknowledged. Are you finished speaking?"

Swanson: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "All right. Members, Representative Swanson has requested a verification. At the appropriate time, please be at your seat to vote your switch. Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Wehrli: "Representative, it's been a busy day around here and it's only going to get more chaotic as time moves on and I've been sort of in and out, so forgive me if I repeat questions that were already asked. So, can you remind me how marijuana, as it relates to the FDA, what's the status of marijuana with the Food and Drug Administration?"
Cassidy: "I don't know that the FDA has a position on cannabis."
Wehrli: "Well, they have Schedules of narcotics. Can you tell me what Schedule..."
Cassidy: "It is a Schedule I narcotic."
Wehrli: "Okay. What else is on that Schedule I?"
Cassidy: "Heroin. Meth. Some pretty bad stuff."
Wehrli: "Okay. All right. So... and because it's a Schedule I, would you agree that there has been very little, if any, research done on the impacts of marijuana?"
Cassidy: "Internationally, there's a great deal of research."
Wehrli: "I'm talking about in the United States."
Cassidy: "Domestically, there's an FDA approved drug derived from cannabis."
Wehrli: "There's one. But you're not... I'm trying to work with you here a little bit but..."
Cassidy: "I'm trying to give you the information."
Wehrli: "So, there... would you agree that there has not been a lot of peer reviewed medical peer-to-peer data emanating from the United States because marijuana is a Schedule I FDA regulated narcotic?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Wehrli: "Okay. So, I am in agreement that marijuana should be removed at the federal level from Schedule I. There is so much research we need to do on this. We've seen the benefits when it comes to seizures and things like that that it can have on the medical marijuana side. But it remains that and so... I guess I'm to the Bill now. This... the Federal Government needs to get involved here. This needs to be allowed to get that research done. There... we do see positive things, studies..."
from around the world, I'll admit that, and with medical marijuana. However, it remains illegal for banks to participate in this market. There are regulatory problems when... you know, when we had the federal firearms debate and what... on the gun debate. And there are boxes that check that this would directly impact. This is still a federally Schedule I narcotic. And that's unfortunate, we need to do those studies. However, we all took an oath to uphold the United States Constitution. So, I am a process guy. I believe in following the law, that's a major hang up for me. Now, there's another admirable part of this piece of legislation that I somewhat question. This is about a business environment in areas that desperately need business and that's laudable. I agree with that. We need to encourage business in every area of this state. But this Bill alone will not provide all the jobs in those areas that one needs to lift those entire areas. We need the pro-business, the pro-economic development things that Members of this side of the aisle desperately clamor for to help all communities in Illinois. This is not the silver bullet that's going to save these communities from decades of just poor business climate in the State of Illinois. Everybody deserves a job. Everybody deserves the right to become an entrepreneur and this isn't going to go far enough to save those communities. We need to do a better job at this. Unfortunately, as much as I really am not concerned about what adults do on their back patio on a Friday night, that is not for me to decide, this is still an illegal drug. It needs to be removed from Schedule I. We need to do these studies because as we see with tobacco 50 years ago, it wasn't that
big a deal. And now we see, this state included, Tobacco 21. We're taking steps because we've realized that tobacco is a harmful chemical. It has detrimental effects to brain development. It causes cancer. We don't know what the studies are on marijuana but we should get those. We should make an informed decision on what the long term implications are of marijuana. I wish I could support this legislation, 'cause as I said, I'm not concerned what adults do their back patio on a Friday night. But I want the process to be followed on how we remove laws that we don't agree with and how we institute laws based on science and data and this one just isn't there yet. Thank you."

Leader Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler for five minutes."

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

Leader Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Wheeler: "Representative, I'm just going to walk through this as quickly as I can 'cause I know this has gone on plenty long.

Is marijuana an addictive drug?"

Cassidy: "I'm not going to say that it's not addictive but it is... there is dispute about that. Quite frankly, I believe that anything is addictive. I tend to have a lot of problems giving up chocolate, frankly."

Wheeler: "Well, my health department in my home county says that it is an addictive drug and it's a problem in our communities. Is alcohol an addictive drug?"

Cassidy: "It's far less addictive than alcohol, or tobacco, or heroin, of course."
Wheeler: "Is alcohol... you said alcohol is an addictive drug, you answered my question there. I have a question going back to youth possession. We talked about, I think four years ago, Kelly, on this topic when you ran the decrim Bill about... I asked you a question about what happens if a young person under 21 is found in possession of alcohol, whether they're driving or not. Right now, they lose their driving privileges. And if they do it again, they lose it for longer. And if they do it a third time, they lose it indefinitely. Do you recall that conversation?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Wheeler: "And I was hoping, looking forward, to seeing if you've actually made these two on par. If marijuana possession for someone under 21, under your Bill, if they have possession of the substance, it's my understanding that's still going to be just a citation offense. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "It... sorry, I was trying to check on a status of another Bill that we were actually going parallel with. Because there's... a Bill was moving through very quickly, and I honestly haven't kept up with it, to make those alcohol changes have a nexus with driving. And that's why our Bill has a nexus with driving for that suspension."

Wheeler: "So, which way... you're saying that this Bill then only removes driving privileges if it has a nexus with driving, correct?"

Cassidy: "Right, because it was anticipated and I believe it has advanced that the... that there's going to be a requirement of a nexus with driving for the alcohol as well. So, we did not want to have a disparate impact."
Wheeler: "So, we're moving one in the correct direction and one in the other direction, effectively again, so that if you have possession of alcohol."

Cassidy: "The intent was for them to be aligned, yes."

Wheeler: "Okay. I appreciate that because my concern is and has been that we are pushing, based on the way we've defined our penalties, one or the other, both addictive issues for young people. And I am very concerned about that part of it."

Cassidy: "And when you brought that up, that's why that was... we were mindful of that as we approached this."

Wheeler: "I'm grateful of that. I am grateful that is in place here. Let me say quickly... Going back to that four years ago, you talk about law enforcement, about a saliva THC test that was mentioned at that time as a way we could actually detect drunk driving. Do you recall that part of the conversation?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Tell me, how many local and state agencies have actually implemented the equipment and training that goes along with that?"

Cassidy: "I know of Carol Stream and I got a text message during debate that Chicago is as well but I don’t have that..."

Wheeler: "Okay. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Other than... coming from a reliable source, other than that, I can't verify that."

Wheeler: "Well, thank you for answers to the questions. I'm going to go to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, the ideas here about how the law enforcement in all of this should work to me are kind of the cart in front of the horse. If we really care about public safety and we're concerned about how
people are going to be dealing with driving impaired, this is something we should have in place first and then follow this process. This to me is just backwards. The elements of the idea of a person who is under the influence of marijuana driving... If you purchase an alcoholic beverage, there's a period of time in which you may be able to drive again with certainty. With marijuana, I don't know if people know the answer to that question and there's no way to be tested. There's no way to test yourself. We are doing things in the wrong order here. At this point, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Miller for five minutes."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I know it's part of human nature to prefer to believe what we prefer to be true. And I know a lot of things that we... that we think about marijuana. There's a tremendous gulf between what everybody thinks they know and what's actually happening. What's going on with the scientific research is not filtering down to the public. And I know that there's going to be an impact on neighborhoods. I know that there's going to be an impact on our cities, and towns, and our schools. And there's always unintended consequences to everything. I know that I grew up in the same era as my colleagues where I remember the commercials of, here is your brain and here's your brain on drugs, and just say no, and why do they call it dope? I've been involved in all of those things. And I know that one of the things that happened in my... along the way in my campaign was this issue came up and I took time to try to educate
myself on marijuana, and the effects, and the societal things that happen, and not just base my opinion just because I thought I knew something about something and so, I began to do the research. And I have friends that live in Colorado and I contacted them and interviewed them about what they thought. I did download the 150 plus page impact study that they did in Colorado and the snap shot or the cliff notes on that was that it was 150 plus pages of bad news. I know that... and then I began to look at some of the research from the National Academy on Medicine and the news just kept getting worse. And I know that the learning, and memory, and the attention are impaired after use of cannabis. And the damage may last even after people stop using the drug. Cannabis use can negatively affect adolescents and young adult's health, well-being, including their school performance, education level, social lives, future employment, and income. Smoking cannabis during pregnancy is linked to lower birth weights in babies. Smoking cannabis may cause cancer and causing substances such... similar to smoking tobacco. Some of the other research finding was that cannabis use is associated with the developments of schizophrenia and the risk is highest with more frequent users. The more a person uses cannabis, the more likely they are to develop an addiction to it. Heavy cannabis users are more likely to report thoughts of suicide than nonusers. Frequent and long term cannabis use may be linked to worsen symptoms in individuals with bipolar disorders. There may be a link in using cannabis and becoming dependent or abusing other substances including alcohol, tobacco, and other illicit drugs. And so, one of the things that I did was base
my decision on this Bill based on education, based on research, based on interviews, based on talking to people that have had... that have actually experienced the use of this drug where it's legal. The time is right now and will never be right to create an environment where there's more of an opportunity for kids to have access through this drug, through gummy bears, through cookies, through all kinds of things that they will find attractive. And so, because of all the things that I have done through the educational process, I would encourage a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."

Leader Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Flowers for five minutes."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to take this opportunity to let you know that I've lived through the ordeals of the war on African American families. I've lived through the ordeals on the war on poverty. And I also live through the war... the so-called war on drugs, and it's been hell and none of it worked. That reset button is broken. The fact of the matter is... the fact of the matter is nothing in this Bill is addressing the harm that's been done to our community. The harm that will never be able to be fixed because we still lack access to education because of the war on drugs, because of the crime in the background. And everybody knew that the war on drugs was purposely done to get the outcome in which it got, in order so other people can create jobs for themselves. They made the prison system longer, bigger, and more devastating to our community. African American families have been broken and will never be restored. There's nothing in this legislation that's going to
do anything for our community but what it has always done off the backs of poor people. You're going to make rich people richer. One of my colleagues spoke and said something about what we did in regards to medical marijuana. He said we did it right. He said we did it right with medical marijuana, and I'll be doggone if he wasn't telling the truth. Because by the standards in which this Bill is going to follow, he did do it right. There's not one African American that have any ownership and will ever have any ownership in the medical marijuana business. And guess what? It's not gonna happen here. Oh yeah, we're going to always be, you know, picking the cotton... I mean picking the marijuana, whatever you do. Or the low wage jobs. That will always be there. But there will be no betterment of our community. If you wanted to do something... because when my colleague came to my community I told her exactly how I felt. I felt that... that the whole discussion about this Bill was very... I said to you that you were acting very paternalistic over us. That you decided what was best. You decided what programs was going to be in place. You decided what was going to be the social impact. You decided how much was going to go to schools, how much was going to go to health care. There was no conversation. There was no conversation at all with anyone in my community. So, when I look at this Bill, again, I looked at the amount of monies that's going to be going to education. It says two percent will go for DHS... to DHS. Two percent of the money will go to DHS. It has to go to DHS first and then it'll go for public education. So that'll be one percent, I guess. And another one percent, maybe, for the awareness of public health
and safety. Only two percent? And it's going to go through DHS, and then to public education, and then to public safety? Give me a break. And then when I look at the 25 percent, it's going to go to the Criminal Justice Project Funds to restore, and revest, and renew program. What... restore what? Can you give my grandparents their house back? Can you give my community their jobs back? Can you give the mothers their families back? Their dignity? Can you do that? What do you mean? How is this agency... the purpose of the criminal justice information project fund, the agency... the purpose of... I see just agency... is to reduce terrorism. How is this agency... it's not gonna... why is it that my community have to be treated any differently? When the Italians was having their fights... for some reason now most of them have restaurants, talking about you, DeLuca. I love you, man. And so, the Italians wasn't... they were given businesses..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers, can you please make your final comment?"

Flowers: "That's exactly what we need. We need the opportunity to create jobs. We don't want you or your board to give us anything, Representative. If you get out of our way and get this X off our backs, like the law says it should be for expungement, it already... these kids should not have this X on their backs because of that. But if you get out of our way, allow us the same opportunity to go to school, to get an education, we can do the same things that any other community has done. If you keep the drugs out of our community. If you keep the crime out of our community. If you stop bringing your illicit drugs in our community, all of this stuff never
would have happened. So my point to you, and again the ACLU, when it comes to legalizing weed, the economic justice for the communities of color must be the guiding principal. And the guiding principal must be that we have to allow these people with criminal records to have it cleared. We must... I don't mind this legislation being decriminalized, but the fact of the matter is, we are still being used. Our community is still being used for people to make a profit, and to get rich, and give nothing back to the community. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Buckner for five minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Buckner: "So, let's start off talking about the numbers, right. Legalized cannabis has, in short order, created a multi-billion dollar industry. It's created tens of thousands of small businesses who employ hundreds of thousands of people. California boasted nearly $3 million... $3 billion, sorry, in sales in their first year of full legalization. Despite all of these opportunities in the legal cannabis space, there is... there is, however, still a very high barrier to entry for minorities. America's war against drugs created policies that over criminalized cannabis possession and disproportionately affected black and brown communities and it wiped out generations. Statistics suggest, that nationwide, no more than one percent of businesses in the legalized marijuana space are black owned. Even with the decriminalization of cannabis, black people are almost four times more likely to
be arrested for marijuana possession than their white counterparts, even though usage is statistically even. Hundreds of thousands of black people have records for cannabis offenses and sometimes even incur felonies that prevent gainful employment while cannabis companies now are gearing up to rake in millions of dollars. I applaud the effort on expungements, because to me, these are not just numbers, these are people. These are my friends, my family, my neighbors, and if not for the grace of God, very easily could be me. We owe it to provide some restorative justice to communities that deserve it. Communities who have been disproportionately affected by draconian drug policies aimed directly at them. The unjust 100 to 1 powder cocaine to crack sentencing disparity is one that comes to mind. We keep using the word prohibition. It's only prohibition in certain communities. In my community, it's criminalization. That criminalization legitimized disinvestment and generations suffered. I'm from the South Side of Chicago and, specifically, from an area that's known as the Wild 100s, right. And there's a thing, a phrase, that we say where I'm from, 'God made the hundreds, man made it wild.' Now, it used to be just a phrase but it's... it’s a truism, it’s a real thing. Man made it wild by flooding it with drugs and by locking people up for it, by creating a situation of despair and not fixing what had been broken. I welcome many of my colleagues on either side of the aisle who don’t have firsthand knowledge of what the war on drugs really, really looks like to come home with me and see it for yourself. The things that many see only on television, I could look out my
window and see every day. I'm ashamed that it seems that only once the realization that cannabis can make a lot of people very rich, that we concern ourselves with the restoration of communities. And only when we figured out that there was money involved in this, that we become concerned with righting the wrongs of the past. I have sat in committees in this very Body where expungement language has come up in Bills and had been voted down without the bat of an eye. I never thought I would be quoting Lauryn Hill on the floor of the General Assembly but she says, 'It's funny how money changes situations.' That’s where we are today. Is it that magically on January 1, 2020 that marijuana is no longer bad? No. It wasn’t bad when black folks, brown folks, and poor folks started going to jail for it, but it served a different purpose. We have to do better. I'm reminded of something I was told a long time ago. If you stick a knife in my back nine inches and pull it out six inches, that’s not progress. If you pull it out all the way, that’s still not progress. Progress comes only from healing the wound and can never happen if don't even admit that the knife is there in the first place. I would hope that this legislation realizes that the knife is there. I don’t oppose legalization and I believe the state's economy can greatly benefit from such. But it is incumbent upon us in this chamber to do it the right way. I am not urging a 'yes' or a 'no' vote, I'm urging that we all vote with a conscious of a clear context. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hammond for five minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Hammond: "Representative, I know that this has been a passion of yours for quite some time and you are not blind to the fact that there will be problems as this moves through rule making, and implementation, and everything. So, I have a question when it comes to the rule making. What was the reasoning for putting in the emergency rule making rather than have it go through JCAR as would normally be the case?"

Cassidy: "Representative, obviously, you've... we've been friends for a while. You've watched me work on this for quite some time, and so you know I didn't enter into this process blindly at all. What we have done in crafting this legislation is attempt to sort out and make appropriate use of the emergency rule making provisions while not over-using them and respecting the space of JCAR to do the rule-making that there is sufficient time to accomplish. This is only applicable to the things that are time sensitive, as I believe is appropriate. And just as we did with the medical."

Hammond: "So, it is your intention that you would use those emergency rule-making process much like we did with the medical cannabis legislation?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Hammond: "Okay. I'm not going to spend a lot time talking about the big doobies and things that came into the conversations last night, although I think it added a little bit of levity at a very late hour. But my last question deals with the opt-out portion of the legislation. When video gaming became the law a few years back, Chicago was one of those communities that did opt out of the video gaming. So, as we move forward..."
and it's my understanding that either a municipality or a county as a whole can opt out. Is that correct?

Cassidy: "Yes."

Hammond: "So, as we move forward and we look at the projected revenues from legalizing cannabis, have you taken that into consideration when you’ve thought about what the revenues would generate on legalizing cannabis?"

Cassidy: "The revenue projections were based on looking at usage rates and population rates in other states with adult-use markets. And pretty much all of them have similar opportunities for opt out, so I think that levels it. Given that, you know, you can travel to a neighboring community to make those purchases, I think the purchase rates would be level."

Hammond: "So... if certain areas of the state opt in, if you will, or decide to take advantage of this, do you look for, perhaps, the City of Chicago to also opt in to video gaming in the future to generate even more dollars?"

Cassidy: "I don't have an opinion on that. I wasn’t here when the video gaming Bill was debated, so I don’t really know the nuances of how that came to be."

Hammond: "Okay. Representative, thank you. Appreciate your time."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Thapedi: "Representative Cassidy, if I understood correctly, there is no disparity study that currently exists, correct?"

Cassidy: "There is nothing current. We intend... we've written into the legislation..."
Thapedi: "My question is, today, there is no disparity study, right?
Cassidy: "Right."
Thapedi: "Okay. 'Cause I'm on the... I'm on a timer. So, cannabis was prohibited in Illinois in or about 1931, right?"
Cassidy: "Okay."
Thapedi: "Yes?"
Cassidy: "I don’t know the date but, yes, for when Illinois did it."
Thapedi: "And that prohibition was just after they created in the Federal Government a Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in 1930, right?"
Cassidy: "Okay."
Thapedi: "Is that a yes?"
Cassidy: "I don’t have the materials in front of me that you have, so I'm going to take your word for it."
Thapedi: "All right. And then in October of '37, Congress affected the Marijuana Tax Act of 1937, correct?"
Cassidy: "Again, I don’t have the materials in front of me that you have, so I am going to take your word for it. And I trust you on this because you’ve done your work."
Thapedi: "And then at that point, the assaults on the disproportionately impacted communities affectively began, correct?"
Cassidy: "I would agree."
Thapedi: "And then in 1951, the Boggs Act was enacted which established a mandatory minimum of 2 to 10 years in the penitentiary and a fine of up to $20 thousand for a first offense for marijuana possession, correct?"
Cassidy: "Again, I do not have the materials in front of me but I do believe you and trust you with your research."

Thapedi: "And then in 1956, the Narcotic Control Act was passed which increased penalties and introduced the death penalty, correct?"

Cassidy: "I trust your research."

Thapedi: "And then in 1970, the Control Substance Act was enacted with the support of Nixon combining all the previous Acts into one piece of legislation, correct?"

Cassidy: "Again, I trust your research."

Thapedi: "And at that time, there were five categories for drugs, and cannabis was deemed to be a Schedule 1 drug, meaning that it was a drug that had quote, 'no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States', correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And as we sit here today, cannabis is still a Schedule 1 drug, correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And other Schedule 1 drugs are heroin, LSD, ecstasy, MD, MA, correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Does cannabis have quote, 'any currently accepted medical uses in the treatment in the United States'?"

Cassidy: "There are significant medical authorities that would say yes."

Thapedi: "Then why is it still a Schedule 1 drug?"

Cassidy: "The FDA approved an epilepsy drug specifically."

Thapedi: "Then why is it still a Schedule 1 drug?"
Cassidy: "They're still doing research, and then I am not a Member of Congress."
Thapedi: "So then in the '80s, we saw the frying pan and the egg and a significant increase in incarcerations for non-violent drug crimes, correct?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Thapedi: "In fact, in 1986, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act was enacted which established more mandatory minimum prison sentences for drug offenses, correct?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Thapedi: "For example, it allocated longer prison sentences for offenses dealing with crack cocaine and shorter sentences for offenses dealing with powder cocaine, correct?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Thapedi: "And people from disproportionately impacted communities were targeted and arrested on suspension of drug possession at higher rates than people not from those communities, correct?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Thapedi: "And then that then led to a disproportionate incarceration rate between people from these targeted communities and those people not from those communities, correct?"
Cassidy: "Yes."
Thapedi: "In 2013, and I heard one of my colleagues mention some of these statistics, a study was done by the ACLU that found that a person who looks like me is more than three times more likely to be arrested for cannabis possession than to my
colleagues to my immediate left and to my immediate right, correct?"
Cassidy: "Actually, I was referring to a later one but I'm familiar with that one as well."
Thapedi: "All right, fair enough. Now, the social equity program in Article 7 of the Bill is designed to achieve what purpose for the people of the State of Illinois?"
Cassidy: "The disparity study will examine the Social Equity Applicant Program and other measures intended to infuse new entrance into the market. It will determine how many businesses could have applied to be Social Equity Applicants and would have been qualified to participate in the adult-use cannabis industry."
Thapedi: "But at the end of the day, what is the purpose of that social equity component of the Bill? Why is it there? Why is it important?"
Cassidy: "As we create a new industry where individuals and businesses can profit from the sale of cannabis, we recognize that individuals in certain communities have faced higher levels of arrest and incarceration for violating the prohibition of the sale and possession of cannabis. The Social Equity Applicant Program reconciles this reality by giving it additional points to individuals who have been personally impacted by enforcement of cannabis related laws or who come from communities that have been negatively affected by high enforcement of cannabis related laws."
Thapedi: "I've got... I've got eight seconds. I've got seven seconds. I've got six seconds. Is it narrowly tailored to achieve the purpose..."
Speaker Turner: "Representative, can you please make your final remark?"
Thapedi: "Did she hear my question?"
Speaker Turner: "I think she answered it."
Thapedi: "I didn't hear her. I think we got cut off."
Cassidy: "Did you ask is it narrowly tailored to achieve your goals? Is that what you said?"
Thapedi: "Well, just to back up, that I was asking about the purpose of Article 7 and you were going through what you believe the purpose was. And then my last question was, was whether or not the Bill is narrowly tailored to achieve the purpose that you were mentioning?"
Cassidy: "I'm not an attorney. I'm afraid I don't know how to define narrowly tailored."
Thapedi: "Are you sure?"
Cassidy: "I am sure I don't know how to define narrowly tailored."
Thapedi: "Well, I don’t want to quarrel with you. I just simply was trying to establish..."
Cassidy: "That sounds like a term of art that I'm not familiar. I'm sorry, I'm just unfamiliar with that term."
Thapedi: "Well, I think that you heard the Lady from DuPage's comments and if you don't feel comfortable answering them on the floor then fair enough. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ugaste."
Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
Ugaste: "Thank you. I have a letter from two of my mayors, and they're just wondering what is going to be the revenue going toward mental health to help this, not a percentage but on
the projected revenue. How much money are we actually talking?"

Cassidy: "Well, that’s going to grow year on year. In the first...
    I'm not great at math on the fly here but..."

Ugaste: "If you don't have the number, that’s okay. I don’t need you to do calculations."

Cassidy: "It is 20 percent."

Ugaste: "It's 20 percent. Twenty percent of what?"

Cassidy: "Of... in the first year it's 50... 57-58 million. It's about $11 million in the first year which only represents 6 months. It's really half a year of revenue."

Ugaste: "Okay. Okay. To the Bill. I've heard, today, about the need to expunge criminal records and for people to have second chances. I've heard about the need for jobs in communities, about need for revenue in certain communities, and entrepreneurial opportunities in those communities. And those are all laudable goals and I believe goals we can all support in this chamber. However, I do not believe that this Bill is the way to achieve those goals. We should be working to achieve those goals on their own and I'd be happy to work with anybody to do so. But it's not a reason to vote to legalize a drug that we know is going to cause some problems in our community. And even the Sponsors of this Bill know it's going to cause problems in our community, which is part of the reason why they have allotted money for mental health and other issues, and are allowing local governments to tax on it because it's going to create problems for law enforcement and other officials. I understand it's been a long debate but if I could have your attention for a minute."
We've heard about health concerns and these are set out. These aren't... these aren't fallacies. It's not just associations. There are actual concerns and the CDC website contains that information. It further indicates, repeatedly, that part of the problem is there's not enough research in this issue... on this issue. So, I do not understand what our need is to rush forward on an issue when the Centers for Disease Control is telling us we need further research. Why aren't we, instead, supporting some type of legislation asking the Federal Government to conduct this research? There's further, not the testing we need to know... testing available to us to tell whether someone's intoxicated. It's just not there yet. And by way of social media, people are going to find that this isn't there yet and they're going to know that they can go out and drive high and there won't be repercussions for some time to come because of it. Representative DeLuca asked us not to pass this Bill because it's not the way he wants his family raised. I know all of you have concerns for your family too. I'm asking you on behalf of my family and all the families of the State of Illinois, don't pass a Bill to get goals that we should be truly working on, such as bringing businesses and jobs to every part of Illinois, including and especially those underserved communities, just so we can make something that needs further work, put it into law, and create opportunities that we should be working on in different ways. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, Batinick will be our final speaker. Representative Batinick is recognized for five minutes."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. I've actually been sitting over here, tearing up a little bit. A couple things I want to hit before I get into that. I got a chart here that was sent to me about youth marijuana prevention. Says that Colorado spends, I think, $32 per student. We spend... we're going to spend 56 cents which doesn't seem appropriate. Apparently, some of us are going to ignore what my friend here, Representative Windhorst, stated about the 20 to 30 percent increase in violent crimes in the states that have legalized it. The 37 percent increase in the murder rate. But, you know, some people like to tie those to other things. Think what troubles me the most, personally, is the... is the psychosis, and young people, and what happens with marijuana use when the brain isn't developed. I actually came into this issue neutral and wanted to do some research. And I think if somebody's coming into this unbiasedly, they will find out that there's plenty of doctors they can talk to, studies they can find, that say there's definitely a strong link between marijuana use and schizophrenia. And the hard part about ignoring all of that bad stuff is that in July of 2000, I got a call not... I got called three, four times when I was at a party... at a party with my mom saying, come home, when you coming home, when you coming home. I'm like, why is my mom... 30 years old, why does she keep bothering me when I... when am I coming home? Came in and sat down in the chair and my mom let me know that somebody that was basically like a little brother to me, had schizophrenia, and committed suicide. And I just... the idea that there's no studies out there on this stuff or that we think that we have the answers
on this stuff is... is pretty appalling that we're rushing into this May 31. I know this has been out there for a while. I know the Representative has worked on it for a long time. But, my goodness, there sure seems to be a lot of red flags on this issue. So for those reasons, I will urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "Thank you for this amazing debate. I came into this aware of the need for a trailer Bill. Whenever you do anything this big, there are going to be... there's going be clean-up required. I want to acknowledge the folks that have asked about specific things. And I want to promise all of you that I don't anticipate that my pace of work is going to slow much as we move into the summer. So, I am open to your input and suggestions. I intend to engage in discussions over the summer on these issues, including finding ways to address some of the local concerns around home-grow while acknowledging concerns about privacy that were raised during those negotiations, acknowledge... addressing some drafting errors that we've identified. The issue that Representative Stuart raised about the county taxes. So, I am here for your ideas and I welcome them. I want to thank everyone today for your engagement in this debate. I want to apologize to those who were not able to speak. I certainly wanted to hear what you had to say. To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, proponents and opponents alike, I thank you because your input has made this a better Bill. To my sisters, Heather Steans, Toi Hutchinson, Jehan Gordon-Booth, to Jason Barickman, Celina Villanueva, and Dave Welter, who really all did the Yeoman's work of crafting this, thank you for sticking with
it for this long, hard work, the tough conversations and the fun and the friendship. To State's Attorney Kim Foxx, thank you for leading the way. I have deep gratitude for your approach to this work and I look forward to long partnership with you on this. To Rose Ashby, who has worked with Heather and me, the herder of the cannabis cats, bless you, bless you, bless you. You've kept us organized and sane. The rest of our staff, Lea and Jewel and everyone, amazing. Our staff here on the floor, Kit Walsh and Marishonta Wilkerson, you guys have pulled some serious all-nighters and I thank you. Shonta, is this your last Bill with us? Wow. So, I just want to pause for a second and thank you, Shonta, for how well you take care of all of us. To the folks at the Marijuana Policy Project and especially Chris Lindsey, your expertise was invaluable. Governor Pritzker and the team, especially Christian Mitchell, who I miss here in this chamber, and Marty Torres. Governor, you came along at the perfect time. You grabbed an ore and you helped us row to shore and I thank you for that. To the activists and advocates who haven't seen exactly what they want from this, today is a beginning. We've said that multiple times. To my colleagues and to the folks who have interest in this issue, this is a beginning. It's the beginning of the end of the war on drugs. The beginning of us finally having rational conversations about cannabis and of working together to improve this policy. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, verification has been requested by Representative Swanson. Please be available at your chair to vote your switch. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in
Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1438? This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 66 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'... Representative Swanson. Mr. Clerk, please read those voting in the affirmative."


Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Swanson would like to withdraw his verification request. And on that, there are 66 voting in 'favor', 46 voting 'opposed', 2 voting 'present'. And on this question, the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1438. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Resolution. Leader Manley on the Motion."
Manley: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that HR433 can be heard in the Appropriations - Human Services Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1932, offered by Representative Carroll. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #2 and #3 have been adopted. And Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Carroll."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Carroll on Floor Amendment #4."

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very tough act to follow up. I'll be very quick. House Amendment #4 clears up the language that the Minority Leaders from both chambers will be able to make appointments to the task force."

Speaker Turner: "Gentlemen moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1932. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1932."
Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Yes, thank you. Yesterday, we started discussing this Bill. This is creating a Property Tax Task Force. I heard the other side of the aisle, I made the change that they asked for. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Batinick: "Representative, thank you. Thank you for being a man of your word. Thank you for pulling it from the record and making this Bill what it should be. And I look forward to a fascinating task force and you know I will be following it closely. Thank you very much."

Carroll: "Representative Batinick..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McDermid is recognized. Would you like to speak on Senate Bill 1932, Representative?"

McDermid: "Absolutely, I would."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

McDermid: "To the Bill. Thank you very much for this Amendment. I spoke about this extensively yesterday. And I never... well, I'd like to say something to kind of get past the negativity that I put out there yesterday because I don't like to be so cynical. Unfortunately, in my five years here, I have learned... I have been taught to be cynical and to see that everything boils down to an election day or an election cycle talking point. And I wish you every success. I'm hoping that some new people, some freshman, who are not... who haven't learned things
the hard way like I have, can approach this and get a different outcome from the five previous task forces. So, I certainly wish you all the best and I hope you can find many other optimistic people to look all around, under every rock, to reform this and yet not run across or earn the ill will of any of the folks that have vested interests in this system just in the way it is. So good luck, Representative. You're gonna need it."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."
Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
Skillicorn: "Johnathan, thank you for this Amendment. I do appreciate it. I still think you're going to find it's pensions, prevailing wage, and unfunded mandates are the biggest drivers of this issue, property taxes, and we need to cut them. But again, thank you for this. I'm going to be supporting your task force. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Carroll to close."
Carroll: "First of all, I want to thank Representative McDermed. I know yesterday you and I had a little bit of a heated exchange. I appreciate your kind words and I look forward to us having a strong working relationship moving forward. And thanking my colleagues for their kind words on the other side. And I hope for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1932 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 a count of 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0
voting 'present', Senate Bill 1932, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ammons, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
Ammons: "It is with great disappointment that I stand in this chamber being denied the right to speak to the devastation that has impacted our community for generations. I grew up in the big City of Joliet, where Stateville Prison is located, and have watched generations of black men be locked up for the possession of drugs in this country. I listened to my colleague Thapedi lay out very clearly the intentional destruction of black communities across this country but, specifically, in the State of Illinois. And I stand here, today, having been denied the right to speak on the most important legislation that will impact our communities in my lifetime, and I am offended by that denial. Our community has suffered untold harm and many devastations that we cannot just wipe over because we need revenue in the State of Illinois. I agree with my colleagues on the right and the left that this legislation will have unintended consequences. Will those consequences remedy the 40 to 50 years of drug devastation that has destroyed the communities of East St. Louis, Danville, Joliet, the South and West Sides of Chicago? For generations, we have had to wait for our emancipation. For generations, we've been denied access to jobs, and education, and training, and opportunity. For generations, our children have looked at us as if we have not done our due
diligence. And today, the very denial of my right to stand before this Body and express the harm and devastation that we've experienced. This law will not legalize drugs for our communities. This legislation will still see devastation on the behalf of those who are stopped by the police as a result. We are calling for international declaration for the renewal of people of African descent in this state from this day forward. We deserve justice and access to justice in every single way. We are calling on this Governor to make sure that he, not only enforces equality and justice as it pertains to this legislation, but everything that goes forward. It is not good enough that we simply expunge records for those of low level marijuana possession. That is not good enough. That young black men and women have to walk around and be saddled, be saddled with the results of this legislation going forward. We know that the people who are going to benefit from this are already benefiting. They're already benefiting economically. We know that black communities from the top to the bottom of this state are struggling economically and this does nothing to solve that problem. And so, I call on colleagues to look at this issue as a justice issue and not a revenue one. We understand that the state is strapped for cash, but it is certainly not because black communities have stolen those dollars. We have been denied equal justice under the law and we have been stopped at three to four times higher rates than any other community. And we call on justice today for our communities. And this measure must be looked at as simply a beginning and not an end. We will not stop fighting for our communities from this day forward. And we call on the
Democratic Party of Illinois to stand with us to bring justice and equality to our communities and every single area of life. I refuse to vote on a Bill that would not allow me to speak to it. And I hope that people of Illinois will do better for the communities who are suffering. Do not make them victims. Do not make them victims of our legislation. I want to acknowledge the profound need for justice for us. The untold suffering and evils that our people have suffered in this country from slavery, to emancipation, to post Jim Crow era, to drug loss, and to the drug war. We have suffered and we demand better from this institution. I hope that we are not doing the wrong thing by our community. I thank my colleague, Representative Thapedi, for putting on record the true reality of how we've gotten to this point. And I thank him for being a voice for us. I thank all of my new Members who stood on this issue. I do appreciate all the work that has been done to get us to this point, but I don't believe we've done all that we can do to bring about justice and equity. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to speak today. And thank you so much for all that you do. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we have an announcement. Due to the volume of workload, the House will be in Session at least through Sunday, June 2. Today, the House intends to adjourn at a reasonable hour. Please note that per diems are not available beyond May 31. Please plan accordingly. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Agriculture & Conservation will meet in Room 115. Appropriations-Human Services in D-1. Cities & Villages
in Room 413. Labor & Commerce in Room 114. Revenue & Finance in Room 122. Judiciary-Criminal in C-1. The Executive Committee in Room 118."

Speaker Turner: "The House will recess to the call of the Chair."

Clerk Hollman: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will reconvene in five minutes. Please report back to the House of Representatives."

Speaker Willis: "The House will come to order. Leader Willis in the Chair. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports, please."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harper, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3623. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations – Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2304, House Resolution 433. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3394. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments #1, #2, and #3 to House Bill 925. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary – Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with
Senate Amendments #1 and #3 to House Bill 92. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following the committee action taken on May 31, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1... correction, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 75, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 262, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 689, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 690, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1814."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. On page 5, Senate Bill 262, offered by Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you. Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118."

Speaker Willis: "Do you have a time, Sir?"

Butler: "Four hours and forty-eight minutes, it looks like up there."

Speaker Willis: "One hour will be awarded to you, Sir. The Body will be at ease 'til the call of the Chair. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, on page 5 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 262, offered by Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."
Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris on Floor Amendment #1."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the proposed state budget for the State of Illinois. Could we adopt the Amendment and debate it on Third?"

Speaker Turner: "Gentlemen moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 262. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 262."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, we live in a great state, with great people, with great colleges and universities, with great business, industries, agriculture, and so many assets. Yet, we have found ourselves over the last couple years with credit downgrades, with financial problems, and with some fiscal instability. Tonight, working together, I believe we can take a large step forward into putting the State of Illinois back on a better track, stabilizing our finances, raising our credit ratings, investing in our families, in our communities, and in our businesses, in our cities and towns to bring back the full potential of the State of Illinois. Working in junction with each other, with our new Governor J.B. Pritzker, I'm proud to present a very comprehensive budget for the State of Illinois that it is fully balanced,
that is fiscally responsible, that will pay down $1.4 billion in our backlogable of old bills, that fully pays our pension obligations, and sets us back on the road to a much better State of Illinois. Let me just name several of the items that appear in the Bill that is before you. And just to point out that there are other pieces of the budget, the BIMP and the revenue portions, none of those are in this Bill. This is just the appropriation. And what is included in this Bill is $375 million investment in our elementary and secondary education systems, done through the evidence-based model. We provide half a billion dollars in MAP Grants for our students to attend Illinois colleges and universities. It contains a comprehensive statewide violence prevention program, including youth jobs, youth job training, and career readiness programs, after school and summer youth programming, along with special new additions in mental health and substance abuse treatment to prevent young people from falling into the traps of addiction. This legislation also includes funding for a census grant program which will help all of us work to count every Illinoisan, in every part of this state, in every community and in particular, the harder to count populations, so that when the decennial census comes and goes, and we go into the legislative remapping process for seats in Washington, that we maintain our representation in Congress at the appropriate levels. And for the next 10 years, the federal programs we count on so much that are reliant on census data means we will get more funding if we completely count every Illinoisan. As well, we are committed to funding business development, to recruiting new
industries to come to the State of Illinois to expand here and to make Illinois their home. We also work on trade development, and job preparedness, and workforce readiness programs. This legislation also includes funding for rural broadband. It contains money for the CCP Program, fully funded. This is the home services program for those who serve senior citizens. But it also contains cost containment language. We know that as the baby boom ages, the CCP Program is one of our fastest growing and more expensive programs. And we as a state must work to be sure that we prudently manage costs. And in this, and in many other programs, there are such cost management efforts. We invest over 700 million more dollars in behavioral health, with special attention to areas with high needs for substance abuse and mental health treatment. In addition, we provide funding for the community based services that serve in our neighborhoods in human services, mental health, substance abuse, developmental disability, disability and aging to help them raise their workers to meet the new minimum wage requirement. We are instituting a scholarship program for the dependents of veterans to be sure that those who have served our country that we honor their service and make sure that their children may also have a chance to prosper. I mentioned that we are paying down $1.4 billion of old bills in this budget. The $1.2 billion is a backlog bill borrowing where will go to the market and borrow money and pay down $1.2 billion of bills. But in addition to taking those old bills off of our record off of our books, the savings and interest... right now, we are paying 12 percent per year in interest... the savings of
interest on that will be several hundred million dollars to the people of Illinois that we can invest in schools, colleges, or public safety. In addition, this budget shows an operating surplus of $200 million. And all of that surplus is being dedicated to the payment of backlog of old bills. We spend a good deal of money in this program investing in equity programs for job training, workforce development, community trauma reduction, and access to justice. We provide treatments for the first time to young people who are enrolled in the Medicaid program, who are in the autism spectrum by adding ADA therapy. In addition, many of you know who have nursing homes in your communities that due to problems over the last several years with the long term care determination and redetermination backlog, that we owe our nursing homes $450 million in unprocessed claims. This budget also includes a relief program for the nursing home industry to help them bridge the gap and continue to hire workers at the higher levels of RN and CNA to fully staff their homes. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm very happy to have worked with folks to, you know, come to this night. It's a good budget for the State of Illinois. It is balanced. It is fiscally responsible. We pay down our old bills. We meet our full pension obligations and we provide a great value and a great deal of service to those citizens we represent. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Members, pursuant to an agreement between the Speaker and the Minority Leader, we will hear from three Republicans and three Democrats. Leader Harris was the first Democrat. Chair recognizes Representative Demmer for five minutes."
Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Demmer: "Thank you, Leader Harris, for that detailed discussion about what's included in the budget for this year. There's just a couple of things that I want highlight that I think are really of importance to several Members have gotten a number of questions about tonight. So, you may have touched on them. I just want to repeat them and make sure everybody understands what kind of commitment we're making. First, one of the issues that we've talked about for many years is the burden that the unpaid bill backlog presents to the state. It's certainly a burden on vendors who are waiting to get paid, people who have provided services to the state. It's... sometimes those payment cycles can extend for a very long period of time. So, I think it's important to note that in this years' operating budget there's a pretty significant commitment to reducing the unpaid bill backlog. Can you tell us what... I think there were two mechanisms that'll help us pay down the unpaid bills and what those amount to?"

Harris: "Yes, Sir. There is $1.2 billion in bond borrowing that will immediately put $1.2 billion back in the Illinois economy when those bills are suddenly paid. That will also save us about a day six or seven percent spread on the interest we're currently paying and reduce our borrowing costs."

Demmer: "And additionally, another concern that we've had is in addition to the unpaid bill backlog, we also all know we have a very significant unfunded pension liability that requires the state to make a significant investment each year. At what
level are we funding the pension contribution in this proposed budget?"

Harris: "We are funding at the full actuarially certified level."

Demmer: "And is this budget... looking at the revenues that are identified as available and the expenditures that are made, is this budget balanced?"

Harris: "Yes, it does, Sir."

Demmer: "Thank you. To the Bill. I know that this budget process this year has been a result of a number of meetings of different forms. Most Members of this Assembly have been involved in various stages of those meetings. As a Member of an appropriation working group, as Members of appropriations committees, folks who have attended various hearings to hear from the people of the State of Illinois of what they're looking for in a budget, and to deal with some of the realities of what are the resources that we have available, and how can we work together to prioritize those in a way that's satisfactory to Members of this General Assembly. I'd also note that as a part of those conversations, the House Republican Caucus has talked about other policy changes that are very important to us and important really to the people across the State of Illinois, to know that not only is it important that we have stability in a state budget but that there's also things that we're doing to signal that Illinois is a place that welcomes new investment. Illinois is a place that welcomes the creation of new jobs, and that we're positioning ourselves as a place that can attract new growth and try to grow our economy and grow the revenues that the state brings in by growing the state's economy and providing
better opportunities for the people of Illinois. So, this vote tonight... and we'll have a number of Republicans who will be supporting this proposal tonight... this is the first step in a multi-Bill package that I think will help both sides tell the State of Illinois what their priorities are. It's a budget that... a budget and Bill package that both sides might have some things they disagree with, but have a lot of things that they do agree with. And in the end, I think we can come to a fair compromise from all the Bills that we'll consider, this one tonight, and those that we'll consider of the next couple of days. So again, there will be a number of House Republicans who are supportive of this package tonight, as it relates to a multi-Bill package that we think will strike the right balance and be a fair compromise to provide a stable budget for the state, one that addresses the pressures that we face while also changing some important policies to help us grow our economy. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Davis for five minutes."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I can assure you that there was a lot of hard work that went into putting this budget together, a lot of difficult conversations. And while maybe this Bill doesn’t do absolutely everything that we want to do, truly, it's a move in the right direction for us. We can talk about how throughout the budget we have seen maybe some increases in some areas. Just like the previous speaker said about moving this state forward. And as the former Chair of the Appropriations Committee for K-12 education, you know, I am very pleased with the direction that this budget moves
with regard to K-12 education. A couple years ago, we were able to put in place a brand new funding formula that does some very unique things relative to acknowledging that every school different… every school district is different and that each one needs its own resources in a way to determine what those resources are, to give it each an independent opportunity to grow and to allow young people to grow. And what it does is that it sets forth a path that says that the districts that need the resources the most get the money first. This budget continues that effort. And not only continues just the basic effort, which we are again meeting our constitutional… or excuse me, our legislative authority opportunity to increase not only… how can I say this? We are continuing what we passed relative to the level of funding that we have suggested that we need to at least contain the minimum base and we are increasing this year by an additional 25 million. Now, I think all of us would argue that we want to do more relative to school funding. And hopefully, this is the first step as we work through this budget with a new administration, a lot of new Members, and we gained the momentum, and we gained a confidence that we have the ability to move these items forwards. Who knows? Next year, we look forward to maybe trying to figure out how to increase that more, all working toward adequate funding for all of our schools. There is opportunities in this budget to increase the level of early childhood education so that, again, and we all agree, that if we're not touching the babies at their youngest stages, then in some respects we're doing ourselves a disservice. So, this budget meets those obligations. And
then I have to say that, as Member of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus, again, maybe this doesn't do everything that we want it to, but a lot of the priorities that many of you have heard about, a lot of the prioritizes that we fight for hard on behalf of the communities that we represent, a lot of the prioritizes that we talk about on this floor on both sides of the aisle, a lot of those are being addressed in this budget, either maintaining and in some cases possibly increasing those opportunities. And the great thing about it is that when we increase opportunities that impact minority communities, well black and brown communities, in some respects the reality is that everyone across the state benefits from these opportunities. So again, this budget represents hard work on both sides of the aisle, a lot of conversation on both sides of the aisle, and an effort to try to make sure that we are falling to our priorities and making sure that we are funding those things that we deem and those things we know that are important to the best of our ability. Again, do we want to do more? We would love to be able to do more, but there are some realities. And we hope as we continue this process, as we continue to provide the opportunities for business growth and development in this budget, as well as addressing some of our ongoing challenges like our bills and pensions, as well. We know that as we continue to work collaboratively, that is what we indeed want to do. When we work collaboratively, there are a lot of things that we can indeed get done. So again, this budget represents all of that. And if I can just take another liberty with regard to higher education, another very important piece of the budget speaks
to where we want to start sending and the direction we want our colleges and universities to go. Admittedly, we know we had some tough years prior to this. We had some difficult years. And while K-12 may have been able to survive, other parts of this budget did not survive. And we knew that we had a huge mountain climb to get to where we want to go, including not only K-12, but also in higher education as well. So, I applaud the efforts of all those Members who sat in those work group meetings, who discussed where we want to go on those priorities across the board. So, I'm proud to say that I'm going to vote this budget, and I encourage every Member to vote for this budget. And even if you don't, that's okay because we know that we are addressing priorities across the board that everyone in this chamber wants us to address. I certainly encourage everyone to vote 'yes'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you much, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Brady: "First off, all I want to do is really speak to the Bill. I'm sure that everyone here would like to hear me talk for five minutes tonight but it's not going to happen, Ladies and Gentlemen. So, that's my gift to each and every one of you. I want to say thank you to both our Leaders, Leader Harris, Leader Demmer, and everyone in the rank and file that's been involved in this process. And to Leader Durkin and to the Speaker, thank you. It's not perfect. It wasn't easy and we all know that. Those of us that have been here for a while have experienced this before. There's four things that people
in my district ask me to do in regards to a budget, and I believe this budget does it. The first, they asked us to make it balanced. The second, they asked us to pay down debt. The third, fund and stabilize the pensions. And the fourth, was help education. Not only K-12, but higher education. This budget does that, Ladies and Gentlemen. I vote... I will vote 'yes' and ask you to do the same. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I appreciate Leader Harris for bringing this budget tonight. It's well thought out. It pays down our bills. It makes pension payments. And it makes strategic investments in education through the evidence-based model, including monies for property tax relief fund to help more high tax districts lower their property taxes. We've made better investments in two areas that were neglected during our budget impasse, namely human services and higher education, including a $50 million increase to MAP funding and an increase to the AIM High scholarship program that's made available to Illinois students attending four year public universities. We've restored funding to our four year universities and to our community colleges. This is a good budget. We've included increases to human service agencies and programs that need a boost such as DCFS and some rate increases for organizations that take care of our elderly and disabled. I appreciate the hard work of the Appropriations Committees and the willingness of all the Members of those committees to sit through endless hours of meetings, going through that budget
Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. To the Bill. You know, I started off the beginning of the year at Sangamon Center, in which we got sworn in. And I say this over and over again, is that our Caucus will work with the Majority Party in any issue and we will respect your priorities as long as you respect our priorities. You know, if we can do that we can get good things done. We can accomplish which some people have said in the past that we would never be able to do. Example, last year, not only did we finally get a budget after three rough years, really tough years of not having one, we did it when we sat at the table. We worked it out, and the priorities of both sides were recognized. We did it with the historic education funding reform. That's an issue that many people for decades said the Legislature will never touch. We did it because we recognize each priorities, we negotiated, and that's how we get things done. So, tonight is a start. Tonight is a start of us finishing up this year working on a budget that is balanced and one that is fair to Illinoisans, fair to our businesses, but also... and fair to the taxpayers of Illinois. Let's not forget about them. And what's good about this budget right here, when I hear that we're going to say that we have balanced budget, you heard me rail about budgeting in the past last night. So, it's a pleasure to say that we have a balanced budget this year. I don't like saying out loud that it's out of balance by this and that. Sometimes I got to raise that and I did that last night. But because we worked together
and we made some concessions, both sides tonight were able to say that we have a balanced budget for this FY20 year. What I'm also very happy with is our commitment to K-12. This is our obligation that we made the Leaders, we did when passed historic education funding reform. That is something we will never lose. Our best investment, we all know, is with our children and for kids going through grammar school and high school. And that's my commitment, too, that we will continue with that. Higher Ed is also benefiting from this tonight. We heard the stories over the years of how much trouble and how much devastation happened to them over the years. We're giving a five percent across the board increase in funding. And here's something I think is also important that we got to pay attention to. There's a very troubled system within DCFS. We are putting an extra hundred million dollars into DCFS. It's an agency that needs the support and it needs additional funding to make sure that it can take care of these kids who get lost in this very, very, very sad but also very troubling situations that they live in. So, I think that's important for us to recognize what's in this budget. But let me just tell you this also. This is... again, we're going to vote for this. I plan to vote for this tonight. This is about good faith. And also with this is that I want to recognize that about a week and a half ago, the House Republicans said it's important for us to establish our priorities. And these are... which I'm very pleased that we are finally... these matters are being taken under consideration, and I hope they'll be in our Bills by tomorrow, and that is things that we believe are important for the business community by enhancing our ability
to locate data centers in Illinois through tax incentives. Eliminating the retailer's discount, which we've talked about before. Eliminating the antiquated Illinois Franchise Tax, reinstating a manufacturer's purchase credit, enacting a blue collared jobs act, and others. That strikes the right balance of what we need in this state. Not only do we have to make investments as we just talked about, higher ed, human services, we need to make an investment within our business community. And when we do that, we've done a good job. So, I'm pleased to say we've made a lot of progress within the last 24 hours. It's amazing what we can do around here in just a few hours if people are willing to work together. And we just started doing that. So, I feel like we're on a good path, and I'm pleased to put my vote on the board tonight, and let's get our work done by tomorrow."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Harris for a quick close."

Harris: "Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 262 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 a count of 83 voting 'in favor', 35 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 262, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 437, offered by Representative Halpin. House Resolution 438, offered by Representative Halpin... correction, 437 was by Hoffman. House Resolution 438, offered by Representative Halpin. House

Speaker Turner: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Saturday, June 1 at the hour of 10 a.m. Saturday, June 1 at the hour of 10 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come in to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 448, offered by Representative Edly-Allen. Senate Joint Resolution 6, offered by Representative Caulkins. Senate Joint Resolution 43, offered by Representative Welch. Senate Joint Resolution 43 (sic-45), offered by Representative Parkhurst. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."