Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on October 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 3888, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 10."

Speaker Hoffman: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off the cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Assistant Doorkeeper Padget."

Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Lord, as we prepare for Session today, I ask freshness of your spirit to quicken our thinking, that out of confused issues, may come simplicity of plan, that out of fear, may come confidence, that out of hurry, may come deliberation, and that out of frustration, may come guidance. Let us get to work, not head first, but heart first. And may we be able to disagree without being disagreeable, to defer without being difficult, to be honest without tension, and to be frank without offense in an atmosphere of team spirit. These things we ask in your Son's name. Amen."

Speaker Hoffman: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Edly-Allen."

Edly-Allen - 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 Hoffman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side. Leader Harris."
Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Andrade is excused today."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Spain is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side. Representative Spain."
Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Republicans have two Members that are absent today. Please let the record reflect that Representative Sosnowski and Unes are excused."
Speaker Hoffman: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 114 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"
Brady: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."
Brady: "Thank you very much. Please let the record show that yesterday's vote on Senate Bill 1784, my intention was to vote 'yes' on 1784, if the record would reflect that from yesterday. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "The record will show reflect. Representative Butler, why do you rise?"
Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."
Butler: "Since Assistant Doorkeeper Wayne Padget gave our prayer today, I would just like to give him a shout out and
congratulations for getting married a few weeks ago to Nicole Downey. So congratulations, Wayne and Nicole."

Speaker Hoffman: "Congratulations, Wayne. Representative Kifowit."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

Kifowit: "Members, the Conference of Women Legislators will have their annual meeting immediately after Session in Capitol Committee Room 409. It should only take a half an hour, but I'm inviting all women Legislators to join our annual meeting today, immediately after Session. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Mason, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mason: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Mason: "Thank you. Fellow House Members, today, I rise in recognition of Domestic Violence Awareness Month, which takes place here in Illinois in October. Domestic violence affects one in three women and one in seven men. Domestic violence thrives in darkness. It thrives in secrecy and embarrassment and shame. It thrives in 'it's none of our business', 'that's a family issue', 'they'll work it out'. It thrives in 'it's your responsibility to take whatever your husband gives you.' Today, I want to recognize all of the strong survivors in Illinois. And I want to share some facts from the Illinois State Police regarding domestic violence. Every fifteen seconds in the United States a woman is beaten. Domestic violence results in more injuries that require medical attention than rape, accidents, and muggings combined. Two in
five women who are murdered are killed by their husbands. At least ninety-five percent of cases of partner abuse involve a man beating a woman. Domestic violence happens in all classes and all races. It knows no socioeconomic status. It knows no educational level. It knows no sexual orientation. It happens at all levels. Violence in the home usually becomes more frequent and severe over time. The abusers apologies do not mean the violence will not occur again. And children who grow up in violent homes come to believe that violence is normal. They come to believe that it is an acceptable way to control someone else. The majority of adult violent prisoners were raised in violent homes. Domestic violence is more than beatings. It's more than black eyes and broken arms. It's financial abuse. It's emotional abuse. It's threats and control. I want to thank everyone for recognizing Domestic Violence Awareness Month. And if anyone out there needs assistance, and our statistics show that someone in this very chamber, in fact, more than just someone, is struggling with domestic violence either for themselves or someone close to them needs assistance, I encourage you to seek out and get it. And I promise you that I am a welcoming ear and a hug away. And I'd love for the Body to take a moment of silence for those lost to domestic violence."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Representative Yednock, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Yednock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."
Yednock: "Thank you. I would like to direct the attention down to the well. Ms. Ashley Hines, who is actually Jeff Keicher's Page for the day, but he has graciously, in a spirit of bipartisanship, allowed me to do the introduction since she is from the grand town of Cedar Point in the 76th District. She is a double major at NIU University of political science and nonprofit studies. She is up here representing the NIU Student Association of where I got to attend college. She is their legislative director. She is working on civil engagement, and she has been part of a recent student rally. And her participation in the ALL IN Democracy Challenge, which is trying to get the vote out and increase participation in our democracy. She is also on the University Council and she is a sitting member... sitting voting member at NIU. I want everybody to give her a warm welcome here to the Legislature. So we will probably see her in the future, or so I hope. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative West."
West: "Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."
West: "I also want to draw your attention to the well where we have another Page named Ian Pearson, who is Representative Keicher's Page as well. So, in the spirit of bipartisanship, Ian Pearson is a constituent of mine. And he is a double major at NIU, majoring in political science and nonprofit and NGO studies. He also happens the Speaker of the Student Senate. So, he also may be in this chamber or the one across the hall one day. But the most significant thing about him is that he just cleared the significant screening process to be selected..."
for an in-person interview for Marshall Scholars, which is a program where only 50 students in the nation attend a United Kingdom. And he plans... if he gets accepted, he plans on majoring in public policy. So, if you can not only use him as a Page today, but also wish him luck and hope for the best when he goes for the Marshall Scholar interview. If you can give him a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Lisa Hernandez, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hernandez, L.: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Hernandez, L.: "Earlier this month, I, myself and Representative Rita Mayfield, joined a delegation of religious leaders and advocates at the U.S.-Mexican border at Brownsville, Texas. October 14 was the date we set to visit the area where an influx of asylum seekers were camped out waiting for their court proceedings. For some time, we have been hearing of the horrors occurring at the border, the chilling stories of children crying for their parents while being mocked by ICE agents. While these stories can give you some sort of perspective on what’s going on, they can’t begin to give you the true human cost to human rights violations taking place in the name of securing the borders. You do not truly grasp the pain and despair of fellow human beings at the border until you see it for yourself. The first day we arrived, the plan was to walk across the border towards the clusters of people who were scattered all over the base of the Border Bridge. Crossing was a first time experience..."
Speaker Hoffman: "Excuse me, Representative. Members, Members, please. Staff please remove to the rear of the chamber. Please proceed."

Hernandez, L.: "Crossing was a first time experience for most of us. We paid a toll to cross the bridge before entering into Matamoros, Mexico. Given that the Trump administration is forcing asylum seekers to remain in Mexico while they await these court hearings, the beating, hot sun of the desert gave me immediate clarity of the need for proper human shelter. Hundreds of tents were all over the place. Families were placed in tents that fit 2, maybe 3 people on the dirt or on concrete sidewalks, some living on bare ground. Clothes hung over fences and tents. Empty water plastic bottles were all over the place. They bathed and washed their clothes in the river. Some developed rashes from bathing there. There were so many children. These were families and individuals fleeing their countries because of turmoil and fear of persecution. These families left everything behind to save themselves and save their loved ones. The huddled masses yearning to be breathe free. A month ago there were 300 people. Now, there are over a thousand. While we were there, we helped fill out paperwork and their document. We documented their cases. We gave out diapers, water, clothes. We prayed, we hugged, and cried. We offered comforting words. Sometimes we just listened to them tells us about their heart-wrenching journey. Our government is washing their hands free from the refugee crisis taking place at the border with the Migrant Protection Protocols Program. This program does not provide a safe and orderly process, but rather it creates an inhumane,
undignified, cruel way of handling people fleeing for their lives. The point of this policy is cruelty. So let's make something clear. Trump's decision to force asylum seekers to remain in Mexico while they await their court hearings is not only a violation of International Law but an affront to our values. I am submitting a Resolution to defund... asking Congress to defund this program, this cruel program. I ask you to join me in asking Congress to defund and to essentially say that this program is deplorable. I also want you to know I am going to continue putting these delegations together, but truly you do not really understand. You hear it off. You hear all these stories, but until you see it for yourself, you really grasp it. This... there's got to be a better way. There is a better way. So, I will continue to work on putting these delegations. Should you choose to be there and be part of some positive change, work with me, see me, this delegation will continue. Thank you for your attention."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Bourne, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to... oh he's awake... to introduce the Body to my favorite sidekick. He turned four months old yesterday. This is his first time on the House Floor on the outside. This is Marshall Dean. Please welcome him to the Capitol."


Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Davidsmeyer and I are jointly hosting a Page for a day, today, from Jacksonville, Maria Ferraro. And she is a freshman in college right now, wants to study political science. She's very
involved in her community as a volunteer. And I would ask that the Body welcome her as our Page for the day."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Rita Mayfield, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mayfield: "I was also on that delegation with Representative Hernandez, and I'm grateful that she allowed me to go with her. I want to just echo some of the things that she said. You hear about these things in the news, but until you are actually there, until you actually see what has happened down in Matamoros, Mexico, you truly do not understand the level of inhumanity that exists. It took me a few days after coming back to truly process all of the things that I had seen and the conversations that I had had. I was angry and I was heartbroken that the United States would subject individuals to that type of inhumane conditions. No human being should be subjected to the living conditions that we saw there. There was no food, no water, no clean water. There was no medicine. One diaper per day for a child. Imagine that. Diapers dragging on the ground. But they had to ration them out. Nothing clean. Asylum seekers of every skin tone, of every dialect were there. LGBTQ were living in terror for their lives down on the border, and having to pay for weekly protection. Several of them did not make it. We had asylum seekers who were escaping persecution, kidnapping, and sex trafficking. One of the families that Lisa... Representative Hernandez and I met was a father who escaped with his daughter because she had been targeted for sex trafficking. She was eight years old. They ran in the middle of the night, only to be subjected to more inhumane conditions when they reached the border,
seeking asylum. He has family here in the United States, but they're not allowed to communicate. I want to put things in perspective. Matamoros is a level four security risk. Level four. That means if you go there, you may not come back. It was very hard for us to cross that border knowing that we may not come back. It was just that serious over there. And imagine the families that are living there in these conditions, day after day, with more arriving daily, and being subjected to that. The Migrant Protection Program does not protect migrants. It puts them in harm's way. We really want to draw your attention to what is going on down there. If you have a chance to be part of the delegation, do so. But just know that what is... you see on television is a fraction of the inhumane experiences that are happening down there. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Members, we will go to page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills Second Reading. It's the intent of the Chair to hear the Bills on Second Reading, move them to Third, and hear the Bills on Third Reading. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 392, Representative Mason. Representative Mason. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 392, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mason, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mason."

Mason: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're doing the Amendment now, correct? This Amendment is... it's an Amendment that actually becomes the Bill. The Lake County Children's Advocacy Center
is in my district, and they do amazing work with children who have been victims of sexual violence. It extends the sunset date for two years on this advocacy center juror fee donation pilot program. So, it's set to expire December 31, 2019, and it extends that to January 1, 2022. Under this program, jurors can voluntarily donate their service fees to the Children's Advocacy Center. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 392, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mason, Third Reading of House Bill 392."

Mason: "Thank you. As discussed in the last thing, this extends the ending of this great program that voluntarily allows jurors to donate their funds to the Children's Advocacy Center of Lake County. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative Mason, I just wanted to ask if this pilot program was only for Lake County to do this, and could it be extended to the entirety of the state?"
Mason: "Thank you, Representative. Yes, this was a pilot program that existed only in Lake County. And I believe it's a great example for us to extend to the rest of the state."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

Mason: "Happy to work with you on that."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Weber."

Weber: "I... to the Bill. I just want to say that I think this is a great program. It is voluntary and I urge my fellow Caucus to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mason to close."

Mason: "Again, it's a great program. I would love to see this continued elsewhere throughout the state. It's helped many children throughout my district and other districts. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 392 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 961, Representative Crespo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 961, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo."
Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. The Amendment pretty much changes the date for the five year senior citizen homestead exemption program from taxable years 2020 through 2024, to 2019 to 2023, which was the initial intent of the Bill to make sure that the pilot program started right away rather than delaying it a year."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Crespo moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 961, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. As I stated earlier, this pretty much just goes to the intent of the Bill that we start the pilot program right away rather than delay it a year. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is 'Shall House Bill 961 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 1268, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much. House Floor Amendment #1, which ultimately becomes the Bill, is to extend the sunset from January 1 of 2020 to January 1 of '22 for the Community Association Manager Licensing and Disciplinary Act. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Davis moves to the adoption of House Amendment #1 to House Bill 1268. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any other further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just explained the Bill, which extends the sunset to January 1 of 2022. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1268 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 3902, Representative Monica Bristow. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3902, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3902, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bristow.
Bristow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3902 puts in place a sales tax exemption for certain kinds of aircraft parts that sunset unknowingly at the end of 2014. This extends that sales tax exemption to 2024. There are 14 facilities across the state in 10 different communities for a total of 3700 jobs that this would affect, 507 in my district, and more than 30 states have this same exemption. This is not lost revenue. This is an economic development at its best. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, Representative... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3902 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3904, Representative Welch. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3904 is the Student Athlete Endorsement Act. It is very similar to the Fair Pay... Fair Pay for Play Act that was passed in California and signed into law by Governor Newsom in September. This Bill is important for two reasons. Number one, it's the right thing to do for equity and fairness. And number two, it's the right thing to do because we need to keep Illinois competitive. We need to make sure our colleges and universities are on the same playing field as those colleges in California, and our coaches can go into those living rooms of perspective students and recruit. I'll say this and then be happy to take questions. The NCAA colleges, coaches, athletes, athletic directors... not the athletes... athletic directors, and commissioners have made billions. Billions. The NCAA has become a billion dollar enterprise. And they've done it off the names, likenesses, and images of student athletes who make nothing. This Bill is about equity and fairness and will allow those students, if they so choose, to hire agents and benefit themselves off their own name, likeness, and image. I welcome questions and debate. I believe this is a nonpartisan issue, that Democrats and Republicans across the
country have embraced. And I hope that, today, Democrats and Republicans can come together and embrace this issue for the students across this great state. I would ask for support of House Bill 3904."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Chair will institute a five minute debate timer. There are several individuals who are seeking recognition on this Bill. Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Representative Welch, thank you very much for your leadership. In fact, I stand with the Governor DeSantis in Florida, other Republican leaders throughout the country, and I strongly support this Bill. And we also saw yesterday that the NCAA Board supports this Bill. This Bill is long overdue. This is about fairness. This is about making Illinois competitive. This is about showing leadership. So, I strongly urge a 'yes' vote, and thank you for your leadership, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll."

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

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

Carroll: "Representative Welch, you are a former college athlete yourself, correct?"

Welch: "Yes, Sir."

Carroll: "And you went to Northwestern. Is that correct?"

Welch: "I did."

Carroll: "So, all the things that you guys, as student athletes at Northwestern, did that nearly cover the amount of money it cost you to live in a city like Evanston?"

Welch: "Absolutely not. You know, I..."
Carroll: "And so, did you see other students in college like musicians and artists able to profit off of their work while you got nothing in return on yours?"

Welch: "Absolutely. The music student on a full ride scholarship, they'd go to Evanston bars, Rodgers Park, and make money on weekends without fear of losing a scholarship. But the student athlete who would do that could lose his scholarship and eligibility to play."

Carroll: "Thank you very much. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Carroll: "The NCAA has been an organization for years that has tried to control its athletes. They can pull scholarships at any time without any... without cause. This Bill, as Representative McSweeney said, will level the playing field and allow athletes the opportunity to get... to have the same benefits that other students will have. I don't think this system's been fair for athletes for years. That's where we're going with this. So, I want to thank Representative Welch and other Members of this... of our Party and the Governor for supporting this legislation. And as also was said, this was endorsed by the NCAA yesterday. So, I would hope this Bill would have full support. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

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

Skillicorn: "Representative, who currently benefits from the TV contracts that the college athletics has?"
Welch: "That's a great question, Representative. Definitely not the student athletes. The product, the colleges and universities all benefit. Recently, the Big Ten signed a contract, and annually each Big Ten school receives $55 million each just from that TV contract. And if you look at the amount of money that goes to the coaches, like a Lovie Smith and a Pat Fitzgerald, millions. But nothing goes to the student athletes."

Skillicorn: "And isn't it true that under current regulations that college athletics is a big business, and there's millions and millions of dollars flowing to these athletic organizations?"

Welch: "The NCAA tournament alone, back in March, raised $1.1 billion. Just that one tournament. This is big business. Make no mistake about it. These student athletes are being exploited, being used to make money. And it's being made by the coaches, their assistants, the athletic directors, and those commissioners. The Big Ten commissioner on that TV contract, Representative, got a $20 million bonus just for signing that TV contract. So, you want to know who's making the money, just look at the coaches, athletic directors, and the commissioners."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Representative. And to the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Skillicorn: "The Representative is absolutely correct. College athletics is a big, multimillion dollar business. This is not about student athletes. This is not about students. This is not about education, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is about big business contracts benefiting the elite. I agree with the
Representative that this should be addressed. I agree wholeheartedly we should pass this Bill today. It's the students who provide the product. It's the students that are the value to these organizations. This does not interfere with the TV contracts. This does not interfere with the ticket sales. Just... this allows the students to recognize... be recognized as the product, as the point of interest, the item that's of value. So I absolutely, wholeheartedly support this. The arguments that this deflects money from the universities is just not true. The universities still have TV contracts. The universities still can sell tickets to these games. It just gives the individuals to be able to market their own product, which is themselves. This is just market orientated. This is a good idea. I'm so glad to rush around on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Good morning, Representative. A couple quick questions. What's the difference between what we're passing and what the NCAA did yesterday?"

Welch: "Significantly different. The NCAA basically did a PR stunt. Completely lacks substance. I don't think it was a coincidence that it was three hours after what we did in committee yesterday. Make no mistake about it, they're paying attention. We've got their attention."

Batinick: "All right... let me... I'm going to be direct here. What is the technical difference? You said it's a PR stunt. I just
want to know what's different. What did they do that doesn't have teeth that has teeth in what we do? I'm just..."

Welch: "Well, our Bill has substance to it. Theirs is just a recommendation to begin a process until their rule committee."

Batinick: "Okay. So, theirs is a recommendation to look at the process."

Welch: "Correct."

Batinick: "This makes it happen right away. And then I just wanted to know what the nature of the opposition from the universities was. Does it... is it that they feel they're going to lose some revenue because of this?"

Welch: "I think the nature of their objection was wait for a federal solution. Wait and let the NCAA do it. I don't believe that money is an issue because they know that the universities aren't going to lose a dime. This isn't going to cost them anything. And that... I just don't believe that position has any merit."

Batinick: "So, if we make this the law and it's against NCAA rules currently, will the student athletes somehow still be in violation of NCAA rules or how will that work out?"

Welch: "Well, we're going to make it the law. We're going to join California in this fight. And the NCAA is going to join us, too. As evidence by what they stated publicly yesterday. So, once this law goes into effect in 2023, I don't believe our students are going to be in violation of a NCAA rule, because the NCAA is going to do what we're doing."

Batinick: "Okay. So you think this will force the NCAA to do what we're... I'm in support of the concept. I'm just wondering if
we're putting student athletes in the trick box somehow where if they do this, I want to know what we think the consequences is going to be. Have you heard from the NCAA at all?"

Welch: "I have not heard from them directly, no."

Batinick: "Okay. Thanks for the answers."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

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

Mazzochi: "Thank you. Representative, I, too, support the idea that someone who is actually creating what is essentially intellectual property should be allowed to have the rights to that and not have it taken away from them. Because this Act doesn't go into effect though until 2023, one thing that I would ask, would you be willing to consider putting forth a tighter definition on the age? Because as we know, one of the things that does come up with student athletes is they may in fact be recruited or they may decide to leave high school to join early. Because they are underage, they may not have the lawful authority to enter into those contracts. I think it would be prudent for us to put something into place that would allow… that would provide for that provision, and also ensure that the earnings are going into a trust for the benefit of that student so that it doesn't get swamped away through agent fees or other issues. Is that something you'd be amenable to in the future?"

Welch: "I'd be happy to sit down and talk with you about that and look at that closer."

Mazzochi: "Right. Other things that I think that could be… that you may want to consider to try to strengthen the likeness
rights is designating who would also have ownership of copyright or trademark related rights. Because one of the things that a college could do is they could turn around and create an additional copyright or a trademark and brand that student independently of the student under the... irrespective of how this is written. So, that's another area that I think you may want to consider in terms of who has rights on ownership of any copyrights or trademarks associated with the student athlete. Is that also something you'd be willing to consider and work on?"

Welch: "Representative, I’d be happy to sit down with you and look at all of these issues."

Mazzochi: "Okay. And with that then, I would be in support of the Bill and also because it's doesn't go into effect until 2023 so we do have time to work these issues out. Thank you."

Welch: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Well, it seems like a foregone conclusion that this Bill is going to pass today. I know the Governor came out in support of it and there was a press conference and there's bipartisan support. And the NCAA come out recently and flipped like cowards because of a little bit of pressure. But this is a sad day for amateur athletics. A very sad day. This is driving a knife, a dagger, right through the heart of amateur athletics. Which what is amateur athletics about? It's about experience. It's about the experience of the athletic. Now we are inserting money into it. Now it's all... now it's going to be all about money. And we're creating an inequity. We're arguing that we are
removing an inequity. We are actually creating an inequity. It's a very sad day for amateur athletics, and where does it end? You know, we all support our high schools. We go to the gymnasium, we go to the football field, we see our top teams, we see our top athletes. Is it now wrong for the high schools to profit off the gate, off the admission? And the concessions and everything else that goes along with high school sports? Or are we eventually going to include high schools in this where they'll be able to profit? So, I think it's wrong. I think it's sad. With this vote today, it's clearly going to pass by the comments people are making. But with this vote today, you're inserting that dagger right in the heart of amateur athletics here in Illinois. So, for those of you who support the amateur athletes, it's a very sad day."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Keicher."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Keicher: "Representative, thank you for bringing this Bill. I know we had a little bit of an opportunity yesterday to discuss this. And some of the concerns that were raised in committee, I just kind of want to revisit today to get into the record. As I think was pretty evident during the discussion, one of my biggest concerns is the timing on this. We've had all of 30 days to consider that and look at the issue. And there are some underlying concerns that were raised this morning, and I think will continue to be raised in the future concerning implementation of this Bill. And so, I'd like to go over a those a little bit with you this morning. First, I have concerns with recruiting. If we have a small,
rural college looking to build their basketball program, trying to compete with Loyola and the Chicago metropolitan market and we have a car dealership sponsorship, say for $5 thousand in that small, rural town, and there's a Cadillac Jaguar dealer on up on the north shore of Chicago willing to throw down $75 thousand for a sponsorship of an athlete and his likeness, how do those small schools... how are they able to compete? How do we ensure that the recruiting doesn't weight towards those that are economically able? And how do we support our universities that are struggling to gather and retain good student athletes today?"

Welch: "Representative, as I said to you yesterday, I think you're selling your own community short. I think you represent a fine community. I think DeKalb is one of the best regional areas in our state."

Keicher: "I'm not speaking to my community in particular."

Welch: "I'm speaking to your community, Sir, because you're selling them short. And people like Jordan Lynch, one of the best athletes to come out of the South suburbs and go to DeKalb, could have benefited greatly and help supported that region economically, and supported those mom-and-pop shops, and supported those businesses. That's a beautiful region. Don't take it and sell it short, because people want to go to Northern."

Keicher: "Representative..."

Welch: "It's a great university."

Keicher: "...I don't think you're answering the question. Let's think of..."

Welch: "I'm answering the question."
Keicher: "...small, rural school. How are they going to have the economic wherewithal to be able to support this, compared to a Chicago metropolitan market?"

Welch: "Let me answer you this way. And you're..."

Keicher: "What about Knox College versus Loyola basketball programs?"

Welch: "I can't believe you're standing on this floor and arguing against the free market."

Keicher: "I didn't indicate which position I was taking on the Bill."

Welch: "Competition is good. And they're going to stay in Illinois."

Keicher: "Let's move forward because..."

Welch: "The goal is to keep them in Illinois."

Keicher: "...we're on limited. Who do you intend to have oversight of this so that we can record what the sponsorships are, where they're coming from, what they're going to, and that we're making sure that there's no shady characters that are involved in the process in a gambling scheme, or an under the table scheme?"

Welch: "Well, I think right now, if you follow college sports, you already know that shady things are going on. I think..."

Keicher: "Understand, but as a state institution where we're legalizing this, how do we ensure that we have oversight of the program once implemented?"

Welch: "I think this Bill helps clean a lot of that up. Number one, there's a provision in the Bill that requires the athletes to disclose to the universities these potential deals so that they can be vetted to make sure they're not in
conflict with contracts already in existence with the universities. Secondly, as I mentioned to you yesterday in committee, that I was working on a Bill that I filed after committee, House Bill 3941, that will require agents to be regulated in this state. We want to make sure those agents are regulated and registered. We know who they are. And they're going to follow some strict guidelines. We're working with the Uniform Law Commission already who's reached out to make sure…"

Keicher: "So, what is the entity that will be responsible for oversight? Help me understand whose purview that falls under."

Welch: "Well, each university will have some responsibility for that."

Keicher: "So, we will allow the university? Do we then run into any Title IX concerns with the university controlling, monitoring, or governing where these dollars are flowing to and from?"

Welch: "You also heard me say, yesterday, because the Illinois Board of Higher Education who supports this initiative, that I would be willing to sit down with them as well since we have until 2023 to also address this issue."

Keicher: "Help me understand how we ensure parity across sports programs, parity across men's and women's sports, and parity across a team. The quarterback's going to get the incentive deals. What are we going to deal about the third line cornerback who's got nothing?"

Welch: "So, since I've filed this Bill on September 30, I've lost track of the number of people that have reached out to me."
I've spoken to attorneys, and agents, and parents, and athletes in California, New York, New Jersey, Washington, D.C. and I can tell you one of the things that excites them the most is that a law like this would allow them to sign up entire teams. And you know who would have benefited from that? That Loyola Ramblers men's basketball team. Not one single student went on to the next level. But that was a great team."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative. Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Yield my time to Representative Keicher, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Five minutes is yielded to Representative Keicher. Please proceed, Representative."

Welch: "That was a great team. That could've been signed up as a group, and they all would have benefited as a group. But the only people that benefited from that Loyola team was Loyola."

Keicher: "And you and I have spoken, especially last spring, about my concerns with money in high... or college athletics. Especially with removal of 20 week limitation on severance for college coaches. So, the other question I have for you is, how do we ensure that we aren't creating an athletics over academics environment in our state institutions of higher learning?"

Welch: "Well, I don't remember putting anything in the Bill that required changing the academic eligibility requirements."

Keicher: "So, if we conceivably have a college athlete who's bringing in bucks and bringing in attention and they are performing at a lower academic standard, are there any repercussions within the Bill to ensure that we have athletes that are going to colleges to actually learn something and go
on and prosper in their life, so that when we have a Loyola team that doesn't secure any professional sports after college, we've ensured that they've had a good education to be able to provide for their family for generations to come?"  
Welch: "There's nothing in this Bill that reduces the academic eligibly requirements of student athletes."

Keicher: "Okay. And as I understand it, most state universities, today, offer scholarships to these students that are able to help support their food and their living standards above what we saw a couple years ago. Can you confirm for me that scholarships are received tax free by the athletes today?"

Welch: "Scholarships are received tax free by all students. And..."

Keicher: "Okay. Can you help me understand that any dollars earned here would be taxable earned income, correct?"

Welch: "That is correct."

Keicher: "Okay. 'Cause there was an issue raised in committee yesterday that said any dollars raised through this program would need to be offset on the scholarship side, but that would create a taxable impact of the student athlete, correct?"

Welch: "I don't agree with offsetting scholarships."

Keicher: "I don't either, and I just want to make sure we're on the same page of that. We don't have any intention in the current Bill of offsetting any scholarship received by a student athlete for any money received for a dollar support under this Bill, correct?"

Welch: "We don't offset the scholarships of music students who make money, so I don't support offsetting scholarships. This
is income that they would have to pay taxes on and that's a fair thing to do."

Keicher: "Okay. And I want to close here by, again, suggesting with an implementation date of 2023, with us talking yesterday in committee that the NCAA was coming out with rules. My biggest concern is that we haven't vetted this issue within the 30 days it has been introduced to look and solve the underlying issues created by it. With that being said, I will be voting 'yes' on your Bill today. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Brady: "Thank you. Representative, yesterday in committee, as has already been spoken to, there was a number of questions that were asked, myself included. And one of the things I'm still a little confused over is the fact of what this may or may not do to the financial aid side of a student from their qualifications for financial aid with this additional income. How is that going to be dealt with?"

Welch: "Well, I think it's two different issues. You're talking about a student on an athletic scholarship... this wouldn't impact their scholarship at all. It wouldn't impact anyone else's scholarship either. Financial aid is financial aid. I mean, if revenue is used to determine a financial aid package... I didn't have a scholarship when I was in college. I was at Northwestern with a financial aid package based on my family's income. So, income is considered when determining financial aid."
Brady: "And so, this piece of legislation then would apply towards all sports. Is that correct? Not just the bigger, money generating sports of football or basketball for universities, correct?"

Welch: "Can you ask that question again? I'm sorry."

Brady: "Sure. This is legislation that is intended to apply to all sports, not just the major generator, revenue generator, of for instance, football, basketball, et cetera?"

Welch: "That is correct."

Brady: "And it is intended to apply to men and women's sports. Is that correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Brady: "Okay. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. My concerns yesterday are the same concerns that I still have today. The financial side, the regulation side, and the General Assembly entering into an area of college athletics and losing the focus of academics and creating the emphasis and the importance on the money and on the athletic side. I think that with the NCAA's most recent information that came out yesterday in plan, that those stakeholders, all stakeholders, should be at the table of something of this magnitude. So, with that, I intend to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Frese."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Frese: "Representative, I tend to like a lot of things about your Bill, but in conversation something came up that I didn't have the answer to so I said I'd ask the Sponsor."

Welch: "Yes, Sir."
Frese: "And one of the concerns was in regards to activities that a student athlete might perform in order to get themselves more notoriety, more publicity because... and sometimes any publicity is good publicity. Who's going to... will the NCAA and the NAIA still govern whether or not a student athlete can profit from an activity if it was... say it was an unsportsmanlike activity? Is that still in their realm?"

Welch: "The Bill, as written, would require disclosure to the universities to make sure that that proposed deal is not in conflict with the university contracts."

Frese: "I'm sorry. Help me out. Say that one more time, please."

Welch: "The way the Bill is written, the student athletes would have to disclose the proposed deals to the universities..."

Frese: "Okay."

Welch: "...so that they're vetted and not in..."

Frese: "Okay."

Welch: "...contradiction... in conflict with anything with the school district."

Frese: "So, a certain activity that maybe people might be familiar with. If I hide a Sharpie and sign a ball and throw it into the crowd and I get a flag for unsportsmanlike conduct, but Sharpie wants to pay me $20 thousand for my image because I used their Sharpie to sign the ball and throw it. Again, that is governed by the university? By NCAA? Or are they still allowed, no matter what, to accept that money."

Welch: "I think we also first have to make sure... in disclosing these agreements, they also have to be in compliance with those team contracts..."

Frese: "Okay."
Welch: "...that players have signed."
Frese: "Okay."
Welch: "Keep that in mind."
Frese: "Very good. Very good. So, the universities... in your estimation, the universities don't really then have a concern about this? They think they can govern that and everything will be fine?"
Welch: "I have not heard that expressed to me as a concern."
Frese: "Okay."
Welch: "Not by the universities."
Frese: "Okay. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Jones."
Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For nearly 40 years, the NCAA in full knowledge of universities around Illinois and around America, they have prostituted, pimped, and perversed the minds of college athletes. They've made money off college athletes. And now, the NCAA want to change course and say that we want to support the college athletes and give them the ability to use their likeness to make money. Now, listening to the discussion, many of you are adding things to this discussion that shouldn’t be. Amateurs will always have the ability to be involved in sports. Amateurs will always have the ability to go to college and also make a living for themselves. But we've got to think about the former athletes, who now, the NCAA are not envisioning. This fight started with... in the O'Bannon case, and he took the NCAA, not only to court to make sure that they weren't profiting off his likeness, but also he made sure that the field was level with the NCAA making money off of him and him not having the
ability to afford college. That's what many of our athletes in the State of Illinois are going through. They're coming from the West Side of Chicago. They're coming from all over the State of Illinois. And many of them are going to universities in our districts, and they can't afford college. This Bill levels that playing field and allows college athletes to not only have the ability to make money, but also the ability to control their own destiny. And I want to thank Representative Welch, not only for taking this Bill up, but I also want to remind you guys for the last three years I had a Bill that was filed that not only demanded and talked about universities and paying college athletes, making students college employees of the universities, and none of you said anything about that Bill. None of you said anything that this was a disgrace, that we had to do something about it, and now it's upon us. The NCAA, I don't trust them. So, if you think that the NCAA coming out saying that they're for this, and that they're going to make this right, and they're going to do right by college athletes, you guys have another thing coming. Let's look and follow the money and follow what the NCAA will do in the next year and we'll see if they're going to be on the side of righteousness. I don't trust that they will. This Bill will take us in the right direction to make sure that we hold their feet to the fire, and we keep the pressure on the NCAA. But please make sure that you... when you look at this Bill, you examine the real facts and how we need to do this to bring parity, to make sure that college athletes not only get what they deserve, but also that the universities make sure that they do right by the college athletes. So,
Representative Welch, I thank you not only for your leadership with this issue, but let's keep the fire on the NCAA and make sure that they do right by college athletes. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

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

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

Reick: "Representative, when a student athlete sign... goes and says, 'Hey, I'm going to play football for you, University', they sign a contract with the university to conduct themselves in certain ways. Is that not correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Reick: "Did you sign such a contract?"

Welch: "I did."

Reick: "Oh, okay. And in that contract, I'm assuming that there are clauses in there dealing with behavior detrimental to the program and all of those kind of things that would circumscribe any kind of activities that would happen off campus, that would identify that person as a member of a particular team?"

Welch: "That is... you agree to abide by a code of conduct on and off the field."

Reick: "Okay. And your Bill... if I read your Bill correctly, there is absolutely... there is an absolute prohibition of any type of identification of that athlete as a person who is, say, quarterback for the University of Illinois, selling whatever. He can't do it in his position as quarterback of the University of Illinois. He can do it as XYZ athlete who's got some name recognition because he threw for 500 yards against Northwestern."
Welch: "That's correct."

Reick: "Okay, very good. I am reading from the NCAA Website, right here, it... dealing with the particular actions they took yesterday. And it say... specifically, the board said, 'Modernization should occur within the following principles and guidelines.' First one, 'Assure student athletes are treated similarly to nonathlete students unless a compelling reason exists to differentiate.' Now, let's say you are the quarterback of my school's football team and I am a trombone player in the marching band. Is there anything in... do you know of any prohibition that me, as a trombone player in the marching band, has to go out and put my likeness on YouTube and sell trombones or to be a member of a jazz ensemble and get paid for it, even though my talents have been honed and developed in that university setting?"

Welch: "You know, it would depend on the contract that that trombone player signed to be a member of that band. Any of those..."

Reick: "Okay. So, they're going to sign a contract similar to what you signed, but with different requirements, because you're a student athlete and I'm a trombone player."

Welch: "Most of those contracts are pretty similar."

Reick: "Are pretty similar. But do you understand... is it your understanding... Our staff in indicated to me that there's nothing that prohibits a college musician from engaging in profit making activities off campus as a part of... doing the same thing they do for the university."

Welch: "I think that's a correct statement..."

Reick: "Okay, very good."
Welch: "...about the musician. Yeah."
Reick: "Pardon me?"
Welch: "I think that's a correct statement."
Reick: "Okay. So, what you're doing here is drawing what appears to be a very bright line between what a student athlete does within the conduct of his activities as a student athlete, and selling used cars at the local used car lot because his face is somewhat recognizable and he got a good deal on a Chevy."
Welch: "That's correct."
Reick: "Okay. This is something... let's make something here. To the Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."
Reick: "To the Bill. If you get recruited to play quarterback at the University of Alabama, Clemson, University of Georgia... go Dawgs... you're going there to further your education as a football player. Let's not pretend... let's not put a... some sort of a cover over this. Yeah, these kids are expected to go to class. They're expected to get an education, and by God, I wish they would do it because it's an opportunity that very few of us have. But if you're going to the University of Alabama to play quarterback, you're learning to be a professional football player. So, to... for the NCAA to, in effect, subsidize an unpaid minor league system for the National Football League, or the Major League Baseball, or NBA, while telling these student athletes that they cannot do something other than what they do on the field to help subsidize their families and their education, I think is a
little crazy. So, I strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Demmer: "Thank you. Representative, yesterday in our brief stairwell conversation, I asked a question about the limitation on the scope of the type of contract that a student athlete may be able to enter into as a part of one of these endorsements. Is there any limitation of that in the language that's presented today?"

Welch: "I think the protection in the language today... there's two protections. One, the requirement to disclose to the universities the contract to make sure it's not in conflict with a university contract. I think that's a protection that addresses the issue. I also think the regulations regarding agents is going to be one of those protections that will really help guide this issue."

Demmer: "I appreciate that and, you know, I know it's been mentioned a couple times, the implementation date of this Bill is a couple years away. I hope we can continue to work on to ensure that we're not putting student athletes in a potentially, you know, disadvantageous position where they may enter into or sign away their rights to their own image or likeness for a very long period of time. Or enter into the types of endorsements that if they end up, you know, transferring schools, could have a negative financial impact on them. Things like that. You know, a lot of times if you're a freshman who's just getting into college, just getting out
striking out on your own, and somebody comes before you and says, you know, hey, here's a couple thousand dollars in exchange for you signing away every piece of personal image and likeness that you have for the remainder of your life. You could see a lot of people doing that out of hopes that, you know, if I sign a thousand of these contracts maybe one of them will really shoot up and, you know, make it worth it for everybody else. I think we want to make sure that as we continue to develop these rules that we have some consumer protections in place knowing that we're talking about people in many cases who will have just attained the age of being able to enter into contracts. And this might be the very first contract that they will ever have to evaluate in their lives. And that's... a lot of times, some of these skills or ways of thinking about it develop over time. So, I look forward to continue to work with you. I'm going to be supportive of the Bill today and just look forward to continuing to, as the NCAA progresses in what their regulations will be, and as this Body can continue to evaluate what types of restrictions or limitations, if any, we want to place on this. But I appreciate you bringing this Bill and I encourage a 'yes' vote."

Welch: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representatives, we have Representative Zalewski, Davidsmeyer, Bailey, Butler, and Wehrli. Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. Just to remind the Body that they should be under no illusions about the sacrosanctness of the NCAA and amateur athletics. Last year,
this Body... that spring, this Body allowed the NCAA to apply for and get monies from official league data when we authorized sports betting in Illinois. And there was no discussion about amateurism and no discussion about whether these kids were going to, you know, be able to play and who... what kids were going to be able to be the quarterback versus the third line offensive lineman. The NCAA stuck out its hand and said, where's mine? So, we need to grow up in the 21st century when it comes to these things because these young athletes are putting their bodies on the line. They're coming and they're doing things that, quite frankly, if the universities profiting off of, they should be compensated too. I stand in enthusiastic support for the Gentleman's Bill. I think he's on the right track, and I think this Bill should get to the Governor's desk as soon as possible and get enacted. Thank you, Representative. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'ell yield."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. Couple questions. When... in dealing with this, I'm a little bit conflicted because I see the open market, and I want free markets, and I want people to be able to benefit from their talents. On the other side, I think of my experience in my business, and I have a family business. When we were doing transition for it, they asked us if we were a business family or a family business. What comes first? And we said family first, right? Our employees are... always come first. And so, when I think about a student athlete, I'm concerned... I have concerns that this will be the impetus for
creating athlete students instead of student athletes. And I think the goal of higher education is to provide an education. I think the opportunity provided for these athletes is that scholarship, that room and board. Now, where I agree with you is that I believe that they should be able to receive some form of stipend to be... you know, if they want a pizza on a Friday night, I think they should be able to get a pizza on a Friday night and not have to worry about asking mom and dad who may not be able to afford that. So, you know, my concern is that the athletics becomes number one over the education. And I think we're seeing that already a little bit. But the other concern that I have is... are these superstars... and frankly, they're going to be superstars eventually anyway, probably in the NFL, NBA, wherever they end up going. Are they required to share any of the profits with those members of their team that they do not... that do not have these contracts? Maybe a lineman that doesn't have the notoriety that the quarterback may have. Are they required to share some of these benefits with those members of their team?

Welch: "Let me answer that two ways. Number one, it's not a mandate in the Bill. We didn't require it. But any good quarterback knows you take care of your line. You want to make sure those blocks are there for you."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you're allowing to do that out of the goodness of their heart?"

Welch: "Well, number one..."

Davidsmeyer: "Which is what good people do."

Welch: "But also, in the conversations I've had with the experts who do this, the practice is going to be... they're going to
sign a lot of these teams as a group, and they're going to share the wealth. And I have to rely on the folks that do this for a living and agree that that is going to be a great concept."

Davidsmeyer: "So, like I said, I have concerns about this. I'd like to see... and since this isn't going into effect until 2023, correct?"

Welch: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm trying to figure out what the veto emergency is to get this done this first week of veto other than maybe a press release."

Welch: "This is bigger than a press release, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Welch: "All due respect, one of the reasons I talked about at the very beginning is about recruitment. This is the Law in California. They have a conference called the Pac-12. They're in living rooms right now recruiting the next athletes. We need to be able to recruit and compete with them."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, their law doesn't go into effect until 2023 either."

Welch: "But it's on the books. Let's put ours on the books."

Davidsmeyer: "They've got a lot of laws on the books that I pray to God we do not pass in this state. But let me go back. I think this is going to pass. I'm not opposed to the idea overall, I just think it needs refined. I will say that I have concerns at the educational level. When we have D3 schools that cannot even give athletic scholarships, right, they cannot even give out athletic scholarships, and a lot of times those scholarships would go to those most in need. These
kids that may not have done the best in high school, but they can provide an opportunity to go to an institution of higher education, maybe a smaller school where they would get the closer, one-on-one attention that they need. And we're focusing on people making money as opposed to people being able to get an education and move ahead and be better in life. I hope that we can work together on something possibly with the NCAA to provide opportunities for D3 schools for provide these same opportunities, and maybe just on the scholarship side. Thank you."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, can I respond to that? Because this is also about eligibility. If an athlete, a student athlete, wants to make money, they could lose their eligibility. And I'm aware of a D3 golfer. His team was a week away from playing in the championship. And this D3 golfer wrote a book about the summer between his senior year in high school and his freshman year of college. And when the NCAA heard he was about to publish his book, they suspended his eligibility and he didn't get to play the next week in his team's championship golf tournament. This D3 golf player. This is about eligibility. It's about the right thing to do. And it's going to apply in all 3 divisions, and that's why the NCAA did what they did yesterday."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bailey."

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

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

Bailey: "Thank you. Representative Welch, I have a question for you I couldn't get an answer to back here. I'm just curious. These sponsorships, these endorsements, how are they handled
tax wise? Are there... is there any tax deductibility to the company, the corporation, the person who's making these sponsorships?"

Welch: "The person who is earning the money, or..."

Bailey: "No, no. So, I understand the student that's going to be collecting the money will be paying taxes. What about the entity that is making these endorsements and paying this? Is there a tax deductibility for that company, the person, or the individual? That... they're making them... they're signing a contract to the person, and there's no... they're just... they're making this expenditure, but they're the company, there's no... they're not able to deduct their taxes or is there a deduction that's going to be allowed for this?"

Welch: "I don't see any reason, Representative, why this would be treated any differently than if that entity had a Bulls player or a Cardinals player come out. However they're treating that Bulls' player and sponsor... Cardinals' player, that's how they're going to treat the college student athlete. Same thing with the local weather man on TV. If they're paying that person to sponsor, however they're... that's addressed currently, is how it would address the college student athlete."

Bailey: "All right, thank you. To the Bill. I just... as I've heard here on the floor, too, I'd wish Illinois would set an example. And if we're going to teach free market capitalism, let's up the ante and let's do a better job of that in the classroom instead of on the court or on the field. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Butler."
Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor."
Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."
Butler: "Chris, good morning."
Welch: "Good morning."
Butler: "Can you tell me what your batting average was for the Northwestern Wildcats?"
Welch: "You're going to make me do that on TV?"
Butler: "Please."
Welch: "I was a better runner than hitter."
Butler: "So, it's safe to say that you probably weren't going to get an endorsement deal for the Northwestern Wildcats, huh?"
Welch: "No, I think they were looking at Mark Loretta and not me."
Butler: "Okay. I just... a couple things I want to add is to Representative Zalewski's point earlier about amateurism and where we're at on today. I mean, we can kid ourselves about amateurism, but the Olympics went well beyond amateurism a long time ago. We have travel teams for kids that are six, and seven, and eight years old that travel throughout the year to play sports. I have an athlete in my district who's an eighth grade basketball player that just got a D1 scholarship offer as an eighth grader for basketball. So, we can talk all we want about amateurism, but I think we've gone beyond the pale on that. Chris, I do have a couple questions though. Are there any prohibited sources of revenue for athletes?"
Welch: "That would be covered in the team's contract. I got to imagine that you're talking about things like strip clubs and..."
Butler: "Exactly."
Welch: "...cigarettes, sin products..."
Butler: "So, can FanDuel sponsor the starting quarterback?"
Welch: "Again, if it's not in conflict with the university's contract, yes."
Butler: "So, we could have a... you know, in Illinois, under sports betting we can't bet on Illinois teams, but you can go across the state line now and bet on them in Indiana. So, if an Indiana sports book wanted to sponsor the quarterback for the University of Illinois, they probably could."
Welch: "Yes, but they wouldn't be able to use the University of Illinois' name. They would use..."
Butler: "Okay. And that also would be the same for... so for athletes under the age of 21, could Anheuser Busch or Juul or something like that sponsor one of the athletes who are under 21?"
Welch: "I believe sin products are covered in team contracts code of conduct."
Butler: "Well, I think to the point that's been brought up several times so far today..."
Welch: "But we can clarify that."
Butler: "Yeah. I think... obviously, this doesn't go into effect until '23. I would assume there's going to be more legislation on this. I think there's some legitimate issues that have come up on things like this. I don't want to see a kid who's 19, you know, out there promoting Juul as the quarterback for Eastern Illinois University or something like that. So, I think that's things we've got to take a look at. I do have some concerns about especially the gaming aspect of this, and how they might sponsor kids. But I think you... we've had this
conversation, I think you're going in the right direction. I'm in full support of this. I think this is the right thing to do, so thanks for bringing this forward. And I'm going to be a 'yes' vote."

Welch: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Hoffman: "Final speaker, Representative Wehrli."

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

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

Wehrli: "Thank you. Representative, thanks for bringing this Bill forward. I'm inclined to support your Bill. And we sort of touched on this in some earlier debate, but I want to just get a little bit of clarification. Is there any language in your Bill that allows or disallows the compensation of a student athlete based on single game or season performance? So, if they, you know, pass for a hundred yards against Michigan, can they be compensated for that? Or if they run triple-doubles for the season, can they be compensated for that? Is there any language in your Bill that addresses actual athletic performance?"

Welch: "I would have to imagine if it's not addressed by the university contract already, it will be."

Wehrli: "It will be by us in a trailer Bill or it will be by the NCAA?"

Welch: "No, I'm talking about more specifically within school contracts and university contract that athletes sign. But, certainly again, with us having this conversation globally anyway, I'd be happy to have a further conversation with you about it."
Wehrli: "Okay. I'm going to support your Bill, but I am concerned about maybe incentives for performance or lack thereof would be, you know, that's just a concern going forward. But this goes into effect '23, I believe."

Welch: "Yes."

Wehrli: "So, I think that's something we can work out. I'll be supporting your Bill."

Welch: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welch, to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members of the House. I appreciate this great discussion we had here this morning. Before I close close, I want to just first thank our Governor. I want to thank Governor Pritzker for being a leader on this issue and help making Illinois a national leader. I want to thank his team who helped give him a lot of the information to help him make that decision. But I really want to take a moment right now to thank this Gentleman on my right. Representative Jones has been fighting on this issue, as he said earlier, for years. And we're here today, I'm standing on this man's shoulders, because of the work that he's put in. And both of our names are on that board for a reason, because this is a team effort. This is a team effort. It takes more than one person to get anything done. And I want to thank him for paving the way for these student athletes. I want to thank Senator Napoleon Harris, one of the best linebackers to ever come out of Northwestern, and who is a posterchild on this issue, who had this same issue in the Senate, leading the way and being a champion for student athletes. I want to thank our Speaker who understands why this is important to
address now. The Speaker has supported this from the day I asked if we can debate this in Veto Session. So, I have to thank him for that. But I also have to thank this guy here on my left, who I know I've driven crazy the last month, researching and getting all the facts, and that's Paul Schroter on our staff. These are the ones that are not celebrated. They're doing all the work. I want to thank Paul. Thank you so much for all the work you put in on this. And as I close, I want to just bring home a couple of points. This is the right thing to do today because it's about equity and fairness. If that music student can go to the bars on weekends and raise money and get by in college, why can't that student athlete? I got to tell you, when I played baseball at Northwestern, we practiced at 6 a.m. We left practice and went to class. We went to class and went back to practice. We left practice and went to mandatory weight training. And sometimes, when we were done, the cafeteria was closed. That meal plan that was part of our plan, was no longer accessible. And for someone like me who couldn't even get home, which was just 45 minutes away… I didn't have money. There were many days where I didn't even eat a meal because of a situation like that. And there's many student athletes who are on scholarship just trying to make it just like that music student, and they shouldn't be treated any different. This is also about being on par with California. This is truly a recruitment thing as well. But what people aren't talking about is why the recruitment is so important. We have fought for the last few years to bring our universities back to another level. And we know from the data that if we get the
students in our universities, that at a 92 percent rate, they stay here. They buy homes, they raise families, and they pay taxes. This is very much an economic development tool. This is about lifting up our Illinois economy. Get these kids here. Get them to stay here. Make them pay taxes and help us lift up that economy. Equity and fairness. Recruitment, retention, attraction. This is good policy. I don't see any reason why anyone wouldn't support this. But if you don't, I truly respect that decision because there are people that have a firm belief on their issue. But I ask on this nonpartisan issue, that this Bill that's strongly supported in a bipartisan way, that we send a message to the NCAA that this is the right thing to do, and they need to get on this train that has left the station. I ask for an 'aye' vote here today."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3904 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, House Bill 3888. What is the status of this Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3888 is on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please move this Bill back to Second Reading for a purpose of an Amendment. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3888, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day."
Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Mayfield, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield, on Floor Amendment #2."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. Amendment #2 just changes the effective date of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3888. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3888, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Wehrli excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect. Representative Mayfield on House Bill 3888."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. House Bill 3888, as many of you know, has had a lot of conversations this past week. This Bill deals with ethylene oxide and its emissions. What we are trying to do is to address a public health safety risk. Ethylene oxide is a Class A carcinogen, and we know in Lake County that we have a serious problem. We are asking everyone that stood up for Sterigenics when they were poisoning that community to please stand with us on this Bill, because we have a similar issue in my district. I'll take any questions."
Speaker Hoffman:  "Representative Connor."
Connor:  "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman:  "Again, we will have a five minute time limit. The Sponsor will yield."
Connor:  "Representative, you and I have had some conversations on this Bill, and is it your intention to continue to negotiate this Bill on the Senate side expecting that there will be changes to some of the restrictions prior to it coming back?"
Mayfield:  "Yes, there was a conversation... there was a company that we have been trying to reach out to, but have not been successful in getting language from them. I did receive a call from their representative this morning who told me that they would have that language ready and that... and I did give him... I told him that we would review the language, work with him, and that we would amend it in the Senate."
Connor:  "Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman:  "Representative Demmer."
Demmer:  "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman:  "She indicates she'll yield."
Demmer:  "Thank you. Actually building on this previous question, have you identified a Senate Sponsor for the Bill?"
Mayfield:  "Yes."
Demmer:  "Who's the Senate Sponsor?"
Mayfield:  "Your Leader Senator."
Demmer:  "Senator Curran?"
Mayfield:  "Yes."
Demmer:  "And have you had conversations with him about the plan to amend it in the Senate?"
Mayfield: "I have not, but Jen Walling with the IEC has, and we will definitely be moving forward with an Amendment. This was an Amendment that... for this particular company, that we had been talking about for, I'm going to say over a couple weeks. But we just have not been able to get with the correct representative to get the language. We have been... I know I have had several conversations with the Teamsters Union saying, you know, I'm happy to amend the Bill for them, and that we will... just get me the language and we will address it. And as I said, I did not receive a phone call saying that they would get me that language until this morning. So, I am...."

Demmer: "So, you're waiting on new proposed language from Teamsters? Anybody else?"

Mayfield: "No, no, no, not from the Teamsters, but from the company themselves."

Demmer: "Okay."

Mayfield: "The Teamsters are just part of that company."

Demmer: "Is there a potential Amendment in the Senate that would... that you would support, that would allow Medline to continue operating its facility if they use ethylene oxide?"

Mayfield: "I guess I don't understand the question."

Demmer: "Is there a potential Amendment that you would support that would allow Medline to continue operating its facility and still use ethylene oxide under any circumstance?"

Mayfield: "I haven't seen any language. I've had several conversations with Medline, and so far they've offered me nothing. So, to say that I would support an Amendment, specifically for Medline, when Medline themselves have not
asked for anything, I just can't commit to that. I need to see what they'd be willing to give me. And I've asked several times. They've given me nothing."

Demmer: "And I understand, you know, and we also... you know, we make a distinction between having some debates about the concept and then looking at specific language, and it's always good to pay attention to specific language. I'm just asking as a concept, is there a circumstance that you would support in which Medline would continue to operate if they used ethylene oxide?"

Mayfield: "I can't commit because they've given me nothing."

Demmer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "To the Bill. Right now, there are families in Lake County who are living with the consequences of our failure to take effective action against the dangers of ethylene oxide emissions. I spoke with one of those families this morning, and they asked me to share their story. It's a mother and her son. Her name is Dawn Dolcimascolo. She lives in my district in Waukegan. She has a three-year-old son who was diagnosed with leukemia. They live less than one mile from a facility that has been emitting dangerous levels of ethylene oxide into the air. We know that ETO is a mutagen, and it causes diseases like leukemia that Sam Dolcimascolo is suffering from today. We are already too late for Sam. They feel like they have lost the last three and a half years of their life, and that they cannot get that back. Sam suffers with sores on his body and sores in his mouth. He is subjected to intense and painful therapies. They feel like no one else should have
to suffer the way Sam has suffered. When I spoke to Dawn, I told her that I am sorry that we did not find out about this sooner. It is too late for us to go back in time and take the action we should've taken long ago to protect kids like Sam from poison that is being emitted into the air. A chemical that can go through walls. They are not safe in their home. They are not safe in their schools. They are not safe anywhere they go. So, this Bill today is very, very important to people like Sam, people throughout Lake County, because they deserve to clean... to breathe clean air just like anybody else in our states. Earlier this year, we took action on a Bill designed to ensure that the people of Willowbrook have the right to breathe clean air. The people of Waukegan, the people of Gurnee, and the people of Park City, their lives matter just as much the people of Willowbrook. So, I am asking you today, please vote 'yes'. Please vote 'yes' on the right for everybody, even the people in Waukegan, and Gurnee, and Park City, to breathe clean air. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
Speaker Hoffman: "State your inquiry."
Batinick: "What is the effective date and vote requirement?"
Speaker Hoffman: "It's my understanding that there's 60 votes that are needed. The Amendment changed the effective date. There is no effective date."
Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Carroll."
Carroll: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I heard a lot of conversations around this Bill. I heard a lot of
people that were very disappointed and upset, and we had a lot of things going on in this chamber yesterday. One of the things that kept me up last night was when the conversation went around money, and profits, and what potential financial impacts closing facilities like this would have. We are talking about a cancer causing agent that is killing people. And if even the conversation of profits and financial impact is more important than that, then I'm beside myself on that one. I cannot believe that that would even be part of this conversation. People are dying. People are getting cancer. How many times are we going to see something like this happen before we stop and take action? So, I applaud Representative Mayfield for this Bill. I applaud her colleagues for all the work on it. And I strongly encourage a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Davis: "Thank you very much, and I'll try to be very brief. Representative, in lieu of this Bill passing out of this chamber and going over to the Senate, you indicated that you are open to continuing the dialogue and working on this Bill, correct?"

Mayfield: "That is correct. That has been my assertion from day one when we filed the Bill. I did my best to reach out and ask for suggestions, language changes, what will make it better for this company versus that one. And to date, I've received nothing."

Davis: "Understood. So, if I believe a previous conversation that I had just today, outside of this chamber, it's my
understanding that you're going to get language as this Bill travels over to the Senate. Now, I'm not asking you to commit to anything because you don't know what the language looks like, and I can appreciate that. But for the record, we know that intent... you will work on the Bill. You will review language and see what that language is, and you will, presumably... if the language is palatable, you will, you know, possibly amend this Bill relative to the language that you receive."

Mayfield: "Right, as long as it doesn't change the intent of the Bill. Correct."

Davis: "And then what would you say your intent of the Bill is?"

Mayfield: "We want to make sure we're... let me be very clear, I'm not trying to close down any businesses. I am asking them, if they're close to a school or a day care, to move to a... to move their facility, just the sterilization facility, away from that school or day care. I am asking that they reduce their emissions to an acceptable level to where they are not creating a public health crisis."

Davis: "Do we know what that is? Because it's my understanding, when I talked to EPA director, he said that there really are no published standards, state or federal, relative to what that level is."

Mayfield: "But we do..."

Davis: "So, when do you say to a certain level, do you know what that is?"

Mayfield: "We do have recommendations that we've been operating off of, and those are the recommendations... we have them from the Illinois EPA, as well as from the U.S. EPA. What...
recommendations, but they are not requirements. So, there are recommended limits. Under the previous legislation that was filed, I believe it was .2, was it .2 ccp? I need the exact language, I'm sorry. It's parts per billion. House Bill... I'm sorry... Senate Bill 1852 established a standard at .2 ppb. And I would just like to say that Medline is dramatically over that limit. They are 500 times the limit."

Davis: "Five hundred times that limit?"

Mayfield: "Yes."

Davis: "Okay."

Mayfield: "The limit that was set."

Davis: "Okay. So, if their language suggests that they will reduce their emissions to that level at their current facility, is that the type of language you're looking for?"

Mayfield: "Well, the issue with Medline is not just their emissions, but the fact that they are right next to a preschool. So, they need to move."

Davis: "They're next to a preschool?"

Mayfield: "They're next to a preschool. And the emissions, because we took the... we tested the air quality around that, and it is substantially higher than that .2. So, they've created a public health risk for those children. So, we would actually have to... Medline would be reviewed a little bit differently than, let's say a company in Southern Illinois."

Davis: "Okay. But..."

Mayfield: "...that is not next to a school."

Davis: "I know you wanted to move them away from schools and day cares, but I didn't realize they were, say, right next to a school. And I don't know what that distance is, but..."
Mayfield: "It's less than a mile."
Davis: "Less than a mile from a school?"
Mayfield: "Right. You could probably walk to the preschool from Medline."
Davis: "Okay. Without getting into which came first, Medline or the school but, again, you want then to reduce their standards to a certain point but, at the very least, you still are suggesting that they move... move their facility."
Mayfield: "Right. Medline has multiple plants within the area and in other municipalities as well. Their sterilization is in Waukegan. And that particular plant houses less than fifty people. So, we're just asking them... and I've offered to help them to find a suitable place because I'm not asking them to close. I'm saying we can help you find land because we do have land in north Chicago and other areas that would meet this criteria, that would not require them to pick up and move their equipment too far away."
Davis: "So, very quickly..."
Mayfield: "So, I'm willing to work with them. Again, they've given me nothing."
Davis: "...in addition to lowering their emissions, you still want that facility to move."
Mayfield: "That particular one."
Davis: "Can the local jurisdiction require them to move?"
Mayfield: "I'm sorry."
Davis: "Can the local jurisdiction require them to move?"
Mayfield: "What local jurisdiction?"
Davis: "Is this... wherever they are... Waukegan, I think you said they were. Can Waukegan require them to move?"
Mayfield: "No, not that I'm aware of. They could probably deny them their permit."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis, do you need more time or could you bring your remarks to a close?"
Davis: "If I... maybe just a minute or somebody..."
Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hernandez gives you five minutes."
Davis: "Okay. So, when I say the local jurisdiction, I'm talking about the local municipality. Where they're located, can they require them to simply move their facility away from that daycare? Is that something that we have to legislate?"
Mayfield: "No, I don't believe so."
Davis: "You don't think they can. Okay. All right."
Mayfield: "No, because they couldn't do it in Willowbrook, so I don't believe they can do it in Waukegan."
Davis: "Okay. Maybe they can... you know, and maybe you've talked to them, maybe you haven't talked to them. I don't think the city of Waukegan has weighed in on this Bill."
Mayfield: "Actually, let me be very clear, the City of Waukegan paid for the air quality testing because we asked the Illinois Department of Public Health multiple times when they were doing the testing in Willowbrook. We said, hey, we have a health crisis here. Can you come to Waukegan? Please stop ignoring us. And they refused to bring those canisters. So, the City of Waukegan actually paid for the study in and conjunction with the Lake County Health Department. That's how come we know how high the emissions are in Lake County."
Davis: "All right. And I appreciate them participating in that."
Mayfield: "Yes."
Davis: "That's why I'm wondering if they determined that there was a health hazard. If the Lake County Department of Public Health has determined as such, I'm just wondering versus a Bill here to do it, whether or not that's something, as a municipality, they can legislate on behalf of their residents."

Mayfield: "I don't believe they feel that that they have the ability to do that."

Davis: "They feel they don't have the ability? Okay. So again, language..."

Mayfield: "I do have the support of several aldermen."

Davis: "...language notwithstanding then... because again, there's some concern about giving you the opportunity to pass this Bill out if there's going to be language in the Senate. But it sounds like there really isn't any language that's going to do what you wanted..."

Mayfield: "No one has given me any language yet. But that doesn't mean I'm not open. I've said it over and over again, show it to me. Give me something I can work with. Because right now, nobody has given me anything."

Davis: "But the clarity of..."

Mayfield: "They've lobbied heavily against the Bill..."

Davis: "Right."

Mayfield: "...and saying that they don't want to do anything, but that's not an option. That is absolutely not an option."

Davis: "But the clarity of your ask for language is that you still feel that language needs to follow the intent, which is ultimately to require a facility to move a specified distance away from a school or day care. Would that be fair?"
Mayfield: "That part is correct."
Davis: "Okay. So..."
Mayfield: "Or to... yeah. That part would be correct."
Davis: "...so language notwithstanding, if it doesn't follow the intent of what you're hoping to accomplish with the Bill in its current form, then I don't know if they'd... I don't know if you're going to be able to get language."
Mayfield: "Offer me an alternative. Then they would need to offer me an alternative, something I can live with. And right now, nobody has offered anything. So, I can't really deal in what if's and maybe's. I need actual language. You know, because it's not fair to me, it's not fair to my constituents to say, well if we do this, then that, or if this. No, I can't deal in if's. I need something more."
Davis: "Okay. Well, it's my understanding that you are going to get language. I guess their concern is that if it... if language dealing with the emissions aspect of it does not suffice for you, relative... because we understand that ethylene oxide is..."
Mayfield: "That's a conversation. It's a conversation. And that nobody has been willing to have with me to date. So, I appreciate your questions but, again, I can't deal in what if's. And I've been very clear. Give me language, let's have a conversation. No one has given me language. So, I'm not going to commit to anything without some language."
Davis: "Okay. So... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."
Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."
Davis: "Let me just... because often, we offer that opportunity for Members to pass Bills knowing that there's going to be continued work done in the Senate. So, the Speaker... or the
Sponsor has said that she'd be willing to work on additional language. Now, what that language is going to look like, we don't know. I've not read any language. I understand you're going to get some. But I think maybe a concern though is that language is about trying to come to a compromise. So, if the challenge with ethylene oxide is the emissions aspect of it, then what can they offer you to... what will they be able to offer to address the emissions aspect of it? Because I understand if this plant were to go away, there's still ethylene oxide in the air because it comes from other sources, so I've been told. So, if that is the case, the question then becomes what language. Can they offer you to allow, possibly, a company such as this? Now, again, I'm not trying to minimize or discount any of the previous speakers that have talked about health challenges, those testimonies that we've heard from families, or anything as such. But when we know that it exists in the air, absent of the facility closing, I want... concerned about what language they're going to be able to offer you to address, you know, what you are trying to accomplish. So, for that reason, I think we'll give you the opportunity to pass it, and then hopefully that language will be strong enough that you'll be okay with it, and that that Bill can be amended in the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The final speaker is Representative Caulkins, and then we will close. Representative Caulkins."

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

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

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Representative Mayfield, we've focused this conversation on one particular plant in your
district. Does this Bill affect any other operations in Illinois?"

Mayfield: "This Bill affects Medline in my district, Vantage in Representative Mason's district, and we've recently found out about Step In, which is in the southern region, and those are... that was the company that I said that we were going to do the Amendment for. And then I believe there was one other one that we found out about just about yesterday. So, I don't have any information on that particular facility, which is why we said would be willing to work with them. Let us know what their issues are. What are their emissions? Where are they located in relative to schools and daycares? And let's see what we can do. But, short of that, Medline and Vantage are definitely a problem in my district, in the area."

Caulkins: "No, and I appreciate you looking out for your constituents. You know that this product is used in many, many different processes, particularly, in a corn refining process?"

Mayfield: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question."

Caulkins: "Do you understand that ethylene oxide is used in the processing of corn?"

Mayfield: "Of corn?"

Caulkins: "Yes, Ma'am."

Mayfield: "No, I did not. I was not aware."

Caulkins: "So, what we have in your Bill is you are attempting to regulate ethylene oxide to a level that is... essentially, outlaws it. And it's going to affect corn processors. Have you considered that? Obviously not. We have a great concern in my district..."
Mayfield: "Well, I was not approached by any corn processors, so I did not have that information. Again, this Bill has been out there for a minute. I've reached out to everyone that I was made aware of, so I'm not familiar with every single company within the State of Illinois."

Caulkins: "Well, in our district, and I share a district with Representative, another Representative, and we have a company called Tate & Lyle, and they process corn. The opinion of this company is that if your Bill were to pass as is and become law, that it would severely affect their ability to process corn."

Mayfield: "Why have they not reached out if that was the case? Why did they not reach out? My door's been open."

Caulkins: "Ma'am, I can't answer that question. I can only talk about... I guess your Bill and the stringent requirements that it puts on ethylene oxide. Does this Bill affect hospitals?"

Mayfield: "Yes, it does. And the hospitals are neutral."

Caulkins: "Well, neutral or not, it affects hospitals and their ability to use ethylene oxide to sterilize equipment."

Mayfield: "Hospitals sterilize reusable equipment, and they have successfully been able to move away from ETO with alternative methods. We do have health systems here in the State of Illinois that are 100 percent ETO free..."

Caulkins: "That's not true."

Mayfield: "...for their inter... no, yes. For their internal sterilization."

Caulkins: "Okay. So, you're using... Ma'am..."
Mayfield: "Not what they're buying and shipping in. You asked what hospitals affected, I'm answering your question. So, we do have hospitals."

Caulkins: "Representative, I feel you've twisted the question, because there is no hospital that is ethylene oxide free. Every hospital depends..."

Mayfield: "For their internal, we're talking internal."

Caulkins: "But there are..."

Mayfield: "We're not talking about the items that are shipped in."

Caulkins: "...surgical equipment that's used in hospitals that have to be cleaned with ethylene oxide in order for them to be sterilized enough to be used for many, many, very specific operations, knee replacements and things like that. There is no hospital ethylene oxide free, period. And I think... I guess one more question if I might, Representative Mayfield. The EPA, can they measure ethylene oxide at the levels of 30 pounds that your Bill requires? Can they measure that requirement? Can they enforce that? Do they have the equipment? Do they have the technology to measure ethylene oxide at that level?"

Mayfield: "To answer your question, it is not a measurement. It is a permitting process. So, it would include it in the permit."

Caulkins: "But how do we... Ma'am, how do we enforce that permit?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins..."

Mayfield: "That's up to the EPA."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. To the Bill."
Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Caulkins: "This Bill is overly restrictive. It is... makes it virtually impossible to use ethylene oxide in any process in the State of Illinois. It's going to have severe consequences. There is no question that ethylene oxide should be regulated. It is regulated. We passed the Bill to regulate it throughout the state, not just in one community in the spring. And I think that this Bill... and I understand that there's opportunities maybe to change it, but I object to passing a Bill that we have to depend on someone else to come to the table and make a change. And then it's going to have to come back here, and we're going to have to fix it. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "Okay. I was just notified by the Illinois Environmental Council that this Bill does not affect farming. So hopefully, that will address the Representative's question in regard to his corn processing. I would like to say... I'm going to ask my colleagues to please stand with me, to stand with the people in my district on this particular measure. I have children that are dying. It's just that simple. I have children that are dying. The number one cause of death in Cook County is heart disease. The number one cause of death in my community is cancer. Ethylene oxide is a Class A carcinogen. It is cancerous to people. Medline, which is in my district, has had multiple OSHA violations in regard to ethylene oxide. So, to say that they are responsibly handling this material would not be correct. They have OSHA violations, in addition to other safety violations. I am asking my colleagues to stand
with me and to please vote 'yes'. I've given my commitment that we will work on this language in the Senate for the company, definitely for Step In, and for any other manufacturer that comes to me and says, hey, you know what, can we work something out? How can this work for us or how can we meet the intent of your Bill, you know, and still be able to operate? My goal was to never to close down any business. I do want Medline to either look at alternative sterilization methods in their current location or to simply move their sterilization plant, which employs less than 50 people, to a less populated area. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3888 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McCombie, for what reason do you arise?"

McCombie: "Point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "State your point."

McCombie: "I would like just to take a moment to discuss House Joint Resolution 87. But before I begin with this, I would like to thank Representative West for his leadership and stepping up right away to... as a freshman especially, to join this as a cosponsor. The Joint State Ethics Task Force is to address corruption within Illinois government by putting together a nine Member, bipartisan, bicameral task force. Members of the task force shall serve with no compensation,
and we shall elect one cochair from each of the political party. This task force should not be a method to let all of this blow over, but to look at all of the Bills that are being generated collectively, and to come up with immediate action. Transparency in this process is very important. This should not be done in working groups behind closed doors. There should be roll taken. There should be minutes. The public should see what we are doing. I would also like to thank our chamber Leaders for their leadership and stating that we need to be reviewing the ethic rules and regulations within our House. I'm asking our Leaders to use HJR87 as the vehicle for us to review policies concerning conflicts of interest, our financial disclosures, and empowering investigative and enforcement authority to the appropriate entities. Please join me, join a lot of us, support HJR87. Thank you."


Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 391, a Bill for an Act concerning children. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 391, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a trailer Bill to the Children's Mental Health Crisis Bill that we passed last year. It was requested by the Hospital Association, the State Medical Society, and the Public Guardian. It has no opposition. It's very technical. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 391 pass?' All in favor say 'aye'... all in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Willis in the Chair."

Speaker Willis: "Okay. On to the page 4 of the... page 4, Senate Bill 1042, Representative McCombie, Second Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative McCombie."
McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. SB1042 extends a TIF in my home town of Savannah. We have all affected taxing districts have supplied letters of support and I ask for your support."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing nobody wishing to recognize for debate, the question is, 'Shall House... I'm sorry... Senate Bill 1042 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the roll. On a call of 99 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present', having the constitutional requirement, this Bill does... declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1200, Representative Hoffman. Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill would simply extend some sunsets on task forces and add legislative Leader's appointees to the Lime Disease Task Force. It would extend the Rare Disease Commission Act from January 1, 2000 to January 1, 2023. This is an initiative of Representative Harper who has been out front on this issue. I would also extend the Code of Criminal Procedure to extend the deadline for the Children of Incarcerated Parents Task Force to submit the report from 12/31/19 to 3/1/20, and would extend the Move Over Task Force that we passed last spring from 1/1/20 to 1/1/21. And would extend the task force sunset date to 1/1/22, I apologize. So, the report would be due 1/1/21. I ask for a favorable roll call."
Speaker Willis: "Seeing no one wishing to be recognized, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1200 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1797, Representative Gong-Gershowitz.

Second Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1797, a Bill for an Act concerning children. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Morgan."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz, on the Amendment."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an Amendment that becomes the Bill. And it's a trailer Bill to House Bill 1553 that passed last Session. I... just to move up the effective date a couple of months. The underlying Bill was the one that I passed to conform Illinois Law to Federal Law requiring our State Courts to make the findings of abusive, abandonment, and neglect for the Special Immigrant Juvenile visa. It passed with broad bipartisan support, so thank you for that, with 87 votes in House. This merely, like I said, moves up the effective date because it was brought to my attention after the Bill was signed into law that there were
some kids who could be helped if we were to make the Bill effective before January. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Okay. Representative, we need to first withdraw Amendment 1. So, can you please request that, and then you were talking about Amendment 2, so..."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Can we withdraw Amendment 1, please?"

Speaker Willis: "The Representative has asked for Amendment 1 to be withdrawn. So, withdrawn."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment 2 is offered by Representative Gong-Gershowitz and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Willis: "Representative, for the second Amendment, you've already gone through that?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes. The second Amendment is, like I said, just to move up the effective date two months."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz moves to adopt the Floor Amendment 2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1797, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz is recognized on the Bill."

Gong-Gershowitz: "So, as I explained earlier, the Bill passed with broad bipartisan support, and I just did not have an effective date on it. And it was brought to my attention from some lawyers working on cases that there were some kids who
would really benefit from having the effective date moved up a couple of months. So, I would just ask that we pass this so it's effective immediately."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick is recognized."
Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Willis: "Indicates she will."
Batinick: "Representative, so it looks like this Bill is a tweak, a trailer Bill, to House Bill 1553, correct?"
Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes, that's correct."
Batinick: "And I am looking at that Bill right now. For everybody on my side, House Bill 1553, looks like it has 87 'yes' votes, 18 'no' votes. Looks like a bipartisan mix. That would be House Bill 1553 for anybody interested. Is that correct?"
Gong-Gershowitz: "That is correct."
Batinick: "And you're just changing the effective date to immediate so that whatever this Bill does happens immediately instead of waiting until June?"
Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes, that's correct."
Batinick: "And give me one sentence on the what this Bill does again, please?"
Gong-Gershowitz: "Yeah. So, the underlying Bill conforms Illinois Law to Federal Law. Requiring our State Courts to make the findings of abuse, abandonment, and neglect, which is a prerequisite to filing an application for a Special Immigrant Juvenile Visa for our most vulnerable kids."
Batinick: "I think you exceeded my one sentence request, but I appreciate the additional time. Thank you."
Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further discussion on the Bill, Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."
Gong-Gershowitz: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1797 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all those voted... have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting in 'favor', 19 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on page 5, Senate Bill 1909, Representative Manley. Second Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1909, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Manley, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Manley, on the Floor Amendment, please."

Manley: "Thank you. The underlying Bill established a full time dementia coordinator position by Illinois Department of Public Health. This position will be responsible for implementing of the existing Alzheimer disease state plan and has no fiscal impact, as it's funded with existing dollars raised from an existing income tax check-off program. So, the trailer Bill, House Amendment #1, makes some technical corrections of sections that were eliminated by the original legislation. It clarifies permissible uses of revenue over what it costs to fund the dementia care coordinators position. And the trailer Bill is supported by the Illinois Alzheimer's
Association and the Illinois Department of Public Health. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Carroll, are you on the Amendment or would you rather wait for the Bill? Okay, Representative Manley moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1909. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1909, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Manley is recognized on the Bill."

Manley: "I'm willing to take any questions."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no one that wishes to be recognized, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1909 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 1 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carroll is recognized."

Carroll: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Just let the record reflect that I meant to vote 'yes' on SB1797. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "The record shall reflect. On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 188. Representative D’Amico, you are recognized."
D’Amico: "Thank you. Thank you, Speaker. I wish... thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur what House Bill 188 Amendment... Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Willis: "Can you please explain what the Amendment is, Sir?"

D’Amico: "Basically, the Amendment allows, when you go and rent a car, to use an electronic license or a digital one."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 188?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify 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 this question, there are 112 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 188. Representative Stava-Murray, for what do you wish to be recognized?"

Stava-Murray: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to correct the record for SB1042 and be recorded as a 'no' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The record shall reflect. Thank you. Chamber will be at ease for a few minutes. On page 3 of the Calendar, Second Reading, Senate Bill 115. Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 115, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
Speaker Willis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 115, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Willis: "Representative Rita on Senate Bill 115."
Rita: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 115 is an initiative that affects a hospital closure in my district. It does two components. It creates a freestanding emergency license. And it also locks in the transformation funding that was allocated just for that hospital, which was formally known as Metro South. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
Speaker Willis: "Representative Demmer is recognized."
Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."
Demmer: "Representative Rita, we had a good discussion in committee about this Bill just yesterday. And at that time, we talked about some of the concerns I had with the Bill. We voted to get it out of committee and support it coming to the floor. But one of the real requests was that we continue to have some conversations with HFS. Have you been able to talk to folks at HFS?"
Rita: "I've been in... waiting to sit down to talk with them. They've sent some proposals over, but they were all sent over today and what I'd like to do is keep this process going. And their alternative language really didn't do much to changing what the goal of this is, is to allow for a freestanding emergency room, and have that funding tied to it."
Demmer: "Yeah, and I appreciate, and I think we... I mentioned in committee that a portion of this that applies to allowing
that site to reopen as a freestanding emergency center, I think is a good move. It gives them another option. Helps provide another avenue through which services could be delivered in that community and, hopefully, find somebody who could come in as an operator there. The part that I... and I brought this up in committee. The part that I'm concerned about is this Bill would dedicate funding that's currently going to... or that was going to the hospital on that location, under the Hospital Assessment Program. It would dedicate this money to whoever opened a new facility there in future years through, I believe, is it Fiscal Year 2022?"

Rita: "Yes."

Demmer: "Okay. So, that the... this is where the issue comes up and the reason that it's so important that HFS is part of this conversation. The money that is currently going to that hospital is going through the Hospital Assessment Program. It's GRF funded dollars that are dedicated through transformation, or transition funding, for hospitals. While it's GRF funding and the Legislature has control over that, it's a component of the Hospital Assessment Plan, which was passed by this Legislature and then is required to be approved by the federal centers for Medicare and Medicaid services. So, the Legislature now is... by passing this Bill, we would be altering a piece of the plan that has been previously passed by this General Assembly and approved by Federal CMS. Meaning that Federal CMS could say with this change, we no longer approve of your overall plan. Is that right?"

Rita: "So... well... and here... the date of 2022 was selected based upon that is the ending date of the phase 2 of the
transformation, as why that date was selected. So, coming out of phase 1, that would bring it into phase 2. This money was allocated to Metro South, and that's why we're just keeping it there for that phase 2 process. As it was stated in committee, and this is the goal, and the goal is to not mess up the entire... as I indicated, we do have time. And if it does, it's something we can come back to fix that 'cause we don't want to create unintended consequence for the entire transformation. But, it talked about doing transformation for the last two years, maybe even longer, correct? And this is something new to me that was put on my lap after we adjourned in June when the hospital filed for its closure. And I'm no expert into hospital and funding, but I'm learning a whole lot. So, the date of 2022 was because of the phase 2. This is truly what we're looking at is actually transforming. When you go from a 314 bed hospital, full service hospital, to currently, as of October 22, it was completely shut down with no services. This would be truly starting a transformation of hospitals, wouldn't you say that?

Demmer: "Yeah. So I appreciate that, and it's important to call attention to the fact that we are nearing the date at which phase 2 will begin. Phase 2 begins on July 1 of 2020. So, we're still in phase 1 right now. The current plan calls for the money that's currently being spent on transformation to be expended in phase 2 subject to rules offered by the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. No rules have yet been offered. And I agree with you in committee that time is of the essence on getting a plan together about what transformation looks like. However, this legislation would
then take a portion of the funding that's supposed to be subject to rule, and supposed to be part of a reallocation during phase 2, and instead commit that to one specific location, for not just the remainder of phase 1, but into phase 2. I don't believe we can do that while ensuring the integrity of the remainder of the Hospital Assessment Program. And so, you know, while I was supportive of this Bill getting out of committee, I can't support it today on the floor unless we have continued conversation with HFS and actually bring one of those types of proposals back. So, what..."

Rita: "And it's my understanding that phase 2 has not been submitted yet for approval. And here, the intent is not to mess up the whole program. I told you that..."

Demmer: "Right. And we agree on that, and I understand. I'm just... you know, I'm not comfortable supporting the measure on the floor today, given that there are alternate proposals that maybe are being... that you're reviewing from HFS. Maybe we can continue this discussion. Perhaps we can follow up again on this in the second week of Veto Session. But, you know, I can't support letting this out of the House today, being it's in the form that I think draws some serious questions about the viability of the entire Hospital Assessment Program."

Rita: "And I respect that. And by... you know, the goal would be is to move this to the Senate. We still have time to talk, and still have time to talk with HFS. But again, this started in June. HFS was in my office Monday, from June. So, in a last minute trying to deal with this very complicated..."

Demmer: "And you and I are in agreement on the fact..."
Rita: "Yes."

Demmer: "...that we need to get further information about how hospitals can transform, what are the parameters, what are some of the goals, and how will this funding be allocated in phase 2? My desire though is that we look at that as a holistic piece of the Hospital Assessment Program, and not do it individually through this kinds of legislation. So, thanks for your efforts."

Rita: "Thank you."

Demmer: "And the conversation we've had in the last couple days."

Rita: "Yup."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Thapedi, you are recognized."

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

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Thapedi: "Representative Rita, could you walk us through the transformation process? Exactly how does that work? And if I understand correctly, this is the former old St. Francis Hospital in Blue Island that provides essential services to the far South Side of Chicago in Cook County. So, what is the plan? I had heard that it was going to be closing. Now I'm hearing a transformation. I'm definitely supporting the Bill, but I want to understand what the process is."

Rita: "So, you're combining two things. Some of that talk about the transformation is a plan that the state is looking at and how they look at different hospitals and what them roles will play in the future. Currently, there has been no transformation, to my knowledge, that has taken place. So, in dealing with the former St. Francis or former Metro South facility in Blue Island, they filed for closure in June. They
were granted that closure October 22 from a full service hospital to being closed. So, the idea here is to... and I respect from the other side of aisle saying we need to look at transformation as a whole. Transformation now... is something that we need to do now in particular because of hospital closures and what is been going on. By securing this money, it allows for an operator to come into initially open up a freestanding emergency room, which the legislation calls that would allow for that. And this is a first start in a step towards a goal that has been talked about for many years."

Thapedi: "So, perhaps I'm misunderstanding this, not having read the Bill but relying on the analysis. Is the understanding that the hospital is going to close, but what we're preparing for is that we're preparing for a transformation of that facility from a hospital with beds and inpatient services to nothing but essentially a massive emergency room? Is that what it is?"

Rita: "I wouldn't say just a massive emergency room. What we're trying to do is fill a void in... for the community need, in particular, to start with an emergency room. Because through the various public hearings and through this process, has indicated the... there was almost 50 thousand emergency room visits at that facility. And what the impact to that community would be, would be a start to look at... get a freestanding emergency room going and looking at other services to come online, what would be desired by the community and what the need is."
Thapedi: "So, there wouldn't be any inpatient services there any longer?"
Rita: "No, there is none there right now. It's currently closed."
Thapedi: "Thank you for the clarification."
Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick is recognized."
Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Willis: "Indicates he will."
Batinick: "Hey, Representative. I just want to clarify things for my side 'cause it was a little bit confusing. Looks like it went through committee unanimously. However, some people on our side supported it because they were expecting some Amendments or changes to the Bill, correct?"
Rita: "Well, I wouldn’t necessarily say Amendments. It making sure we're not going to mess up the entire funding for this."
Batinick: "Okay. But the Representative from Dixon, Illinois that voted 'yes' in committee is probably against it now, is what we're hearing in this debate, right? Just clarifying for my side."
Rita: "You'd have to ask on this, but it sounded like."
Batinick: "I just needed to say it on a microphone kind of loud. Thank you, Representative."
Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Rita to close."
Rita: "I just ask for an 'aye' vote. This is something that's very important to my district. It's not taking any funding away from any other hospital. This funding was allocated to Metro South. This is funding that could actually be used to open up this freestanding emergency room and providing some services that the community needs, versus leaving an empty
structure and a health care... creating a health care desert for low income and working families. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 115 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting in 'favor', 35 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."


Speaker Willis: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now... and now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House shall adjourn until Tuesday, November 12 at the hour of noon. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned. Safe travels all."