Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Stuart, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on March 11, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 73, House Bill 573, House Bill 641. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Police & Fire reports the following committee action taken on March 11, 2021: do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 202, House Bill 628, House Bill 640, House Bill 691, House Bill 809. Representative Halpin, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 351; do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 426; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 379, House Bill 416, House Bill 417. Representative Willis, Chairperson from the Committee on Child Care Accessibility & Early Childhood reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 13; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 692. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 83. Representative Harper, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 123, House Bill 633, House Bill 2633, House Bill 2921; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 2620, House Bill 2621. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2021: do pass
Short Debate is House Bill 33, House Bill 1955, House Bill 1956, House Bill 2649, House Bill 2992; do pass Standard Debate is House Bill 228; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 295; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1957, House Bill 2570. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2413; do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 813; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 398, House Bill 1916. Representative Willis, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 307. Representative Ann Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 804, House Bill 2640, House Bill 2791; do pass Standard Debate is House Bill 653, House Bill 1847; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 2785. Representative Carroll, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1711, House Bill 2910, House Bill 2943; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1721; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 52; Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 60; Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 279. Representative Greenwood, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 62, House
Bill 68, House Bill 362. Representative Walker, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1803. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2369, House Bill 2628, House Bill 2991; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1815. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 111, House Bill 184, House Bill 1765; do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 86, House Bill 625; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 182, House Bill 2427, House Bill 2533. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2559, House Bill 2807; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1913(sic-1931), House Bill 1932, House Bill 2454, House Bill 2806. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 110, House Bill 1965; do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 119; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1710, House Bill 1766, House Bill 1950, House Bill 2914. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1831, House Bill 1853, House Bill 1911, House Bill 2590, House
Bill 2741, House Bill 2777; do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 835; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1975 (sic-1795), House Bill 2412; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 2401. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on March 17, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 219, House Bill 376; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1736. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on March 17, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2584, House Bill 2840; do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 365, House Bill 694, House Bill 733; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1915, House Bill 2432, House Bill 2491, House Bill 2860, House Bill 2939. Representative Mah, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on March 17, 2021: do pass as amended Consent Calendar is House Bill 704; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 1976, House Bill 2431, House Bill 2554. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on March 17, 2021: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 14, House Bill 220, House Bill 2568, House Bill 2622; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 816; do pass Consent Calendar is House Bill 51, House Bill 1738, House Bill 2543, House Bill 2947. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on March 17, 2021: do pass Short Debate
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Speaker Welch: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn of all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Gracious God, our father who art in heaven, it is because of your divine and tender mercies that we are not consumed. It is because your precious compassions, they fail us not. We are thankful, this day, for your mercies, for they are new unto us every morning. Now, sovereign and most gracious God in heaven, it is today that we invoke your blessings upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, upon its Leaders, upon all of the Members, upon all of their families. May they be empowered with your wisdom and with your insight. May they be empowered with your strength and with your might. May they be empowered with your spirit and with your guidance. May they have your
heart. May they have your mind. May they have your will to do that which is the good and to do that which is the perfect will of God. This we ask in your precious son's name, Amen."

Speaker Welch: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Murphy."

Murphy - 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 Welch: "Roll Call for Attendance. Members. Members. Members are being asked to respect social distancing. You will hear me say that from time to time. Remember to respect social distancing. Also, Members, we are allowing time for Members to come to vote your own switch. Members, if you are in your offices, please make it to the Capitol for roll call. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that there are no excused absences among Democrats today."

Speaker Welch: "Leader Spain is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Demmer, Severin, and Welter are excused today."

Speaker Welch: "The roll is open. Members, remember to respect social distancing. If you are in your offices, Members, please make your way to the Capitol. The roll for attendance is open. Members, I'm going to remind you to please respect social distancing. Members, if you are in your offices, please make
your way to the floor to record yourselves on the roll. If you have recorded yourself on the roll, we do intend to go to caucus meetings… recognize caucus meetings. So, you can remove yourself from the floor if you have already marked yourself on the roll. Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. There being 109 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on March 18, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 26, Floor Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 158, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 395, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 1680… correction, Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 168; approved for consideration, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 132."

Speaker Welch: "Members. Members, Republicans will caucus in Room 114. The Black Caucus will caucus in Room D-1. The Latinx Caucus will caucus in Room 100. And the Moderate Caucus will caucus in Room 402. Leader Durkin, you expect this to last an hour? One hour. Caucuses will last approximately one hour. The House will stand in recess."

Speaker Manley: "Good afternoon, Members. We're going to get started with today's agenda. Communicated previously, you were informed that there would be a limited number of speakers on each Bill. That still remains, and the speakers will be limited to five minutes each. On Second Reading appears House
Bill 158, and there is an Amendment we need to adopt. Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 158, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lilly, has been approved for consideration."
Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly on the Amendment."
Lilly: "Thank you, Speaker. I would like to adopt Amendment #3. And a brief explanation..."
Speaker Manley: "Representative, does Amendment 3 become the Bill?"
Lilly: "It does."
Speaker Manley: "You'd like to adopt the Amendment and then explain it on Third?"
Lilly: "Correction. House... excuse me. Floor Amendment 3 is a page and line Amendment. And Amendment 1 becomes the Bill."
Speaker Manley: "Would you like to adopt the Amendment and then explain the Bill on Third Reading?"
Lilly: "Yes."
Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk. Representative Lilly moves for the adoption of House Amendment... I'm sorry... Floor Amendment 3. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any other Amendments?"
Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Lilly."
Lilly: "Thank you..."
Speaker Manley: "Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 158, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you. A couple short explanations for the Amendments. Article 55 removes opioid treatment program and deletes that language on behalf of the original Sponsor. Article 115, primary care access, it provides a sentence structural fix, which was an error in Amendment 1. Article 6... excuse me, Article 6(d), dementia training program language has been updated and provided by the original Sponsor. It's identical to HB2660. It is a partnership between the Department of Aging and the Alzheimer's Association. Article 131, the Medicaid technical assistance program, it replaces the language provided by the original Sponsor. And it's very similar, and if not similar, to HB1950. And Article 815, sickle cell prevention and treatment, we changed it a little bit and... at the request of the Comptroller and we added 'subject to appropriation' to the fund, itself. With that..."

Speaker Manley: "For further discussion, Representative Hammond is recognized for five minutes."

Hammond: "Nope. There we go. Thank you, Madam Chair. Representative Lilly, first of all, let me commend you on the incredible amount of work that you have put into this legislation, working with your colleagues... with all of us, actually. And I want to thank you for that, because there is so many components to this Bill that are extremely helpful, vital to a lot of the services that we could provide here in the State of Illinois and improve conditions for our
populations. I do have a concern, and I respect the fact, is the entire Bill, at this point, subject to appropriation?"

Lilly: "Thank you for the question, Representative. One of the Amendments is different. It is to the dementia training program between... the partnership between the Department of Aging and the Alzheimer's Association. The Alzheimer's Association has agreed to fund the training program. So, that's the only difference."

Hammond: "And is the rest of it subject to appropriation?"

Lilly: "Correct. Yes."

Hammond: "Okay. I think that's pretty incredible that the Alzheimer's Association has agreed to do that. I'd like to see a whole lot more of that partnership. And as a result of that partnership with Department on Aging and the Alzheimer's Association, has the Department come around and they no longer have any concerns with it... with that portion of it?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Hammond: "Okay. I will tell you, for many of us on this side of the aisle, Representative, we are hearing some pretty astounding numbers when it comes to the cost of fully implementing this Bill, with all due respect to the appropriation. But, according to our figures, to fully implement this would be somewhere between 12 and 15 billion dollars. Is that something you would agree with?"

Lilly: "No, but I would say it gives us something to talk about."

Hammond: "Yes, it does. I will say that. And it may be that, incrementally, if different portions of it were implemented subject to appropriation, we would see those figures differ."
But to that, do... if it were to be implemented, do you see a way of identifying the revenue stream for it?"

Lilly: "What I would like to say to that, between the initiatives that came out of the efforts of the Transformation Review Committee, the billions that are coming from the Federal Government because of the pandemic, we do have a start of where revenues are coming from. We are now emphasizing the importance of health care for all Illinoisans. And I really believe that the revenue will be prioritized to make sure we have better health outcomes. Department of Health and Family Services very interested in shifting their perspective of outcome and how they fund health care. So, I'm excited to begin those discussions."

Hammond: "So, in your opinion, you do believe that some of the federal funding could be used to pay for many of the programs in your legislation. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "I believe that. And I'm hoping you will join me in that effort."

Hammond: "Okay. Representative, I'm anxious to hear the rest of the conversation as we go forward, and I will repeat that I appreciate all of the work that you've put into this. I have real concerns about the cost of this and will listen to the rest of the conversation. Thank you for your time, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Greenwood for five minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
Greenwood: "Thank you, Representative Lilly, for your collaborative work on this legislation. The stories that we have listened to around the state are shocking, horrible, and unacceptable. We have heard from black women from around our state speaking to their painful experiences of pregnancy in a medical environment steeped in unconscious bias and systemic racism. Story after story, we heard about loss, death, and near-death experiences. Bias and racism, we found, data concluded, has contributed to significant and repugnant racial disparities and mortality rates in our state. We know that here, in our state, black women are dying. They are dying from pregnancy related causes at more than six times the rate of white women, higher than the national average. This is a public health crisis. As we have conversations around social justice and racial equity, we must continue to insist that greater care, dignity, and respect are provided to black women and their babies. And so, I thank you, Representative Lilly. And I thank Representative Flowers for her legislative package of Bills to address this crisis in the 101st General Assembly. And yet, we are still here. There is something inherently wrong with the system that is not valuing the lives of black women equally to white women. We have come to a moment of reckoning that requires us to reach higher and demand more. And so, this legislation, presented today, attempts to address this crisis through implicit bias training, providing doula services and evidence-based home visiting to be covered under Medicaid. Implicit bias training for health care professionals will provide that, in order to renew a license as a health care professional in our state,
a licensee shall complete an evidence-based implicit bias training to address how unintended biases regarding race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, or other characteristics affect the health care industry and the care received by patients. Expanding access to doula and home visiting services is one of the recommendations listed in the 2018 IDPH Maternal Mortality Report. Using Medicaid to finance home visiting doula services makes sense. In fact, more than 30 other states already bill Medicaid to cover home visiting, and Illinois has been imbedded... imbedding doulas into its state funding home visiting program since the mid-90s. Meaning, we are well-positioned to do this. Any investment into the Medicaid budget will be small when you consider the myriad of short and longer term positive outcomes for children and their families, tied to healthier births and healthier child development. These policies, and others in this legislation, reflect the belief in the inherent dignity for all mothers in our state. I stand in support of this legislation, and I urge our elected leaders and health officials to do more to address this public health crisis of black maternal mortality in our state. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Spain for five minutes."

Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, would you be so kind as to excuse Representative Marron for the remainder of the day? And then..."

Speaker Manley: "The record shall reflect that."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
Spain: "Representative Lilly, thank you for bringing forward this important legislation. I know that this is a very substantive Bill and very comprehensive. I know that we also considered a previous version of this legislation during our Session in January, and I think it may have been around four in the morning at the time. So, let me just sort of refresh my memory, because I may have been a little foggy at that point of time. This Bill is substantially similar, I believe, to the legislation that you introduced and carried in January. But I think there are some changes as well, and I just want to get clarification on these changes. The previous Bill ended the managed care assessment that we use to fund and finance a great amount of health care spending in the State of Illinois. Is the managed care assessment still terminated with this legislation?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Spain: "Pardon? Not in the Bill? Okay. Thank you. And also, we included in the previous version of legislation a termination of managed care, in general, or an end to the existing managed care contracts. Does your legislation now, House Bill 158, include an end to those managed care contracts?"

Lilly: "It does not."

Spain: "Thank you. The previous legislation included a moratorium on hospital closures. Is that provision still included in this Bill?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Spain: "Are there any other significant changes that you'd like to bring up between the previous version and what we're considering now?"
Lilly: "Outside of what was explained in the Amendment... there may be one, one second. You may be thinking about the hospital closure moratorium. That is... will remain in place until the pandemic is over."

Spain: "Okay."

Lilly: "So, that is the most substantive change."

Spain: "Okay. Thank you for that clarification."

Lilly: "And we did receive that language... we negotiated that language with the hospital association."

Spain: "Thank you. Now, Representative Lilly, one of the most significant components of your legislation is the community health worker program. What is a community health worker? Who are they? What will they do? What... I support the notion of community health worker. So, I think this is a very good component that you've introduced."

Lilly: "What we are challenged with here, in our America, actually, is the wraparound service, the how to, the hand holding type of approach to get people to their health outcomes. And a health care worker navigates. A health care worker assists. A health care worker advises an individual who are... who's at risk towards their health outcomes because of the disparities, because of their inequities, because they are struggling. And the health care worker goal is to make sure they reach their health goals."

Spain: "Thank you. And I did have questions, though, on community health workers. I believe there is a provision in your Bill that I was confused by a little bit. Just about how these workers are credentialed, or certified, or licensed. What are
the requirements to be... for a person to be a community health worker?"

Lilly: "We are working very diligently with the Community Health Care Association to get those parameters in place."

Spain: "Thank you, Representative. I see here that certification shall not be required for employment of community health workers. I would just offer to you that, again, I think this is one of the provisions of your Bill that I think is very important and look forward to continue working with you on how we move forward with community health workers. I have a question also then about the payment or reimbursement model for community health workers. How will those employees be reimbursed?"

Speaker Manley: "Representative Spain, Leader Batinick has offered to give you his five minutes. He was one of the chosen speakers today. Would you like his five minutes to continue?"

Spain: "Yes, please. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Leader Batinick. Please continue."

Lilly: "Thank you..."

Spain: "To pay for... Representative Lilly, sorry. What is the reimbursement mechanism for community health workers?"

Lilly: "It's the Medicaid reimbursement, which will be determined by the... HFS."

Spain: "Okay. Thank you. The... and is this... a previous speaker mentioned that many of the aspects of your legislation are subject to appropriation. Is that the case for community health workers?"

Lilly: "Yes, it is."

Spain: "And is that the case for the Sickle Cell Disease Fund?"
Lilly: "Yes, it is."
Spain: "Is that the case for the $50 million dollar fund designated for safety net perinatal distinction designation?"
Lilly: "Yes, it is."
Spain: "So, if you consider all of the opportunities for additional costs for your legislation, do you have an estimated range that we would be seeking to satisfy the full appropriation requirement for House Bill 158?"
Lilly: "We do not have that at this time, but we have been working on one, and we will get that to you once we get that in place."
Spain: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is important legislation, and I think it does a number of things that are very important and very good. And I extend a very sincere and genuine thank you and recognition to Representative Lilly for her leadership on this topic, the very hard work that she has done on this Bill and many others for improving health care in the State of Illinois. Again, this Bill does a lot of good things. I think the focus that we need to place on ending health disparities, especially those that manifest themselves along the lines of race and that have become so visible during this COVID pandemic, are very, very important. I think community health workers are a great idea, and we need to figure out how we can actually implement a program of that type. But there is a problem with this legislation. And as you've heard before, cost estimates for this Bill range anywhere in the magnitude of $5 billion per year to 12 or perhaps even $15 billion per year. And just
because we conditioned legislation that it's subject to appropriation, I think we need to be very sensitive to the fact that the people of Illinois need to understand what we're actually able to accomplish when Bills pass out of this chamber and this Capitol. And so, when you think about cost implications, of at a minimum of $5 billion, I have some very significant concerns about this legislation. And, in fact, I have additional concerns just listening to the debate here on the floor because one of the things you heard from the Sponsor was that perhaps we could tap into the federal stimulus funds, the America Rescue Plan funds that have just been approved by Congress. Illinois is set to receive $7.5 billion in federal assistance. But we already know that we owe over $3 billion to repay our borrowing from the state and municipal liquidity facility. We already know that we have over $5 billion of unpaid bills. We've already exceeded our opportunity just on old debts and obligations from what the State of Illinois would expect to receive from the Federal Government. So, I get very concerned that this Bill is subject to appropriation to the tune of billions and billions of dollars and that we're already thinking, as a Legislative Body, how we may expand additionally our spending beyond the obligations that we already have, the $7.5 billion from the state, which I remind everyone is a one-time infusion. And if we begin to look at legislation like this one, even though it is well-intended and includes good provisions... if we begin to take special, one-time federal money and apply it to new spending like this, we are doing a terrible disservice to the taxpayers of Illinois, to the people that require health care improvements
in all of their communities. Again, I commend the Sponsor on her important work. There is much to be supported in this legislation, but there are massive concerns about spending, implementation, and the long term ramifications for the State of Illinois. I urge a 'no' vote on this item. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Willis for five minutes."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to simply speak to the Bill today. I want to commend the Sponsor on this Bill. This is a Bill that I know her and many of her colleagues have worked for a very, very long time to do. And, I think, currently, in our current climate of the pandemic, we have seen firsthand the health care inequity in our state. And that is why now, more so than ever, this Bill is truly important for us to put forward. This Bill would have been important two, three, five years ago, but even more so now, when we have seen firsthand the lives that have been affected because the lack of health care available to them. And that is why we need to take our stance now and stop this inequity. There are some things in this Bill that are truly important to me, and I'm going to highlight those. Child care assistance, that is one of the most important things. I actually chair two committees that deal with early childhood and child care assistance. That's how important it is to me. This Bill addresses that, making sure that the department gets that information out to the people in the State of Illinois so that we can readily have that available to them. Hospital closures, another point that is truly important to
me. Later today, you'll hear me talk about that, as I present a Bill that will, hopefully, reopen a hospital that we had close in this. This is important for us to look at. I know there are some colleagues of mine, right now, that are dealing with it firsthand. During a pandemic, to have another hospital close would be unforgivable. We don’t have less of a need for health care right now, we have more of a need for health care. And, until that passes, we cannot close another hospital. We need to make sure we keep our safety net and our community hospitals open so that people have access to health care. That's what this Bill does. We need to make sure that we protect that. Another point that’s in here is having a commission look at the causes of crime in violence study. I don't think there is anybody in this room, on either side of the aisle, that can say that violence is not a health... a public health crisis. It is an issue that affects our public health. And to actually have a study to look at firsthand, and look at what those causes are, and what makes one community more violent than another, is a step in the right direction to solving and making sure that we can cut down on that violence. Those are the important things in here, not to mention all of the other Articles. I think every single one of us, when we look at it... and I've heard that from people speaking on the other side of the aisle supporting it, saying it's important. Yes, it's important. Yes, it's important. But there is a cost to it, and I agree with that, but sometimes how do you put a cost on a human life? How do you put a cost on someone's wellbeing? Sometimes we just have to do it. This is one of those times we need to make sure we do it. Dementia
training, we know that that is something that affects almost every family as they age. They have someone that’s been affected by that. If we can have that training at an earlier stage, we can, hopefully, make that family's life a little bit better. And having a partnership and making sure we get that training out there is another step in the right direction. So, with that being said, I'm actually not going to take my full five minutes, but I am going to urge everybody to please support this Bill because it is now time for us to put it forward so that we do not have to wait 'til another pandemic to see how inequitable our health care system is. Please, I urge everyone to support House Bill 158. And I commend Representative Lilly on her hard work of working collaboratively with all Members of this Body throughout the entire state to put forth a great Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair... Madam Speaker. To the Bill. So, thank you so much, Representative, for working very hard to put this Bill together with your colleagues and both across the aisle and I know many, many of our community partners. You know, health disparities in this country and in this state are very well-documented. Some of the other speakers have spoken to them. I just want to emphasis them a little bit. So, not only do black and brown people have less access to quality health care, but their health care outcomes reflect this lack of access. Black moms are six times more likely to die of a pregnancy related condition compared to white moms. Women on Medicaid are two and a half times more likely to die within a year of pregnancy than women on private
insurance. Illinois' infant mortality rate is higher than the national average. And infants born to black parents are 2.3 times more likely to die before their first birthday than infants born to white, Hispanic, or Asian parents. This Bill begins to address the problem. Yes, a lot of it is subject to appropriation, but we have to lay out a plan. We have to know where we need to go and where we are going. Women need to be healthy before they are pregnant, and this Bill helps to coordinate primary care between community health centers and local hospitals, giving women more access to primary care that can identify and treat medical problems before they get pregnant. To improve quality of care to Medicaid clients, which you've already heard they are... their care is worse. This Bill establishes the Medicaid Managed Care Oversight Commission, which will work very hard to increase the quality of care in Medicaid. Also in this Bill is requiring medical implicit bias training. When I was in graduate school, we did... I did a very short study, gave a group of doctors... one of them I gave some symptoms that a woman had, and I gave the same symptoms to another group of doctors, and the only thing I changed was their race. Black women or white women. Same age, same symptoms. The doctors identified the white women as having appendicitis and the black women as having pelvic infection. So, there is so much implicit bias. And a discrimination like that, somebody can end up dead from appendicitis attack. So, I am so glad that you've put this Bill together to really, really look at the implicit bias and have doctors understand, when they look at clients, what they're seeing. The Bill also reflects... requests additional
funding for hospitals that provide prenatal and delivery services so we can improve their quality of care. And that’s for safety net hospitals. We want to make sure that they provide very high quality of care, even though they mainly see Medicaid clients. We spoke about the importance of community health workers, doulas, and home visiting services. All have been shown to improve the health of infants, children, and women. These programs have been very small because of lack of funding. And this Bill requires them to be reimbursed through Medicaid, and that will increase their accessibility around this state. Behavioral health improvements are also in this Bill, establishing the Behavioral Work Force Education Center of Illinois to leverage more reforms. We already spoke about the childhood trauma training for day care workers so they can be... provide better care to the children that they see. It is so important to increase these funds for safety net hospitals so they can increase their quality. I would urge a very strong 'yes' vote on this Bill. As I said, this is laying out a plan and a framework for what we need to do. The time has come to right the wrongs. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, we had a short conversation in committee where I shared some of my frustrations with the lack of basis in reality when we talk about creating new programs. But first, I want to start out with credit. We've heard from a number of individuals on this floor, your side
and my side, on a number of things that we can come together and agree on. Many of them would cost little to no money to the State of Illinois, commissions and things of that sort that can help create better outcomes. But I'm going to really talk about the issues that are really affecting the State of Illinois, and that's fiscal issues. Do you know what the estimated cost of this Bill will be?

Lilly: "As mentioned before, we are compiling and thinking that through. We have our plan before us. We do not have those numbers at this time."

Davidsmeyer: "Do you think it's a little premature to pass a Bill that you don't even know how much it cost?"

Lilly: "No, I do not. As mentioned, this is subject to appropriations, which means we have set some priorities and we have set a plan to move us in that direction to improve the health care of all Illinoisans. And as you've mentioned, on both sides of the aisle we see that this is a priority, and we need to sit down and make sure we fund these areas. Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. So... so, do you know how many... what our unpaid bills are at right now? For the State of Illinois."

Lilly: "Would you like to tell me?"

Davidsmeyer: "Over 5 and a half... between 5 and a half and 6 billion dollars of unpaid bills. We heard individuals talk earlier about the borrowing that we've done for COVID, and you've already said that we should be able use federal funds for this and... but we've got more than enough debt that we need to cover than what the Federal Government's bringing in. But $3 billion of borrowing from COVID. Do you know... do you
understand that those are people that have provided services to the State of Illinois that are not getting paid? I mean, you understand that, right?"
Lilly: "What I do understand, Representative, it is important that we prioritize the health and wellness of the citizens of Illinois."
Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, along those lines... and I'm sorry to interrupt, but I have a limited amount of time... what programs are you going to cut to make sure that this will be appropriated?"
Lilly: "What's important, as we've been stating, we have a plan..."
Davidsmeyer: "What... where are you priorities? That's what I'm asking. I'm not..."
Lilly: "Health care is the priority. Health outcomes, better health cares is the priority. One's life is the priority. You have heard..."
Davidsmeyer: "So, what are you cutting to be able to put... make that a priority? You have to cut something to make that priority."
Lilly: "You know..."
Davidsmeyer: "Five to twelve billion dollars. I mean, we're not talking Monopoly money. This is real money. We don't have a printing press in the State of Illinois. This is real money. So, something has to be cut. In the Governor's budget, he said we didn't have enough money for something that was not subject to appropriations. Three hundred and fifty million dollars that was promised to go to schools is not going to go to schools because we don't have the money. And now, you're talking about adding 5 to 12 billion dollars of additional
cost to the State of Illinois. I mean, I know it's subject to appropriances, but you know what that means to me, what I hear when you say that? It's a false promise. You're saying, oh, yeah, we're going to do this stuff, but we're really not going to do it because it's subject to appropriation. I appreciate the fact that it's subject to appropriation, because at least that means you understand that we don’t have the money to actually do any of this."

Lilly: "Representative, I'd like to respond to that."

Davidsmeyer: "That wasn't a… actually, I'm going to… I apologize, but I'm going to go to the Bill. The… I understand the importance of this stuff, I really do. Health care is a very important aspect, and we need to make sure that individuals have the knowledge to ensure that they know what programs are available and that they use those and pursue those because we all have a personal responsibility in pursuing health care and make sure that we have the right access to health care. But the State of Illinois does not have the money. Do you realize that 80 thousand people left the State of Illinois last year. You know why? Out taxes are already too high. Our property tax burden is second highest in the nation. Our overall tax burden is the highest in the nation. And you know who's leaving? The people that are supposed to be paying these bills. Those are the people that are leaving for other opportunities, for better opportunities in other states…"

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "Five to twelve billion dollars. We don’t have the money to fund what we already have. So, I urge a 'no'… strong 'no' vote."
Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Hernandez for five minutes."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I won't take all five. I rise today... well, first of all, to the Bill. I rise today to celebrate another step in our journey to provide equity and access to quality health care for every resident in Illinois. I want to commend Representative Lilly and the entire Black Caucus for their tireless work on the legislation and their steadfast advocacy for our state's most vulnerable. I also want to recognize the work of my colleagues in the Latino Caucus. The reality is that Illinois' largest health care desert is on the Chicago west and southwest side, centered in Little Village, and primarily affecting people of color, both African American and Latinx. The demand for quality health care for all our constituents is a priority for both caucuses and we both share it. And one of many Members of this chamber also shares it. House Bill 158 is a needed step forward. However, it is only the beginning of the journey to bring equity to our Medicaid system. Since I arrived in Springfield, we have worked to increase eligibility to Medicaid and increase the state's financial commitment to our residents and the safety net hospitals that serve them. Yet, we see long-time hospitals throughout our communities closing, and we hear the same reasons from each. The MCO system is eviscerating our safety net. That's why we need to continue to bring more transparency and accountability to the MCO system. The Legislature has shown a real commitment to health care access through our appropriations, but now we must force the MCOs to show that... their math so the appropriated dollars
flow through to our safety net hospitals and FQHCs. I rise today to support House Bill 158 and to call for additional actions to guarantee that the health care resources the Black and Latinx Caucuses have fought so hard to appropriate reach the community. We have recently put forward several additional concrete requirements to reform the MCO system. And we'll continue to work with the Black Caucus and others for full passage of these provisions this Session. We must add to the end the rash of hospital closures devastating too many neighborhoods. I know protecting and increasing health care access for our most vulnerable is a priority for our Speaker. It is a priority for the Latinx Caucus. And I ask that, with your vote today, you demonstrate access to health care is also a priority for you. I urge your support for House Bill 158.

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Haas for five minutes."

Haas: "Thank you, Madam Chair. To the Bill. This Bill contains... actually, thank you to the Sponsor. I'll... I want to start there. You've put a lot of work into this Bill and... and definitely appreciate all the time and effort. This Bill still contains so much with such great cost attached to it. There are numerous new programs with, as we've heard, great fiscal impact, upwards of 5 to 12 billion dollars. However, we've also heard that there are very good pieces included in this Bill. One of these, that I feel is a very good piece, is the behavioral health care education center. This industry has struggled for years and years to train, hire, and retain a qualified work force. And how... how do I know that? I know
that because I run a community mental health center. I've been at the helm of a community mental health center for over 20 years, and we have long struggled with this workforce issue. I deal with this every day, day in and day out. As an education... an education center such as this could greatly help the community behavioral health industry, the workforce flourish. Perhaps we can continue to work on this Bill, break it down into reasonable, workable pieces that could be more palatable for the state and for our constituents. Perhaps we can also partner with Senate Bill 1979, the Healthcare Workforce Education Center, which is in the House now, to accomplish this together. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davis for five minutes."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield for a brief question?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Davis: "Representative, if you can just talk a little bit about one of the provision in your... well, maybe two, but Article 170, the Medicaid Business Opportunity Commission."

Lilly: "Thank you, Representative, for bringing that forward. It is clear that we have a diverse Illinois, but it's not apparent in our agencies throughout the state. And we have legislation of policy, the BEP program, that's supposed to ensure that we have inclusion in... amongst all of all Illinoisans and the business that we do for the state and the people of Illinois. And we found that this provision has been noncompliant year after year, after year, after year. So, what we wanted to do was to make sure that we addressed it in
this omnibus Bill to ensure that we have inclusion and participation to address the issues of all Illinoisans."

Davis: "Thank you, Representative. And real quick, Article 160, the Managed Care Oversight Fund. Just a little bit about that as well."

Lilly: "That particular fund allows equity for businesses who are diverse, businesses who want to do business with the State of Illinois, the equity lens to ensure that they are considered in that opportunity... or those opportunities."

Davis: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. So, my mother, fantastic woman named Marjorie Davis, who's no longer with us, used to tell me that if you don't have your health, you really don’t have anything at all. And what we have seen over the last year or so is the exacerbation of what happens when people are desperate, when people are seeking, when people are just fed up with the current systems and the way that they operate. We have seen the manifestation of that. Now, many of you may characterize this Bill as the fourth pillar of the Black Lives Matter movement, sponsored by the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus. And that’s fine, and that's a great way to couch it. But the reality is that the dearth of health care is not only in black and brown communities. The reality is, it's in many of your communities as well. This is an opportunity for all of us to be able to stand up and to support efforts to create a better Illinois, particularly as it relates to health care, and support this effort. I know many of you are talking about the cost associated, but the reality is that unless we start addressing it, those costs continue to grow, and grow, and grow. And then, where are they going? So, at some point, we
have to draw the line and say we are not going to take it anymore. We are going to start at this point forward and address those issues that are important to, not only my district, but hopefully important to all of your districts as well. That's what's necessary. I commend Representative Lilly and all of her hard work to try to bring this forward. Everything that she went through in lame duck Session and bringing it forward. This is probably, arguably one of the toughest pillars of the four pillars that we have put forth, depending on where you are. But this is one of the toughest ones because health care is such a touchy subject. And part of the reason that I asked her to talk about the efforts in equity in health care is because, unfortunately, we have seen the Department of Healthcare and Family Services, time and time again, not meet its obligation relative to diversity in the health care space. We have brought companies to them and said vet them, make sure that they can handle the load. And they continue to dance around and not making sure that we have diversity in that space, particularly in the MCO space. Hopefully these efforts will be the beginning of acknowledging that, yes, we need to have companies of color, African American companies, work in the MCO space and in that health care space to give our communities an opportunity. When asked, what was the urgency to try to get a company like this up and running? Well, the urgency is that black people were dying. It can't get more urgent than that. Support this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly to close."
Lilly: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, each and every one, for your comments. You have heard that this is the fourth and final pillar of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus black policy agenda as we look to collectively rid systematic racism in the area of health care. I, too, start most of my statements, if you don’t have your health, you don’t have much else. And as I work with Senator Leader Mattie Hunter, we have spoken to advocates, providers, citizens, patients who sees the importance of us working together to make sure that they have access. The basic principles of this pillar is health care is a right, it's constitutionally sound. COVID has spotlighted the state disparities and equities in the black communities and the brown communities across our state. We look to improve the quality of life for all Illinois by addressing the basic, essential needs to have quality of life in Illinois, which is food, housing, jobs, education, transformation, and, of course, health care. Access to health care has to be looked through, through equity lens. We must invest in our communities and in our infrastructures in our communities that gives individuals, our citizens, a chance to live. Poor black and brown communities' infrastructure lacks all components of basic needs. We must stop divesting and invest so that we can get the health outcomes that each and every one of your family members, and my family members, and all of our family members in this great state deserves. Inequity must be addressed. Because if it's not, your life expectancy will be depending on your zip code. We must look at the equities and the inequities as the priority when we look at our budget, to make sure that we are looking at all
people. The coordinated health model and integrated health services allow us to use resources that are already existing in our community at our state level, at our county level, at our city level to ensure that we have the resources collectively to address health outcomes. Our components that many of you have shared and concerns to you, does just that. Access to health care, to making sure we're coordinating inpatient and outpatient services, making sure we have comprehensive networks of services looking at our FQHCs, our hospitals, and our safety net hospitals, and our specialty services. Looking at preventive care. Looking at health promotion. How... hospital closures during a pandemic. Hospital closures during a pandemic, shame on you. The hospitals have saved the lives that are remaining who have been stricken with the COVID virus. That's where their savoir came from. We need our health care facilities in the communities that’s hardest hit to keep our citizens alive by providing health care. I enjoy talking to the managed care organizations to ensure that they, too, want to improve their plan, but they need help. And we, through our oversight commission, will do just that. Hospital reforms, again, will address preventive measures... preventive medicine that makes sure that we are addressing the needs of our citizens. As mentioned, the community health workers who will navigate the needs of all persons who access health care. Implicit bias addresses cultural competencies for all the providers starting in the medical school in the university settings. And you heard about the alarming statistics around maternal morality and infant mortality in 2021, where women
of color, black women, brown women, are not surviving the delivery of their children and their children are not living to their first birthday. We have work to do on this front. And, of course, many of us who are challenged with mental health and substance abuse treatment, which have, again, come to light during COVID, that we lack the funding. We lack the access. We lack the priority. We must understand that we have the resources, when you have over $42 billion in a state budget, but we... what we don’t have is the priority to make sure that everyone has access to health care, that has access to quality of life, and that has access to the necessity to keep them well and alive. I want to thank each of you for listening to me in reference to this forth pillar of the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus. But you heard early on, this is an omnibus Bill, many pieces of legislation put together by colleagues in this General Assembly and previous General Assembly. And I'd just like to mention some of the fine work that has come forth in this particular omnibus Bill. Leader Flowers, Representative Evans, Representative Harper, Senator Fine, Representative Ford, Representative Greenwood, Representative Gordon-Booth, Representative Robinson, Leader Hunter, Representative Manley, Representative Davis, Representative Belt, Representative Lilly, Camille Lilly, Speaker Welch, Representative Hernandez, Lisa Hernandez and Barbara Hernandez, and Senator Steans. These are just some of the pieces of legislation that we all have said is good work, the plan that’s going to move us forward to bring equity, to ensure life, to ensure that we have the health care that each and every one of our citizens need. I thank you for your time.
and your questions. And, at this time, I ask for your 'aye' vote."
Speaker Manley:  'The question is, 'Shall House Bill 158 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Members, please make your way to the House Floor. The voting is open. Members, please make your way to the House Floor to vote. Have all voted who wish? Members, once you've voted your switch, please vacate the floor or have a seat in the gallery. Members, please vote your switch and then please leave the floor, or go up in the gallery, go back to your offices. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 41 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Proceeding to the Order of House Bills on Second Reading, House Bill 1871. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman:  "House Bill 1871, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
Speaker Manley:  "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman:  "House Bill 1871, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Manley:  "Representative Stuart."
Stuart:  "Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I rise to present House Bill 1871. While Legislatures in states all across our country are spending their time trying to disenfranchise voters, I'm proud to bring forth House Bill 1871, which is a step in continuing Illinois' efforts to
encourage voting and making a fundamental right of our democracy more accessible to people across our geographically diverse state, helping people who live in dense urban areas, rural areas, and all the suburbs in between. As the presidential election of 2020 approached, during this time of the COVID-19 pandemic, many of us wondered how we could best protect the health and safety of our communities, while simultaneously supporting the fundamental right to vote. Members of the House Democratic Women's Caucus formed a committee, which I had the honor of chairing, and we got to work, extensively researching election laws and changes in states around the country. While Illinois already had many pro-voter measures, like early voting and no excuse absentee, otherwise known as vote by mail, we knew we would need to do more. We passed a package of measures intended to guide more voters to the vote by mail process and to help our local election authority handle the higher expected volume of those ballots. Those measures applied only to that specific election. The measures enacted were successful. We saw increased voter turnout, and we saw an increase in the use of vote by mail. Many voters who used the vote by mail process for the very first time found themselves feeling more confident in their voting. They liked having the time to research candidates and ballot questions. The former teacher in me sees this like an open-book, open-note, take-home test, the best of all possibilities for any student. House Bill 1871 is identical to a Bill that was presented during the lame duck Session of the 101st General Assembly. Unfortunately, because we're in the midst of an election, we
ran out of time to have the Bill heard on the floor then. This Bill only makes a few of the provisions of that larger, earlier package permanent. It allows election authorities to continue to use secure, locked, tamper-proof drop boxes, subject to rules set by the State Board, like daily ballot collection. It does not make them mandatory. The use of such is still up to the discretion of the local election authorities. There are county clerks who have already purchased such drop boxes and many who are considering doing so. And they want the confidence that they will be able to use them from now on going forward. Drop boxes provide a way for those voters who choose to vote by mail to have an option other than the U.S. Postal Service to return their ballots. It allows election authorities to continue to allow curbside voting, provided at least two election judges from opposite parties are present at the curbside. This allows an option for voters who are elderly, disabled, who may have a medical issue, making them adverse to entering a crowded polling location. While many people in this category may choose to vote by mail, it's important we continue to allow this option. Again, this is also not mandatory. It's up to the discretion of the local election authority. This Bill will also make sure that each and every ballot that is mailed back within the correct time frame will be counted by making election authorities accept them, even if they have insufficient postage. This does not require election authorities to pay for postage of all ballots, only the small number that may be returned with incorrect postage. And the last portion of the Bill simply clarifies the implementation of funds from the
Help America Vote Act or HAVA. The language simply leaves open the possibility that election authorities can seek reimbursement for those drop boxes in the future. This is in line with the intention of the HAVA. House Bill 1871 is a pro-voter, common sense piece of legislation. It keeps Illinois as a leader in enfranchising voters. It shows that we, as Legislators, believe that all eligible voters deserve access to the ballot and encourages increased participation and confidence in the choices made by voters. I encourage an 'aye' vote to show your belief in our voters."

Speaker Manley: "As agreed, there are going to be three speakers from both sides of the aisle for five minutes each. The Chair recognizes Leader Spain."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Spain: "Representative Stuart, thank you for bringing this Bill. I just want to go over a few things that... I see that you Bill does three things primarily. First, that postage would be paid by election authorities for ballots that are returned without stamps, correct?"

Stuart: "That's correct."

Spain: "And do we have an idea of the magnitude of that cost, based on our experience in 2020?"

Stuart: "I don't have that number offhand. I do know that lots of election authorities already prepay for all of those ballots. And, again, this is only to those that might have insufficient postage."
Spain: "And so, those authorities that do not prepay, this Act… this Bill would mandate those authorities to pay for postage, correct?"
Stuart: "Yes, so that everyone who seeks to return a ballot gets their vote counted."
Spain: "Thank you. And then on curbside voting, I show here that curbside voting is made available for those with a disability. But you mentioned folks that may be elderly, which I don't think is a disability. Can you just clarify that for me?"
Stuart: "Well, the election authority can establish who would be eligible. Those were just examples of who they may want to extend that courtesy to."
Spain: "That part is confusing to me because, within my analysis, I show that any voter with a temporary or permanent disability and is unable to access or enter the polling place. Those are the requirements for curbside voting, not to the… for the discretion of the local election authority."
Stuart: "There already is a right for curbside voting for those with a disability. This just allows it to be expanded to the elderly, again, if the election authorities so chooses."
Spain: "Okay. The third part is drop boxes, and that's probably where I have the most questions for you. So, this Bill would allow the use of HAVA funds for drop box locations, correct?"
Stuart: "That's correct."
Spain: "I have a note from the State Board of Elections that says HAVA is to only be used for federal elections. Do I have that correct?"
Stuart: "Yes, and these drop boxes will be used in federal elections."
Spain: "So, these drop boxes will not be used then for the upcoming consolidated municipal elections on April 6 then?"
Stuart: "No, I don't believe that it eliminates the ability to use that, but they can... it be used to purchase them because they are used for federal elections."
Spain: "So, that's a point of clarification that I think is pretty important. The State Board does not believe that funds can be used for drop boxes for elections other than federal elections. So, if... is your Bill effective immediately?"
Stuart: "Yes."
Spain: "So, your intention is, with the passage of this Bill, that drop boxes would now be allowed for the upcoming municipal elections in two and a half weeks, correct?"
Stuart: "Yeah, it actually... because we allow early voting, it's a current election that many people are already voting in. And, yes, it would allow for those... since we are still in a pandemic, and many people found that they enjoy the ability to use those drop boxes. Lots of our clerks found that they appreciated the ability to use a drop box as well, too. This would allow them during this current election."
Spain: "Sure. And I don't have an opposition to drop boxes in entirety. But I do have questions, and I asked you this in committee. Why have we... once again, this is the third time we are seeing this language. Why do we continue to kick the can on instituting security requirements for these lock box locations? Isn't it true that there is nothing in your legislation that speaks to the monitoring requirements for lock boxes, the quantity available for election authorities
to implement, the locations that are appropriate for placement of these locked boxes?"
Stuart: "Since, right now, this is permissive, we are not mandating that any election authority put them in any specific location. I do believe that that would be something that we should talk about in the future because I think everybody should have an opportunity to use a drop box. Our election authorities are under... the control of the ballot and the security of the ballot, we already have rules that apply to that, and that would apply to these drop boxes as well."
Spain: "But, Representative, since this is permissive, under your legislation, would an election authority be permitted to place a drop box a hundred feet outside of the Republican or Democratic campaign headquarters, for example?"
Speaker Manley: "Representative."
Stuart: "They would be... yes."
Speaker Manley: "Maybe you could ask Leader Batinick if he would give you his five minutes? He's awfully generous."
Spain: "Madam Speaker, I just... if we could just have an answer to this question, and I'll do a quick close."
Manley: "That'll be fine. Thank you."
Stuart: "We're allowing local discretion. We think that the authority, the local authority, has the best indication of where the best location would be for those drop boxes."
Spain: "Madam Speaker, I urge a 'no' vote. The issue of ballot drop box locations is an important issue that we should discuss. But I have very serious concerns about the locations that are appropriate and the monitoring and security of these drop boxes. Please vote 'no'."
Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Ammons."
Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
Ammons: "Just in an effort to clear just a couple of points that were raised. Are there drop boxes currently in use? Meaning available as of the 2020 General Election?"
Stuart: "There were drop boxes in use since the 2020 General Election. Yes."
Ammons: "And the usage of those drop boxes, have you received or heard from any clerk's office any concern with the use of the drop boxes, or the availability, or locations thereof?"
Stuart: "No. In fact, I would say that the clerks that I have spoken to across the board have been pleased with the results of using the drop boxes."
Ammons: "Thank you for answering those two questions. To the Bill. The coronavirus disease has presented us with quite a bit of difficulty in the 2020 election, and certainly going forward, since we are still battling with the coronavirus. But recent election emergencies largely have been issued as a result of catastrophic weather events, but we had not prepared for pandemics. And 2020 taught all of us a few lessons. I reached out to my husband, who happens to be the clerk in Champaign County, and I asked him of his experience in relationship to the pieces of legislation that are before you today. And I want to share his response. He wants to say thank you, Representative Katie Stuart. And thank you for taking up these issues to expand access to the voters of Illinois. Illinois by no means is a pioneer in the events and issues that stand before you. Drop boxes have been in use in other states for
many, many years. As of this year, in Colorado, California, and several other states, who have already learned some of the things that we are just learning about accessing and expanding voter access. Let me clarify, first and foremost. Number one, the drop boxes. We are very happy that the Democratic Women's Caucus took this on and was working hard to make this available to the people of Illinois for future elections. Drop boxes save taxpayers money. Instead of having to pay postage, that we will talk about, to return their ballots, the drop boxes make it very simple. It is secure. It is safe. And these boxes cannot be walked away with because they are weighing two tons, in some cases, or more. These are very heavy boxes that we have in use. The drop boxes are inexpensive. We paid about 14 thousand in Champaign County for 7 of them. They were very low maintenance and last for at least a decade or more. When you look at the cost associated with postage for every single ballot returned, the counties will save an excessive amount of money as a result of making drop boxes permanent. Convenience of having them in high traffic locations increases accessibility to voters, and they absolutely love them. I wanted to read to you a statement that was sent to our clerk as a result. And this was sent to him from a Republican election judge. The election judge said this, 'I just wanted to let you and Aaron know how much I enjoyed working with you on the VBM work that we did. I really got out of retirement... out of a retirement rut and felt like I was part something bigger than myself.' He goes on to say, 'It was very evident you all put a lot of planning, preparation, and hard work into making our county's VBM
election process work so well. I felt you put a top notch effort on when you made available the drop boxes.' That is a Republican election judge in Champaign County. Curbside voting has already been in statute. We are extremely supportive of curbside voting for some of our residents. It is very difficult for some of them to access a polling location and curbside voting provides them an ability to do so. And lastly, let me speak to the prepaid postage. Yes, prepaid postage will cost election authorities some money, if people forget to put the appropriate postage on there. However, if we put in drop boxes, this will reduce the cost to not only the voter but also to the county. I'll just close that this is an exceptionally excellent piece of legislation, and I ask and urge an 'aye' vote. And thank you, Representative Stuart."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, before I start my remarks, I would just like... on behalf of myself, and Representative Murphy, and Representative Scherer, who actually physically represents this building, I just want to welcome everybody back to this beautiful chamber. We have missed you all very much. And it's nice to be back doing the people's business in this historic chamber. We appreciate it. And spend a little money while you're in town, too, will you? Representative Stuart, a few questions it you... of you, if you don't mind."

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will yield."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Representative Stuart, I want to echo some of Representative Spain's remarks. You know, this...
this is an okay Bill, I think, in many of our minds, but it's got... I think it still has a lot of work that could be done, and that's why we don't like it... or we'll... we'll vote against it. So, a couple questions for you. The effective date is immediate, correct?"

Stuart: "Correct."

Butler: "And is the plan to get this through the Senate ASAP so it will be in effect for the consolidated election?"

Stuart: "I've had discussions and asked for them to do that, yes."

Butler: "So, because of... if this would go into effect for the consolidated election... this is a change in an election law in the middle of an election. We are voting... as you've said, we're already voting early voting, we're already voting vote by mail. I know people who have already voted. Would we run into legal problems because we're implementing something during the campaign?"

Stuart: "No."

Butler: "We're changing the rules of an election, in the middle of an election, and there's no legal problems?"

Stuart: "No, there won't be."

Butler: "Okay. So, a couple things that I wanted to touch on. And I guess... that was the big question I had, was about the... Representative Spain took a lot of my questions, which were good. I do have concerns about the HAVA funds, since the State Board of Elections has indicated their problems with the HAVA fund for local elections. But I just want to... I'll just go to the Bill and say, there were a couple things stated. First of all, the Representative from Urbana stated that drop boxes are these big, huge things that you can't walk away with. I
know a county clerk in my area that used a drop box that was maybe three foot square, as a drop box. Now, granted, it was within the county building, but it was certainly was something that you could walk off with. And that's my point, is there are no standards for these drop boxes. And they have been liked and they have been well used. My county clerk, here is Sangamon County, Don Gray, used two of them, and they worked out fine for the election and they like them. But our issue is there is no standards around these drop boxes. And as Representative Spain said, we can place these anywhere. We could place these wherever we want. We could place these to help certain demographics, politically demographics of voters to vote, and harm other demographic of voters by not placing them in those areas. There has to be more standards around placement and certainly more standards around construction of these. So, a couple things that you mentioned about your legislation that I... is another reason why I think we need to spell this out a little more. In your opening remarks, you mentioned that these were tamper proof. And as far as I can tell, that term is not used anywhere in the legislation. But you indicated that you're legislation would make them tamper proof, but it doesn't say that. It says secured by locks, that’s it. That’s the only thing that we have, secured by locks. The other thing that you said in your opening remarks was that these would be subject to rules. That’s the term you used, subject to rules of the State Board of Election. These are not subject to rules of the State Board of Election. They are subject to additional guidelines for the security of the collection sites. We institute all sorts of rules. This
chamber, this Body institutes all sorts of rules around our elections. When we can vote, where we can vote, how we can vote. We set those standards in statute. We don't leave a lot of things up to people to just kind of decide how they're going to do it. We're very firm in many of those things. Yet, in this instance, once we've talked about this for a year now, we have been completely ignored about our legitimate concerns about construction and use of these drop boxes. Look, I'm all for drop boxes, but I think, here in Illinois, we need to set in statute or give much more authority to the elections board to come up with rules to do these the right way. I think this is... you know, again, some of this stuff in this legislation is good. We've had this... we had a robust discussion in the spring, I know, about this. Curbside voting is something that I want to see implemented, but obviously some questions came up about that. But we would implore you, as we move forward, peoples' concerns about election security are real. They're real. We need to make sure that everyone has the best access and the right to vote, but we must also make sure that our elections are totally secure. And, in this age, we have dangers from all over the place trying to tamper with our elections. And we could take one simple step here if we set out guidelines for these drop boxes and just put a little more structure around them. No pun intended, but actually spell it..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative."

Butler: "I'll wrap up here."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you."
Butler: "Just put a little more oomph in what we're doing here, and making sure that they're secure, and put some more guidelines around the placement so we would have more clarity about that. So, this Bill is going to pass. I would urge the Majority, in the future, to please listen to us on this because there are a lot of our constituents and a lot of your constituents that are very concerned about election security, and we could help ease that a little bit by having more rules around this. Thank you, Representative Stuart. And thank you, Madam Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this Bill. I think if there's one thing we can all agree on, vote by mail was hugely successful in 2020 in the State of Illinois, amidst a pandemic that made many of our constituents weary about exposure to others in long voting lines. Their unease was understandable, especially for our vulnerable populations. Like those over 65, our black and Latino communities, and those with underlying medical conditions. In my county, Rock Island County, out of roughly 67 thousand votes cast, about 28 thousand were vote by mail, which is about 42 percent. And this is personal to me. One of those vote by mail ballots was mine. And I was fortunate that I voted by mail because on Election Day I woke at 5 a.m., ready to start my last day of campaigning, with fever and chills and a headache. Symptoms which were later confirmed to be positive case of COVID. Had I not voted early and had that opportunity, I would have been forced to either sacrifice my right to vote that day or to further risk my health or put
others in harm’s way to try to vote in person while sick with virus. This should not be a choice any of us or any of our constituents has to make. In addition to those 28 thousand vote by mail ballots, another 12 thousand or so voted early in person, bringing the non-election day votes to about 66 percent of the total votes cast. And these numbers are specific to Rock Island County, but we saw this interest in early voting all across the state. And I think what this shows, what we should learn about this is that the system works. And that includes the drop boxes. It includes the curbside voting. Again, in Rock Island County, our great County Clerk, Karen Kinney, established a drop box outside the county office building. Safe and secure, this box was used for about half of those ballots that were submitted by mail. Our dedicated and reliable election judges, both Democrat and Republican, with professionalism, without discord, regularly checked the drop box to retrieve ballots and ensure that there were no issues with the process. We can trust our local officials to do this job. After those 28 thousand ballots from Rock Island County were counted, there is not a single charge of voter fraud, irregularities. The county simply did its job. And on the flip side, from the voters’ perspective, they could take their time at home. They can review the candidates on the ballot, do some research on the Internet, look at the local paper for their endorsements, without the time pressure of having to stand in line to vote, having to quickly get to work, or to pick up their child from day care. They could make sure they didn’t make any mistakes, double and triple check their ballot to make sure they didn’t
skip a question. Again, what these things should tell us is that we don’t have to rely on this system only when we have a once in a lifetime threat of pandemic. The system can work, even in normal times. Why should it be any different for a person who wakes up on election day with the flu, or a burst appendix, or other medical conditions, child care emergency, or an unexpectedly have to cover a shift at work to not have the same opportunity to vote that I did? Either early, by mail, or by drop box. At the very least, we should be giving our county clerks the option, as this Bill does, to use these tools every election. The drop boxes aren't mandated. Curbside voting isn't mandated. Every clerk has the flexibility to determine what works best for their county when it comes to providing access. This Bill encourages participation in our democracy. It facilitates an educated voting public. And I would say that the pandemic may have been the trigger to implement these practices, but the pandemic's end should not be reason be cast them aside. And so, I would strongly encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes leader Batinick for five minutes."

Batinick: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thanks for letting me keep my minutes and not giving them to Representative Spain. I'm going to go straight to the Bill, folks, and kind of take a different angle on this. I remember being asked very early on when I was running for office the first time, about elections, and I said it should be easy to vote and hard to cheat. And I actually have an absentee ballot on my kitchen table because, as the previous speaker spoke,
it's nice to be able to sit by a computer and go through things and really figure out who you're going to vote for. Certainly support vote by mail. Certainly support the actual... having a standard with drop box... drop boxes. But we seem to be working on making it easier to vote and not working on the other side of the equation of making it hard to cheat. In my county, for example, we had dozens of people come to my office who had vote by mail applications that were auto populated, mailed to their house of people that hadn't lived in the state for years. Now, I don't think anything was wrong with the process after that where there's check and balances. But if somebody gets a vote by mail application that’s auto populated to their house, they're going to think they can vote there, even if maybe... even if maybe they've moved. But the problem is, if you're somebody and you're sitting at home, any of you, and you get one of those applications sent to your house of somebody else that doesn't live there, are you going to trust the election that’s happening? We need to build the trust of the public. The public has to... it's not about how many people have been convicted or have been... how many cases of evidence of fraud, people have to trust our elections. If we haven’t learned anything in the last little bit here, people don’t trust government, and politics, and the election. So, we have to have a process of having people trust our elections. And you don’t actually need to break the law to tip the scales of an election. Let's take this scenario right now. If somebody is going to put a drop box only in Democratic precincts or only in Republican precincts, you can easily skip the scale... tip the scale of a local election. It
is going to be very easy to use this process because we have no standards as to where these... as to where these drop boxes have to go. An enterprising clerk can take advantage of this and tip the scales one way or another. That's why we're looking for standards. Imagine what's going to happen if somebody does that. People are going to feel disenfranchised. We use to have a law where it was same day registration in larger counties at every precinct, but you had to drive to the clerk's office in smaller precincts. So, you had a situation, where if somebody wanted to vote same day in a rural area, they had to get in their car and maybe drive 20, 30 minutes to vote same day. Whereas other people in other parts of the state could do it by taking a walk. Folks, I want people to trust our elections. I like vote by mail. I've been an advocate of vote by mail. I think the drop boxes, with standards, are an excellent idea. And guess what? They save us postage. And for some reason, a lot of people were worried about mailing their ballot anyways. They felt better about just turning it in to a drop box. So, I'm all for it. But for goodness gracious, we're making it ridiculously easy to vote, but can we do something, something on the end of not only making it hard for people to cheat, but let's give people confidence that the election results are the actual election results and that they have confidence in the vote totals when they add. That is imperative to our democracy. That's why I'm urging a 'no' vote. I really hope to work with the Sponsor on House Bill 1920, which is a cleanup of the voter rolls that's desperately needed so that we can start the process of making it harder to cheat. Thank you, everybody, for your time."
Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Delgado for five minutes."

Delgado: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. This last election cycle saw a record number of votes across the country. And while we were challenged with the pandemic, we made the efforts, in Illinois, to make voting safe and accessible. In 2020, we passed laws that kept the voting public safe, and the record turnout shows that these provisions were highly successful. House Bill 1871 will take those key provisions that we instituted last year and make them permanent, providing clarity to election authorities and voters alike. The pandemic has forced us to adapt and find new ways to get things done, and, in some cases, better ways to get things done. And this is a perfect example. Drop boxes are a necessary part of a robust vote by mail system. Many of my constituents on the northwest side of the City of Chicago expressed their relief at having a drop box as an alternative. Not only because it is safer than standing in long lines or crowding in a polling place, but because they did not have to rely on the postal system to get the ballot where it needed to be on time. There are rules that ensure that these boxes are safe, secure, and accessible. And providing an opportunity to hand deliver a ballot gives voters the confidence to know that their vote will be counted. And while this legislation does not mandate drop boxes, it makes them a choice for county clerks, which provides the flexibility that they need to administer fair and free elections. Making these specific changes permanent means that voters in my district and across the state, who work long shifts and who
have child care responsibilities, can exercise their right to vote without having to take time off work. Those that will claim that there is a heightened fraud possibility with these changes are claiming so with no facts to base that claim on, perpetuating the big lie. Drop boxes, curbside voting, they've existed in other states for many years. So, just like we expanded early voting to accommodate today's realities, we do the same with drop boxes and curbside voting. Making voting easier drives more participation, and a strong democracy thrives on that participation. I want to commend the Sponsor as well. Thank you, Representative, for driving us forward on this issue, and for the House Democratic Women's Caucus for being, and continuing to be, highly engaged about this issue. For these reasons, I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you.

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stuart to close."

Stuart: "Thank you. I have a very vivid memory of... I was 17 years old, in my senior year of high school, and a group came to our English classes to register people to vote. My birthday was going to be November 12, in 1988, when I would turn 18. The election... yes, that makes me 50, for those of you who can't do the math. The election was November 8. So, I was missing the election by four days. And I remember how disappointed I was that I was not able to, along with my peers, register to vote and then look forward to voting in that very next election. I could not wait until the very next opportunity because I know how important it is to vote. My parents have always explained to us that being involved in your democracy is what keeps your democracy alive. We need to
do these measures so that everyone has every opportunity available to them to vote. When people keep... what does not instill faith in our elections is when people keep bringing forward false claims of fraud that does not happen. That’s what's attacking the perception of people's integrity of the ballot. I can tell you what happened to me this year. I did vote by mail for the first time, because I used to always love going to the polling place, whether it was Election Day or during an early voting. But I decided to take advantage of vote by mail because I didn’t know what might happen. Maybe I would become COVID positive. Maybe I wouldn't be able to get to an early voting place. So, I decided to vote by mail. I got a notification that my... and I dropped in a drop box. I got a notification that my vote by mail was not accepted. That tells me that the process works. My county clerk had a system in place. Our election judges looked at the signatures, were not satisfied. So, I had to go and take measures to make sure that my signature matched. So, I had to sign my new voter registration on file so that the signatures matched. I brought my photo ID to identify who I was. There are processes in place to maintain the integrity of our election, and they work. As I said before, I think we need to make these drop boxes available across the board. It's not fair that in some places people have access to them and some places people don’t. I look forward to working with people across the aisle to come up with ways and come up with the regulations that we are going to put on those drop boxes. But until we get that work done, we should allow our election authorities, if they so choose, the availability to have them for the voters. Thank
you for your time today, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1871 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Members, please come to the floor to vote your own switch. And 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 70 voting in 'favor', 41 voting 'against'. And this Bill, having... and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bills on Second Reading, we're going to House Bill 2415. Representative Moeller, Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2415, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2415, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and Members of the House. House Bill 2415 allows Kane County to administer and collect a County Cannabis Retailer's Occupation Tax for May 2021 and June 2021. This Bill comes at the request of Kane County, which enacted an ordinance to impose a cannabis sales tax by October 1, 2020, but didn’t file the ordinance with the Department of Revenue until November 2020, essentially missing the deadline for collecting the tax during this fiscal
year. Under this Bill, the county will be able to collect the taxes for May and June, and they have already filed the paperwork to start collecting taxes for the subsequent fiscal year. With that, I know of no opposition and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hirschauer."
Hirschauer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Hirschauer: "To the Bill. As Representative Moeller mentioned, House Bill 2415 is a simple fix that will allow Kane County to administer a county cannabis sales tax on May 1, 2021, rather than waiting until July 1, 2021. As a Representative from Kane County, I have talked with local elected officials about this Bill and how it will be helpful as a source of additional revenue for local government. The collected revenue will be used to help fund Kane County services that are essential for thousands of residents, like addiction treatment centers and mental health resources. Thank you, to Representative Moeller, for sponsoring this Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."
Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, we had this Bill in committee yesterday. I thought you did a great job of explaining it. I just want to reemphasize to the Members on my side of the aisle that this is just a local issue for Kane County. Is that correct?"
Moeller: "Yes, that’s correct."
Wheeler: "And it's just a tax issue. We're trying to correct a paperwork problem that occurred back last year that now will allow Kane County to collect the tax that they should be able to collect... that's going to be collected anyway."

Moeller: "Yeah. Yes, that's correct."

Wheeler: "So, to put it very succinctly, everyone should vote 'yes' on this Bill?"

Moeller: "That's correct."

Wheeler: "Well, thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Kifowit."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Kifowit: "Thank you. To the Bill. As an individual that has represented Kane County... and actually I was an alderman for the City of Aurora. So, I know Kane County quite well. I wanted to put on the record that this situation seemed to stem from a miscommunication of a new program. And that currently, in working with the new members of the board and the board chair, that certain protocols and processes are in place so that Kane County can be... assure this Body that there will not be a problem like this again and that this is a one-time occurrence. And again, with a new system, I believe it was just a miscommunication and a simple error that occurred. So, thank you, Madam Chair."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Moeller to close."

Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members of the House. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this legislation. And would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2415 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Members, please come to the floor and vote your own switch. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? While we wait for the Members to come to the floor, those that are here, couple reminders. You're asked to respect social distancing. That's six feet apart, please. And keep your masks on if you're not drinking. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting in 'favor', 10 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bills on Second Reading, House Bill 2877. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2877, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. 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 Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2877, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon, colleagues. House Bill 2877 is the housing Bill that we have been working on since the beginning of the pandemic last March. As you may recall, we voted for this Bill during lame duck Session just a few months ago. This Bill offers a comprehensive approach to addressing the crisis of housing and stability that has been caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. It provides protections for those at risk of eviction and relief to homeowners and
renters at risk of losing their homes. The Bill protects tenants by sealing evictions during the COVID-19 period. It addresses the foreclosure crisis by creating a moratorium on foreclosure filings through May 1 and a pause on judicial sales and taking of possession through July 31. This Bill also creates clear guidelines for state agencies administering the Federal Emergency Rental Assistance Program, including the December stimulus and also the Biden administration's American Rescue Plan. I want to highlight... thank you, Madam Speaker. I really appreciate that. So, colleagues, I'm almost done. I know that housing is important you. So, I'll get through this quickly. Biden's administration passed additional assistance, and I want to highlight a few of those guidelines. Our Bill removes barriers for tenants and landlords to apply and prioritizes the most in need with the federal guidelines. It also makes sure that we don't have a cap on the amount of assistance that we could provide for tenants who owe significant arrears. These are some of the key issues you all have expressed with the first round of rental assistance we passed last year. The changes we have made will ensure the program is effective in reaching those in need and efficient in getting an aid out as quickly as possible. So, the Bill balances the needs and concerns of tenants, of landlords, of homeowners, and the finance industry. We are creating protections for people at risk of eviction. We are protecting homeowners who are at risk of foreclosure. And we are making sure that financial relief will be administered effectively and efficiently. I urge a 'yes' vote."
Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Collins."
Collins: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
Collins: "Leader Hernandez, how many families will HB2877 help? How many families will House Bill 2877 help?"
Ramirez: "The program will help thousands and thousands of families in Illinois. As a matter of fact, quadruple the assistance that we've already provided."
Collins: "And what damages does a record on eviction do to families?"
Ramirez: "To your question... just to hear you, 'cause it’s a little hard to hear from the sound. You're asking, what's the damage to a family that has an eviction?"
Collins: "Yes."
Ramirez: "An eviction filing record is something that's going to haunt a family for seven years. And so, it means that if you have gone through COVID, if a family member died because of COVID, you are unable to pay rent and there is an eviction filing, even though there wasn't a judgement, that will cause additional barriers to housing for families for years to come."
Collins: "Thank you, Leader. As we, as a state, continue the hard work of the past year to right the ship that was wrecked due to COVID-19, as we open up our state and get our economy back on track, we must not forget the people who make the economy run, the people who make our state great. The majority of those folks are renters. And we can't make our state run unless people have a safe, affordable place to live. Evictions and the mark it leaves on families, especially during this
pandemic, isn't the result of poverty, but as Matthew Desmond, a professor at Princeton, states, 'It oftentimes cause itself.' For those of you who don't know, this is what happens when a family is evicted. The family lose their home, the kids lose their school, their neighborhood. They might lose their stuff, which is left on the street or on the front lawn of the property. What eviction sealing does is it protects those families from losing something crucial, which is the ability to have a clean record and find housing elsewhere. So, let's be clear. The families that are losing their homes during this pandemic are not losing them because the mismanaged funds or because they're lazy. They're losing them because something none of us could control swept down and took their jobs, or made them sick, and caused them significant financial trouble. This Bill, House Bill 2877, aims to alleviate this with rental relief, foreclosure relief, so that homeowners and small landlords, who we know heavily rent to tenants, can keep their properties. But also, that families who have lost so much during this pandemic don't leave it with a mark on their record that prevents them from starting anew somewhere safe, as we all recover from this turbulent crisis. This is the start to what we can do, and we can't wait any longer. We have to put ourselves in our constituents' shoes because across Illinois we need this. And we need them to make our state run. We need them to fully recover. We have two choices here. One, we could turn our backs on the people we serve and give them less to recover with. Or two, we could give them this as a starting point so we could get through this pandemic together, protected, safe,
and on a path to true recovery. Leader Hernandez, I commend you for standing on the frontlines for people who are looking at evictions. You have already compromised enough with this Bill, and today enough is enough. I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2877. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Mazzochi: "Representative, one of the things in this Bill, in terms of prioritizing the financial assistance, it says it shall go to people disproportionately in... areas disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 cases. What does that mean exactly in terms of how the funds will be disbursed? What metric will be used?"

Ramirez: "So, what they're using is, they're using IDPH's numbers, and they're using their information on the positive COVID cases across the State of Illinois in order to determine the highest impact in the DIA."

Mazzochi: "All right. So, just so I'm clear, you basically want to make sure that funds go to places where there were the highest number of COVID positive cases. Is that going to be measured per capita, per 100 thousand, or just straight up numbers?"

Ramirez: "The intent of the Bill, Representative, is to bring rent relief assistance. If you're talking about the program itself on rent relief, it's to ensure that we bring assistance to people from Chicago to the end of the state in East St. Louis that need the assistance right now."
Mazzochi: "Sure. But there are some areas within the state, in our rural areas where people certainly, for example, may have lost their job because of the Governor's lock downs, but they may not necessarily be in a very high COVID positive region. So, in that instance, they're very... some of our Members are very concerned that, without a true objective metric put into this statute that we can agree to, Chicago and St. Louis are going to get most of the funds, in terms of prioritization, and the great swaths in the middle are not going to get the same degree of support. So..."

Ramirez: "Representative, the Bill... the language in the Bill says that IHDA should prioritize to their best effort. That's their best effort, that it goes to these areas, but it gives them the flexibility in order to ensure that, as people are applying, that they are being approved. As you can tell from the Bill language, this is going to allow for significant money. We're talking about $1.4 billion of rental assistance to get through the State of Illinois for all of those applications."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Ramirez: "So, we want to make sure that, if they apply, that they're able to get the assistance."

Mazzochi: "Right. Now, one of the questions that I had asked you before is, which agency do you contemplate is going to be responsible for disbursing the $1.4 billion?"

Ramirez: "My Bill states administering agencies. In the event that there is more than one agency that is going to be administering these funds, it is my understanding from the Governor's Office, the Illinois Department of Human Services
will be partnering with IHDA to administer these services, these resources in order to ensure that they get to as many people as quickly as possible."

Mazzochi: "All right. One of the other questions I had for you is, if you're going to allow multiple agencies to be responsible for disbursing these funds, a lot of what's in this Bill is really relying on making a bunch of really quick administrative rules to figure out how this is going to be disbursed because the Bill is very silent on a lot of those issues. And you're real... and we are putting a whole lot of trust that the agency is actually going to do it correctly. So, who's going to actual... which agency is actually going to make the rules to decide how this money is actually going to be disbursed?"

Ramirez: "The Federal Government."

Mazzochi: "No. It's not just the Federal Government because the Federal Government standards are actually saying that the states have to do a whole bunch of things, including make sure that there is no fraud... that we have sufficient protections against fraud. So, which agency is going to write the rules on how this application process works so we can make sure, for example, that no fraud is going to be happening?"

Ramirez: "The rulemaking components of that federal program that administering agencies will take the funds and then, therefore, disburse is not part of this Bill. That is something that the Governor's Office, through the administering agencies, be IHDA or be the Department of Human Services. I have no power in controlling that. The money went
through DCEO, and then they're going to work with those administering agencies. That will be their responsibility to do so. However, I do want to note something, Representative. Any of the administering agencies, be it one or two that are responsible for administering these funds, are required by Federal Law to go through the Statewide Single Audit. And that is an annual audit that will be available to all of us to ensure that they are honoring and abiding by all the guidelines in which will be required for this program."

Mazzochi: "Sure. Let me go to the Bill because that last answer is what really gets me a lot of discomfort because the..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi, pardon me one second. Representative Batinick has told me he's going to give you his five minutes. Please proceed."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. Thank you. The Illinois Department of Employment Security can also be audited. How many people in this chamber are really happy with how the Illinois Department of Employment Security has handled all of the federal dollars that were supposed to get into the hands of people who were hurting? And in reality, it's been the subject of a huge amount fraud, a whole lot of stress, and people haven't gotten the money that they were promised. They haven't got the money that they were paid into. And that's for people who... you know, there are people who have been waiting for a year to try to get their unemployment money, and they haven't been able to get it. Why? Because there's been fraud, because the administration hasn't been able to actually keep up with the number of claims. We're now putting another huge pot of money, $1.4 billion, on the table. And maybe you're happy trusting
the administration to be able to administer these funds and get it to the right people who need it, we sure don't. We're the ones who have been getting the calls about people who haven't been able to get their unemployment benefits because of the administration. I don't know why you think that without a lot more detail, a lot more structure, you think that the administration is necessarily going to do much better. Additionally, one of the other things that is required by the state, or that the state has to comply with is, we're supposed to be documenting things. But when you look even at the federal standards for what can qualify as documentation, it could just be an email and an attestation, 'Oh, I promise I live there.' That is a recipe, an invitation to fraud. When you have a situation set up as well, where you're also not allowing the landlords to try to actually get the funds, that's a problem. One of the biggest complaints that I've heard from landlords is that they have tenants who will not cooperate with them to file an application. So, here you are creating a situation where the tenants can apply but the landlords can't apply on behalf of their tenants. That's another problem because it means that less of the funds are going to get to where the debt is actually owed. Furthermore, the prior... in terms of the funds that are going to be made available, it's not going to be enough to make everybody whole. It's not going to pay off all the back rent that is owed. It's not going to pay off all of the people who are going to need assistance going forward. And I think that we need to actually explain to the administration how we're going to prioritize those payoffs. The other thing that I'm very
concerned about is that, when it comes to this program, this program cannot be marketed or presented to members of the public as somehow everybody is going to be able to get their rent paid. There's all kinds of things that are supposed to get verified. You're supposed to verify income. You're supposed to verify a whole host of things. I asked, are you going to make sure that the state is collecting Social Security information so that that income information can actually be verified? The federal rules require it, at the very least, in connection with the landlords. But if you're not going to do it for the tenants, how are you actually going to validate that people are meeting the income thresholds that the Federal Government requires in order to issue these funds? So, I want to be clear. We want to get the federal dollars that are coming into people's hands who deserve it, and who qualify, and who meet the criteria. But the way in which this law is set up, people, because we're not specifying, and we're not being clear as to what the rules of the game are to be able to be eligible, we're not putting in place the oversight mechanisms to make sure we know that the money is going where it's supposed to be, I am very fearful that we are going to see another problem of fraud, mismanagement, waste, and abuse of this program. And the people who are going to be hurt by that the most are the people who are going to need the money and who aren't going to get the money because either somebody else is going to try to get it, the program will run out of funds, or the administration won't be able to actually figure out where to get that money into the right location. And the fact that
we're not doing things to try to make sure that we learn from
the mistakes of IDES and do better on this next go round, I
have a real concern about that. You know, when it comes to
the first part of the Bill, that relates to the COVID..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "I think Representative Bos will yield his time
to you."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. The first part of the Bill does, in fact,
relate to the distribution of the COVID dollars, but the next
two sections relate to eviction record sealing, which,
frankly, is a completely independent issue that I believe
does not belong in this Bill. And you probably would get a
lot more support for this Bill if it wasn't in there,
certainly on our side of the aisle. Now, I understand that
you're here and you've got enough votes... if... you wouldn't be
presenting this Bill if you didn’t have the votes on your
side to support it, but that is an issue that's very
important. It's one of the sources of the landlords' continued
opposition to your Bill. And out of respect for all that they
have gone through, I would prefer to see that amended and
taken out. Ultimately, this is a Bill that is like many Bills
we've seen in Springfield as well as today. A lot of great
intentions, but it's going to leave a lot to be considered on
the execution. And because of that, I have real concerns about
this Bill. I don't think it's ready, but it could and should
be. We shouldn't be voting on it at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative LaPointe."

LaPointe: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

LaPointe: "Leader Ramirez, I have a few questions for you. We all know that we've been dealing with a public health and economic crisis for a full year. People have had their incomes slashed, and that became a problem almost immediately a year ago. And that immediately created housing instability and a lot of anxiety for both tenants and landlords. How long have you been working on a Bill like this that would actually provide housing relief through legislation?"

Ramirez: "Representative, this week marks one whole year that we have been working on emergency housing legislation so that your constituents, and your constituents, and your constituents, and my constituents can have a safe home to go to and to stay in. It's been over a year."

LaPointe: "Over a full year. So, I'm also hearing, over a full year, that this Bill has been through a few different iterations. All the while, the pressure for relief for both tenants and landlords is building. Has the opposition to this Bill changed over the whole year that you've been working on this?"

Ramirez: "Yes, the opposition has changed. And we have neutralized the opposition from the REALTORS Association, from the finance industry, with the Amendment that this Bill has. And this new Bill, during this new Session, it has also neutralized opposition from other stakeholders that had concerns, like the community bankers, the credit unions. As we were talking about the foreclosure section, after Amendment, after Amendment, after Amendment and heavy, heavy negotiation, this is a really good Bill that will address the
issues of our tenants, who are families and children, our landlords, who are families and have children, our finance industry, and everyone in the housing market."

LaPointe: "That actually gives me a lot of confidence that this Bill is about housing stability during the biggest crisis of our lifetimes. Not only for tenants, but also for landlords, in particular, small landlords. This is the kind of Bill that New York actually passed in December 2020, when most of us were getting ready to take a holiday break. This Bill recognizes that the very last thing that we want to do in a public health crisis is put people out of their homes. I'm going to speak to the Bill. A year ago, when the COVID-19 pandemic first hit, we asked people to stay home. But what does that mean for people that don't actually have homes? Or what about our people who have been living under... who immediately started living under this specter of becoming homeless, like our hospitality workers or our convention workers, who, about one year ago, all of a sudden had no income and all of a sudden faced housing instability for the first time in their lives. I am actually a little disappointed that we haven't done more in Illinois, legislatively, in terms of housing in response to this pandemic. We really haven't managed to do that much except for making sure we have more rental assistance dollars for our tenants and landlords. So, now, the federal stimulus package that's finally sending help that we desperately need, through that... through those federal dollars... which those federal dollars are coming to us, here in Illinois, either way, thankfully. But we have an opportunity to codify that rental assistance, to make sure it
gets out the door more effectively and efficiently to every corner of Illinois. The Illinois Housing Development Authority, which we've heard a little bit about so far in this debate, that state agency responded to our first wave of federal rental assistance and they stood up a program in two months. The Governor signed the Bill on June 10, and they opened applications for rental assistance on August 10. So, two short months. There were many lessons learned through that process which then became the parts of this Bill that codify rental assistance. A structure that will ensure the assistance flows quickly and efficiently to tenants and small landlords who need it in every corner of Illinois. Again, this money thankfully is coming, and, no, it's not enough. So, there's been some concerns raised about the oversight of this funding. There's been some parallels to IDES. And, frankly, I think everyone in this room has been traumatized by DHS. But IHDA is nothing like DHS. They have incrementally built up their capacity to be able to administer $570 million of rental assistance. They successfully administered 215 million in rental assistance in the summer and fall. I have sat through three briefings from IHDA where they talked about the lessons learned and how they're going to do things differently, like better outreach, better PR to make sure landlords all across the state are aware of this rental assistance program. So, our small landlords and our tenants will get relief not just through the rental assistance, but also through our pause on foreclosures and judicial sales. These are the exact provisions of this Bill that are based on
so many conversations for the last year with realtors... the realtors..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative, can you bring you comments to a close, please?"

LaPointe: "Absolutely. And the financial industry. They've asked us and they've told... we've asked them, what can we do? And this was their answer. So, we're finally seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. That last thing we want to do is create more housing instability by failing to act today. I thank you, Leader Ramirez, for your leadership and persistence on this Bill. I'm proud to vote 'yes' on behalf of both tenants and landlords all across this state. A 'no' vote on this Bill makes it harder for our landlords to be made whole. And it means less dollars to every community across the State of Illinois. Thank you for your leadership, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Ms. Speaker. May I ask the Sponsor a few questions?"

Speaker Manley: "Yes."

Ammons: "Thank you. Leader Ramirez, can you explain if... are these dollars are going to come regardless of what we do here today?"

Ramirez: "Yes. Leader, the money's coming regardless. And so, if we are concerned that the administering agencies are not going to have adequate or enough monitoring, this Bill actually puts in provisions that ensures that a lot of the concerns that both sides of the aisle are expressing, in fact, get addressed."
Ammons: "And so, if we... if we don't pass this Bill, the money will still come to the State of Illinois, but it won't have the direction that this Bill gives it and it won’t have the oversight that you've put... built into this Bill, correct?"
Ramirez: "That is correct."
Ammons: "Can you also explain the process, the court process, of evictions? What you're trying to do not only to protect renters but also the homeowners in this process?"
Ramirez: "Sorry. Can you repeat the question?"
Ammons: "Absolutely. Yes. I just wanted to... I know your Bill is designed to help the homeowner as well as the renter. Can you explain the process that this Bill does to protect both the homeowner and the renter?"
Ramirez: "The Bill makes sure that landlords can apply for the federal assistance, versus the program we had prior, where just tenants could apply, landlords can apply as well and work in partnership with the tenant to do so. And all of the money will go directly to the landlord, ensuring that we are addressing the rent that has been owed. Secondly, the Bill makes sure that, in addition to Federal Law, that we put provisions to protect small landlords and homeowners from foreclosures and from any judicial sales of their property to an extended period of time. And then, in terms of tenants, it ensures that we seal evictions that have happened during the COVID period so that what happened during COVID doesn’t happen for years to come, causing even more barriers to permanent housing."
Ammons: "And a part of this Bill really focuses on low income residents. Is this your intention to make this available to
low income residents? Not in the case of trying to institute all these fraud things that people are suggesting, but is it to assist those low income residents so that they are not homeless at the end of this COVID crisis?"

Ramirez: "Yes, that is correct. So, we want to make sure... I know people have said, oh, this is going to be fraud and people are going to buy luxury homes. This is about getting people who need assistance for their housing as quickly as possible, really prioritizing people within the 80 percent of an area median income and 50 percent of the area median income."

Ammons: "Can you also, just for the legislative intent, express how this Bill directs the funding to localities?"

Ramirez: "So, if a county has more than 200 thousand residents, the Federal Government will be sending them the money directly. Anything outside of that will go through the administering agencies, like Department of Human Service and IHDA, and a tenant or a landlord can apply for the assistance. And, because of this Bill, if someone owes $9 thousand, not 5, or $12 thousand they will be able to have access to this as quickly as possible. So, these checks will be made directly to the landlord."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you for answering those quick questions. I just want to speak to the Bill in the last few minutes allowable. Over the last year and now continuing the last year and almost a half, we've experienced, in Champaign County, an increase in the number of people that are facing evictions in a way that we have never experienced at all. We can't ignore the impact of the COVID crises on working class people, those who do not have guaranteed incomes. Because we
don't have guaranteed incomes in Illinois, people who lose their jobs tend to lose their housing, tend to, in some cases, lose their children. And the snowball continues to roll downhill. This is a good piece of legislation. Yes, we are concerned about the instances of fraud. But I assure you, those are much smaller than the instances of helping those who are most needy at this time. It would be a very irresponsible act for this state to allow people to be evicted from their homes during a pandemic and a crisis of this magnitude. I highly urge an 'aye' vote in response to Representative Ramirez's request on House Bill 2877. And I do hope that we are able to save our communities. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "Representative... Leader Ramirez to close."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Over the last few months, I've heard people on that side of the aisle and I've heard people on this side of the aisle talk about economic recovery. Economic recovery. Economic recovery. I want you to hear that clearly. We cannot economically recover from a pandemic that has killed thousands, and thousands, and thousands of our constituents if we don't ensure that they can stay in their home so that they can also take their children to school, so that they can pay their utilities, so that they can go to church, so that they can get back and recover. Getting this Bill to this point has been among my top priorities over the last year, but I haven't done it alone. I've had reliable partners, like Representative LaPointe here, who has literally worked on this Bill with me night and day nonstop. I've had other partners, like Chairman Guzzardi, in the
Housing Committee, who, on 9:00 meetings with some of the stakeholders, has met with us, listened, and helped us identify Amendments. We've had Leaders, like Leader Ammons, and Representative Cassidy, and Leader Hernandez, and Representative Collins, just to name a few who have said to me, 'Representative, if I don't do something about housing in my district, I can't go back to my district.' So, here's what I'll say. I want to express my deepest gratitude to the broad coalition that has continued to make housing a top priority. To all the housing advocates who have worked tirelessly by my side to draft, to negotiate, and champion this Bill, thank you. I specially want to thank the staff at the Shriver Center, the Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing, and Housing Action Illinois. This work would not have been possible without you. Finally, but certainly not least, folks, we don't thank our staff enough. I want to say a special thank you to the staff who have spent endless nights, holidays, weekends, taking all of their personal time to make this Bill possible. I want to say thank you to Luis, my Chief of Staff, and to Katherine Bray, who has worked so hard on this Bill. Thank you. You are unsung heroes, and I wouldn't be literally standing here on these heels if it weren't for you. And so, colleagues, I stand before you today, asking you, do you care about economic recovery? Do you care about the landlords in your district? Do you care about the tenants? Cause there's also tenants in your district. Because if you do, I'm asking you to vote 'yes' for tenants. I'm asking you to vote 'yes' for homeowners. I'm asking you to vote 'yes'
for landlords. I'm asking you to vote 'yes' for an economic recovery. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2877 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Members, please come to the floor and vote your switches now. 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 73 voting in 'favor', 31 voting 'against', and 8 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following action taken on March 18, 2021: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 72, Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 168."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mah. We can stand at ease. The Chair recognizes Representative Mah."

Mah: "Madam Speaker, I'd like a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today with great sadness and anger in the wake of yet another horrific mass shooting in our country. One that took the lives of eight people, the majority of whom were Asian American women. On March 16, 2021, a shooter reigned terror on three Atlanta, Georgia area spas, killing his victims, including six Asian American women. I think it's important to speak their names, though only three have been officially identified by name so far, Xiaojie Tan, Daoyou Feng, Delaina Ashley Yaun, and at least three others
who have been confirmed to have been immigrants from South Korea. These women were mothers, sisters, daughters, partners, friends, and community members. They were people going about their daily business only to be gunned down in cold blood. They were invisible until their brutal murders forced them to the forefront, into our collective consciousness. The murders of these women need to be seen in the context of racism in this country and more than a year of heightened xenophobia directed at Asian Americans. This past year, we saw our former President insist on using racially charged terms in reference to COVID-19, insisting on calling it the China virus and kung flu and openly blaming China and Chinese people for the pandemic. Recently we have seen a rash of brutal attacks against Asian Americans all across the country. A troubling spike in racial violence directed at Asian Americans that has been terrifying as well as heart-rending. The tendency to see Asian Americans as perpetual foreigners, bringers of disease, helpless targets, or expendable victims is part of a long history of racism in this country, and it's something that needs to change. We must also move from ignoring Asian Americans and perpetuating our invisibility. Asian Americans helped to build this country, from its infrastructure to its economy, with labor that has been largely unrecognized, invisible, like the women who were murdered on Tuesday. The notion that we are a model minority is... in which we have all done well and overcome racism is obviously a dangerous myth if we have members of our community stuck in low wage, exploitative jobs, working in massage parlors, and seen as expendable. Again, these women
were mothers, sisters, daughters, partners, friends, and community members. Just as Asian Americans in our country are complex, multi-dimensional people from a multitude of ethnic backgrounds, educational levels, economic statuses, language abilities, political stripes, and walks of life. The first step in combating the hate is to learn more about our communities. To see us, we are not invisible. To hear us, we have complex needs and issues, and we refuse to be silent. And to understand that Asian Americans have a long history in this country. We are part of its fabric, not simply recent immigrants or invisible labor. On this day, during Women's History Month, I'm proud to stand here with three other Asian American women Members of the Illinois House of Representatives to deplore and condemn, in no uncertain terms, hate crimes against Asian Americans and to honor the memories of the six Asian American women, mothers, sisters, daughters, partners, friends, community members who were lost... who tragically lost their lives this week. I ask the Body for a moment of silence."

Speaker Manley: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative. The Chair recognizes Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Gong-Gershowitz: "I rise, in honor of Women's History Month, to tell you a little bit about Patsy Mink. After attending the University of Chicago Law School, Patsy Matsu Takemoto Mink returned to her home state of Hawaii to pursue her career in
1952, but was unable to find work after passing the bar as a result of her interracial marriage. Mink went on to establish her own practice, making her the first Japanese American woman to practice law in the State of Illinois. Mink began her campaign for Congress in 1959 but was unsuccessful. In 1962, she continued her efforts and instead sought and was elected to the Hawaii State Senate. In 1964, Mink was eventually elected to serve as the first Asian American woman in Congress, where she fought for bilingual education, access to affordable child care, and racial equity. Contributing to the fabric of American history, we honor Patsy Mink. Thank you.

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Willis: "Thank you. Also, in honor Women's History Month, I'd like to recognize a woman that I had a personal connection to, Judy Baar Topinka. She was a family friend of mine, lifelong Republican, but I think she was also a person that knew how to reach across the aisle. And I hope that, as I continue my career, I can do the same as what Judy has done. To give you a little background on Judy, she was born... she was a lifelong resident of the Village of Riverside. She attended local public schools there and got her degree from Northwestern University in the world of journalism. For over 11 years she wrote for the local papers and did... was thrilled to always work on her political aspects on there. In 1980, she began her political career as a State Representative for the area. And then, she went on to serve two years in the
Illinois House of Representatives. And then, in 1984... two terms, I'm sorry. And then, in '84, went to the Illinois State Senate. She served for Senator... as a Senator there for over a decade. And, in 1994, she was elected as the Illinois State Treasurer, becoming the first woman in Illinois history to hold that post. She, again, became famous in history when she was also the first woman to be re-elected as the State Treasurer, and then, again, for a third term. During her time she was extremely fiscally responsible, one of the best things that we could ever have in a Treasurer. And I am so proud of all the work she did that. She went on to have a campaign as a Governor, which, unfortunately, was unsuccessful. And we all know how that turned out, so we won't go there. And, in 2010, Judy was elected though as Comptroller, becoming the first person in Illinois history to ever be elected for both fiscal constitutional offices. She was re-elected in 2014 and, unfortunately, had an untimely death just before she took over for her next term in office. She took pride in her Czech and Slavic heritage and had a great relationship throughout the Illinois... the State of Illinois with Czechoslovakian residents and was extremely known for that. She always was... important to keep her family values in there, worked hard in education and public service, and continued to mentor those that were all around her. Her only agenda as a public servant was to simply help the people. She demonstrated that attitude to fellow Illinois citizens by her words, deeds, and action. I hold Judy Baar Topinka as someone that we all should hope to be as well as. Thank you very much."
Speaker Manley: "Members, reminder, masks must be worn while you're not drinking and have to cover both your nose and mouth. Just a reminder. The Chair recognizes Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Greenwood: "I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. As the daughter of a maid and a sharecropper, Bessie Coleman grew up helping her mother pick cotton and wash clothes in order to save money to attend college one day. After dropping out of what is now Langston University in Oklahoma, because she could no longer afford it, Coleman eventually moved to Chicago to live with her brothers who told her stories of their time spent in France during World War I. When Coleman learned that women in France could learn to fly airplanes, while she was, as an American, could not, she became determined to become a pilot. Coleman applied to flight schools across the country but was continuously denied admittance because she was both African American and a woman. Refusing to give up on her dreams, Coleman began taking evening French classes and submitting an application to the Caudron Brothers' School of Aviation in France. She received her international pilot's license on June 15, 1921. In 1922, she became the first African American woman to perform a public flight. Bessie Coleman. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. In honor of Women's History Month, I would like to introduce you to Ellen Martin. Born in 1847 in
New York, Ellen Martin became the first female law student in Chautauqua County, before graduating from the University of Michigan in 1875 and being admitted to the Illinois Bar the following year. Martin and a colleague opened a law firm on LaSalle Street in downtown Chicago but were prohibited from arguing cases in court and could not be considered true lawyers because they were not permitted to vote. On April 6, 1891, Martin became the first woman in Illinois to vote, after arriving at a polling place and demanding that she and others be allowed to vote pursuant to a local rule that stated that all citizens above the age of 21 years shall be entitled to vote at any corporation election. On July 1, 1913, an Act providing that women of legal age in Illinois could vote for all statutory offices became law. Thank you.

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Avelar."
Avelar: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."
Avelar: "In honor of Women's History Month, I'd like to recognize Sandra Cisneros. The internationally recognized writer, poet, and scholar, Sandra Cisneros, was born in Chicago in 1954 and earned her Bachelors of Art degree in English from Loyola University in 1976, and her Masters of Fine Arts in Creative Writing from the University of Iowa in 1978. Cisneros worked as a creative writing teacher, counselor, and college recruiter throughout her career and is most known for her work titled The House on Mango Street, which has sold over 6 million copies and has been translated into over 20 languages. Cisneros is one of the first Latinx writers to achieve commercial success and is celebrated for her works that helped
highlight the importance of the Chicana movement in literary feminism. Cisneros has received numerous awards, including the National Medal of Art from President Barack Obama, established the Macondo Foundation for Socially Engaged Writers, and the Alfredo Cisneros Del Moral Foundation that provided grants to writers for 15 years. Ladies and Gentlemen, Sandra Cisneros. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Rep... excuse me... Leader Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is my honor to stand here before you today and to talk to you about a woman that has transformed Chicago, has transformed the State of Illinois, and this entire country. Today I want to talk to you about Karen Lewis. Karen Lewis grew up in Chicago and went to Chicago Public Schools. She left high school before graduation after accepting an early admission to attend Mount Holyoke. Karen later transferred to Dartmouth College. She was the only black woman in her graduating class of 1974. She is the only... she was the only president of a teachers' union who is also a nationally board certified teacher. Karen Lewis' leadership was transformational. It's rare that you can say that one person changed things in our city, our state, and country, but Karen did. And she did it which such style, and grace, and wit, and a fighting spirit that just could not be stopped. She literally changed the face of labor in Chicago and nationally. Karen Lewis' leadership and vision turned the Chicago Teachers Union in one of the nation's most democratic and inspiring unions, remaking the fabric of our city and nation and touching of hundreds of thousands of lives in the process, making our children her priority and the union's
priority. She helped transform the political landscape of Chicago, paving the way for women like me to be able to run for office. Everyday women who understand why it's so important that people that look like them, talk like them, come from their communities, and know what poverty looks like run for office and represent them. In 2010, we were told we were waiting for Superman to fix our public schools. It turns out we were waiting for a Superwoman, a lifelong educator, and a disciplined labor leader who changed the trajectory of education reform in Chicago and our nation. Karen had the courage to fight back and inspired many others, including myself, to be part of grassroots movements that empower black and brown communities for real representation, quality neighborhood schools for every child. Karen had the political clarity, the courage that very few people exhibit during tough times. But more than anything, Karen had a heart. Karen ignited the grassroots education movement in Chicago, and her leadership, compassion, and integrity will always be remembered. Her legacy and spirit lives in every teacher who is fighting today for equity and justice. And her powerful work continues to inspire solidarity between parents, teachers, and community at large to fight for schools that our children deserve. And so, Karen Lewis left this earth on February 7, 2021, just a month ago. But who she is, what she has been to our children will live the hearts of thousands of us in the City of Chicago, in other cities in the State of Illinois, in the state and the country because Karen Lewis is one of us. Karen Lewis will always be one of us. And her
commitment to love and our children, undoubtedly, will change us forever. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."


Speaker Manley: "Well done, Representative. Chair recognizes Representative Harper."
Harper: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Today I rise to give honor to one of our very own, for Women's History Month, on behalf of the Illinois House Democratic Women's Caucus. Today we honor Deputy Majority Leader Mary Flowers. Influenced by her mother, Harold Washington, and Dr. Martin Luther King, and encouraged by Carol Moseley Braun, Earlean Collins, Monique Davis, and many others, Leader Mary Flowers has become an icon of leadership, mentorship, and public service. As the longest serving black Legislator in the Illinois General Assembly, Leader Flowers has inspired all of us with her courage, dedication, and passion for the people she represents. Since joining the Illinois House of Representatives in 1985, Leader Flowers has demanded equality for black and brown communities, worked tirelessly to expand access to health care, and blazed a trail for the women following in her footsteps. Today we honor her legacy and thank her for all that she has done for the residents of Illinois. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Madam Chair. And happy Women's History Month to all. I want to thank the Body for listening to the 7 dynamic women that have blazed a trail for many of us who are here, the 46 of us who are serving the Illinoisans here in the General Assembly, the 102nd General Assembly. I want to thank the women who shared their passion and their concern for the legacy. But this could not have been done without the support of Jessica, Katie, Katie... it's two Katies... and Dwight. We want to thank you for being a part of Women's History Month by providing us with the information and the support. We thank
you. With that, I ask all the women join us for a group photo on the second floor, not the first. The second floor by the stairs because we're going to do a little social distancing. But please join us, because the 102nd General Assembly represents a good number of women and good number of fine men. So, with that, thank you all. And again, happy Women's History Month."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Lilly, that's after we adjourn, correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Speaker Manley: "Okay. Don't anybody leave. After we adjourn, we'll meet on the second floor. Chair recognizes Representative Haas."

Haas: "Thank you. I rise today to honor one of Illinois' most prominent social reformers. Jane Addams had a high standard for everything that she did. 'The excellent becomes the permanent,' she said, as she worked to enact lasting social change and improve the quality of life of immigrants and the poor. She was born in Stephenson County in 1860 and graduated from Rockford Female Seminary, now known as Rockford University, in 1881. She was inspired by a meeting with social reformers in England to bring these reform efforts to her home in the State of Illinois. In 1889, she and Ellen Gates Starr opened Hull-House on Chicago's west side to help the many immigrants from southern and eastern Europe who had settled in the city. Many of those arriving in the city spoke little English and had few professions and were being crowded into tenements with their families. Hull-House provided education to learn English, offered job training, child care,
and a real opportunity to achieve the American dream. By the turn of the century, Hull-House had grown from 1 house on the west side to a 13 building complex with multiple activities, including literacy education and even sports and theatre. Jane Addams didn't limit her vision to just Chicago however. The success of Hull-House made her a national figure and she was soon advocating for change nationwide. President Theodore Roosevelt called her America's most useful citizen. She became president of the National Conference of Social Work in 1910 and the Chairman of the International Congress of Women in 1915. She called for better living and working conditions for the poor, more education, and was a prominent voice for the drive in voting rights for women. In 1931, Jane Addams was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for a lifetime of service, the first American woman to be so honored. The momentum she set in motion with Hull-House soon found expression in dozens of different organizations and government agencies. Much of the facility was eventually cleared to make way for the University of Illinois campus in Chicago, though the organization lived on into this century. The original Hull-House building on Halsted Street in Chicago still stands. It was dedicated as a National Historic Landmark more than 50 years ago and today hosts the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum. Jane Addams died in Chicago in 1935. Tributes poured in, as a resolution of the City of Chicago praised her as the only saint America ever produced. And Governor Henry Horner said, 'Her life was dedicated to a selfless service which has few parallels in the history of humanity. No person has ever scaled higher peaks.' Jane Addams is buried near her birth
place in Cedarville, Illinois. I chose to honor Jane Addams today because I, too, chose the profession of social work. And, yes, 33 years ago, I received my masters in social work from Jane Addams College of Social Work at the University of Illinois in Chicago. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Hernandez."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm asking the General Assembly to welcome one of our newest Members, and I'm going to say her name with a little spice. Angelica Guerrero-Cuellar is our newest Member. Now, let me tell you something. If you remember the day, that first day, when you would come to Springfield... you've never been to Springfield, let's say, other than like a field trip. You take that ride down to Springfield and try to find... where is my parking space. You get into the building and you... it occurs to you, you don't have a picture. So, they're questioning who are you, and you're not even on the rolls yet. And then, the next task is looking for your office with no key. So, that was... that was Representative Angelica's day today. So, what I'm asking, give her a warm welcome and... she is our Representative that replaced our Speaker Madigan. And..."

Speaker Manley: "Go ahead, Lisa."

Hernandez, L.: "I was just going to say that Angelica replaced the Speaker Madigan seat, and this is really, actually her first time here. So, I really ask to give her guidance, help her around. She's a wonderful person, and you soon will see that. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Guerrero-Cuellar, would you like to say a few words? I can't say that as well as Lisa."
Guerrero-Cuellar: "Yes, I will. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Lisa, thank you very much. Thank you to everybody for the warm welcomes. I can say that walking into this building in this capacity has been very surreal. And what I represent, that comes with me, all the women in my life who have impacted me and the name that I carry, I can't even describe. But everybody has been so welcoming. Thank you on both sides, and I appreciate it. And I'm here to work and work with you. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Welcome to Springfield. Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed, Sir."

Durkin: "Representative Guerrero-Cuellar, welcome. On behalf of the Republican Caucus, welcome to the House of Representatives. Glad to have you with us. There will be some interesting times ahead, but we're glad to work with you. But let me also say that you are filling some very large but also some very interesting shoes. So, good luck to you. And I hope that this experience will be meaningful for you and also one for your constituents. So, welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Buckner."

Buckner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today just to join all of the students, faculty, staff, alumni, fans, and proud members of the Fighting Illini Nation in celebrating what has, thus far, been an amazing season for the University of Illinois Fighting Illini Men's Basketball Team. On Sunday, the Fighting Illini team earned their third overall Big Ten Tournament Title and their first title since my days on campus"
in 2005, in 91 to 88 overtime victory against the Ohio State University. The Illini were led by... with 16 points from Kofi Cockburn, Andre Curbelo, and Ayo Dosunmu. Not just an Illini graduate, but a graduate of Morgan Park High School on the South Side of Chicago, like myself and Representative Evans. He was named the most outstanding player of the 2021 Big Ten Tournament. Peoria's own, Da'Monte Williams, added 13 points, with a perfect 3 for 3 from behind the arc. And Giorgi Bezhanishvili added 12 points and 6 rebounds. Sunday's victory was a true team effort. The Illini added 41 points off the bench, including contributions from Jacob Grandison and Adam Miller, also from Peoria and Morgan Park High School. And the Illini now head to the NCAA Tournament as the number one seed in the Midwest region. This is the fourth time the Illini have been selected as number one seed and the first since the magical 2005 NCAA Tournament. Here is to Coach Brad Underwood and his team for giving us something to smile about.

We are excited for what's to come. Oskee-Wow-Wow."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Harris in the Chair. Representative Batinick, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Batinick: "As we celebrate Women's History Month, a very special woman close and dear to our hearts made history yesterday. Becca Demmer who, if you don't know, is the wife of Tom Demmer. And they had John Patrick Demmer, 22 inches, 8 pounds and 7 ounces, yesterday. So, congratulations to the Demmer family."
Speaker Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will stand at ease for 10 minutes. At 10 minutes we will resume. So, please do not go far from your seat. House will come back to order. On page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 72, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 72, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."
Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."
Hoffman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask that we adopt, if it's okay, Floor Amendment #2, move the Bill to Third Reading. And this will become the Bill, and we can debate it on Third."
Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman has moved that Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 72 be adopted. All 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 Harris: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 72, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."
Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 72, as amended, is a Bill that... that would essentially replace the provisions that were contained in House Bill 3360. House Bill 3360 was a Bill that was passed"
in January, through the House and through the Senate, that provided for prejudgment interest in Illinois for individuals who are plaintiffs and who were injured in personal injury cases. That Bill is currently on the Governor's desk, and there have been several organizations that have expressed concerns regarding that Bill. So, this is an attempt to address the vast majority of those concerns and make sure that we are mindful of the issues that have been brought before us by organizations, like the Illinois Hospital Association and organizations like the Health Care Council of Illinois. Now, since we have adopted this Amendment, the Illinois Hospital... Illinois Health and Hospital Association is officially neutral on the Bill and has provided a statement to the Members of the Illinois General Assembly on this Bill. In addition, the Health Care Council of Illinois, the largest nursing home and long term care organization in Illinois, is also neutral on the Bill. Why are they neutral on the Bill? I think because we attempted and we did address many of the concerns that were brought forward by the provider organizations. This Bill would no longer be subject or a condition of the signing of the Bill, House Bill 3360. So, it is not a trailer Bill. It is a stand-alone Bill. It would, like 46 other states, provide prejudgment interest in Illinois, and it would be a six percent per annum of the judgement amount. Six percent. The original Bill that passed to the Governor regarding prejudgment interest was nine percent. So, we agreed to a three percent reduction in the interest rate. Also, the original Bill that passed to the Governor indicated that the prejudgment interest began to
accrue upon notice to the defendant. However, this Bill indicates that the prejudgment interest won't begin to accrue until a case is filed. Also, it indicates that the prejudgment interest would not accrue on punitive damage, sanctions, statutory attorney's fees, or statutory costs. It indicates that the plaintiff voluntarily dismisses the case, then the interest will be tolled during the time that it is dismissed. It accrues... the accrual period for prejudgment interest is capped at five years. And, in addition, the effective date has been moved out to July 1, 2021. July 1, 2021. Hopefully, by that time, the vast majority of Illinoisans will be vaccinated and we'll be on the other side of this horrid pandemic. Finally, and I think as important as anything, and one of the reason that the Illinois Health and Hospital Association is now neutral, is a provision that is like other states that indicates that, within the first 12 months, if a defendant makes an offer for settlement and that is not accepted or is rejected in a timely manner by the plaintiff that the interest that... that interest amount will be determined by the difference between the offered amount and the amount, ultimately, of the judgement. Again, the Illinois Health and Hospital Association is now neutral on the Bill. The Health Care Council of Illinois is neutral on the Bill. And I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Harris: "Thank you, Representative. You know, we'll be continuing to have three speakers on either side and a time limit of five minutes. Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Harris: "He indicates he will yield."
Durkin: "Representative Hoffman, you said that there were certain organizations who expressed concerns. What exactly did you do to the Illinois Hospital Association and HCCI to get them to go from opposition to neutral?"

Hoffman: "As I indicated in my opening remarks, we... several provisions were put in at the request of those organizations. First of all..."

Durkin: "Which... could you tell me exactly what those provisions are that were..."

Hoffman: "I just went through them, and I'll go through them again for you."

Durkin: "What are the ones that were requested from the organizations that are now neutral?"

Hoffman: "I'll go through them."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "Okay. So, initially, we had a nine percent interest rate. They thought that that was too high. It's been lowered to six percent. There was issues that were brought to my attention concerning the issue of when the interest rate would begin to accrue. And under the Bill that was sent to the Governor in January, the interest rate began to accrue upon notice to the defendant. This... the interest rate does not begin to accrue until the case is filed."

Durkin: "Which is the current law, correct?"

Hoffman: "Currently in Illinois we don't have prejudgment interest. We don't have prejudgment interest. We have post-judgement interest."

Durkin: "Post-judgement. I'm sorry. Okay. All right."

Hoffman: "And that is at nine percent."
Durkin: "Okay. That's a lot of percentage there, my friend, for some of these health care providers. This isn't... is this specifically crafted towards health care facilities and organizations?"
Hoffman: "No, it is not."
Durkin: "It's for every business across the State of Illinois. Every individual, correct?"
Hoffman: "It is for..."
Durkin: "Who's a defendant in a tort action?"
Hoffman: "In tort, yes."
Durkin: "Just tort action, correct?"
Hoffman: "Yes."
Durkin: "Okay. All right. So, you mentioned the Illinois Hospital Association, the Health Care Council. I presume the Illinois State Medical Society, the largest association of physicians, have enthusiastically moved their position from opposition to neutral as well, correct?"
Hoffman: "They have not."
Durkin: "Why not?"
Hoffman: "You'd have to ask them that. I don't know..."
Durkin: "Well, did you talk to them?"
Hoffman: "I tried to talk to them. They indicated to me that they would not negotiate until the other Bill was vetoed by the Governor."
Durkin: "Makes sense, doesn't it? When you have one Bill that is still sitting on the Governor's Office, and now you're running another one. Don't you think it's premature to run this Bill?"
Hoffman: "No, because I believe that... I want... I wanted to address some of the issues that were before us."
Durkin: "All right. So, I noticed that in the Bill, at the end, that there is... I want to make sure that I'm clear with this. That... it says that, 'Not withstanding any provision of law, neither the state, a unit of local government, a school district, community college, nor any other governmental entity is liable to pay prejudgment interest.' Is that still in your Bill? The carve out for public entities?"

Hoffman: "Yes. And we also, at the request of... at the request of the Governor's Office, they wanted to make sure it was clear that the state would not be liable for prejudgment interest."

Durkin: "How about nonprofit organizations? Are they exempt from this Bill?"

Hoffman: "They are not."

Durkin: "So, let me just make sure that I got this straight. An organization such as Catholic Charities, they do not get a carve out, do they? It's a nonprofit organization."

Hoffman: "Not if there is a judgement, a personal injury judgement, against them."

Durkin: "So, the answer is no. Lutheran Family Services, the same. They will be subject to this. They don't get a carve out, correct?"

Hoffman: "They do not."

Durkin: "Okay. How about Misericordia? This place we all love. Good people. Do they get a carve out like the other public entities, Representative Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "They do not."

Durkin: "Okay. How about Lurie's Children's Hospital? It's the greatest children's hospital in the United States, if not the..."
world. Do they get a carve out? They're nonprofit. They don't, or do they?"

Hoffman: "No, they do not."

Durkin: "They do not. But Cook County Hospital gets a carve out, correct? They would not be subject to any prejudgment interest under your Bill, correct?"

Hoffman: "I don't want to answer incorrectly 'cause I don't... I'm not sure how... I'm not sure how the Cook County Hospital is incorporated, if it's a governmental entity."

Durkin: "It's a unit of local government."

Hoffman: "I can tell you what..."

Durkin: "It is if they are appointed by the Cook County Board, the members who... who run that place. It is a local government, Representative Hoffman. And they're exempt. You know that. I know that."

Hoffman: "The Bill exempts units of local government."

Durkin: "Cook County. Cook County would be exempt. The hospital is an extension. Cook County is a government hospital. It's a county hospital, Representative. We both know that. And that's just not fair. It's not fair that we've got great nonprofit providers, whether its social service agencies and these incredible hospitals who have endured so much over this past year, with... with our loved ones, strangers who have suffered immensely. But when I think of Lurie's Children's Hospital as being treated differently than Cook County Hospital, it really is something that I take issue with. And let me ask. We're going to take up a Bill pretty soon that's going to allow for the reopening of Westlake Hospital. Isn't that great? I would imagine they're nonprofit. So, they
wouldn't be cut out, would they, Representative Hoffman? They're not a government entity, but they are nonprofit. So, they wouldn't get carved out. So, we're going to throw them a lifeline, probably after this Bill. But at the same time, we're going to say, oh, by the way, you're going to get slapped with any type of... with any litigation at six percent on prejudgment interest, even though there's been no disposition about the facts, correct?"

Hoffman: "I don't... that is incorrect. This... the prejudgment interest only applies to judgements. Cases that are settled, prejudgment interest doesn't apply. Ninety-seven percent of the cases that are filed are... never make it to trial. They are settled. Three percent of the ones that do go to trial, not all of those result in a verdict for the plaintiff. So, the facts have to be proved, negligence has to be proved, or, in the case of strict liability, strict liability has to be proved. A jury or the judge has to then indicate an award. The whole idea of tort is to make... is to make plaintiffs whole. That is the underlying reason we have torts. And to not pay some type of interest because a defendant may have decided to delay in order to get a better deal or to prolong a case should not be something we should stand for."

Durkin: "You mean, they can't have their day in court and have their case litigated to determine whether or not there is... they should be penalized for that... for them to actually determine whether or not there is a justiciable claim against them? That’s what you're saying."

Hoffman: "This... this is prejudgment interest."

Durkin: "Exactly."
Hoffman: "That means your only get the interest..."
Durkin: "But you're saying that they're...
Hoffman: "...if the judgment is entered against the defendant."
Durkin: "I know, but you're saying that they're going to delay the process and... but that's called due diligence, and that's what lawyers do. That's what you do. That's what I do. And that's what, I believe, is the right thing to do for anyone who is sued in any type of capacity."
Hoffman: "Can I... can I just..."
Durkin: "Sure."
Hoffman: "I... this is not me taking issue with your statement. I just want to tell you one of the things that is in the Bill that I think is critical that addresses some of that concern, right? It wasn't in the original Bill. This Bill follows many other states that say, if you make an offer of settlement, a defendant, and it is... it is denied or not taken by a plaintiff, right, and is done within the first year, that ultimately that amount that was offered will be deducted in determining how much the interest would be from the verdict. So, if it... if you were offered a million dollars, there is a verdict of 2 million, then the interest will only be calculated on the... the difference."
Durkin: "Okay. Could you give me just an example of one of those states that have this currently within their laws?"
Hoffman: "I don't have it with me, but I think there's like 20... 29 or 30 states that have like an offer type... type system."
Durkin: "Do they have similar type of..."
Hoffman: "And there's 46 that have prejudgment interest, 46."
Durkin: "Well, I'd like to... well, we’ll find out. I think, maybe, one of our colleagues over here can discuss what the tort system there in those states as well compared to Illinois. Question. You said that the point of this is to encourage settlement, correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, and to make plaintiff's whole if there is a judgment."

Durkin: "But there's not... you told... you also said that 97 percent of the cases that are filed result in a settlement. So, what's the problem that we currently have? People are settling. I don't understand when you said 97 percent of the cases in Illinois are settled. So, this is not... so, there's not a problem currently within the legal system on bringing parties together to resolve these cases. So, I... I really question why we need to do this, why we're making this jump from three to six percent. It doesn't make sense. So, should all cases be settled then? Is this going to help this... our civil justice system reach a hundred percent settlement so we don't want ever to have to exercise the right to a trial?"

Hoffman: "I don't believe this will result in all cases being settled."

Durkin: "But you did say 97 percent of the cases that are currently in the system settle."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Durkin: "So, this is about getting that other three percent on board, correct?"

Hoffman: "It's... it's to address the issue of delay, to ensure that we move the cases through the system as quickly as possible and you're fair to the injured plaintiff."
Durkin: "All right. Never mind whether or not the defense is truly liable and giving them their opportunity to..."
Hoffman: "You do not get... you do not get prejudgment interest if they're... if you are not found liable."
Durkin: "No."
Hoffman: "You do not get prejudgment interest if you're not found liable."
Durkin: "That's about five years down the road when there's a trial that actually... particularly up in Cook County."
Hoffman: "But you don't... whether prejudgment interest attaches is not going to be determined until there is a trial. It's... it's in its name. Judgment. There has to be a Judgment."
Durkin: "Do you believe... okay. Do you believe... will the insurance premiums... do you believe insurance premiums for our businesses and also hospitals and that long list of nonprofits will increase because of this?"
Hoffman: "I don't believe that."
Durkin: "I've talked to Children's Memorial Hospital, Lurie's, and they said that it will definitely increase. That their insurance premiums... they've already gone to their insurance provider, and they said that this Bill, at least when it was at seven percent, is going to cause a massive jump in the premiums that they pay. And I'm afraid that that's going to happen. And I think that you realize that, Representative, that insurance premiums will increase due to this law."
Hoffman: "I don't believe that is going to happen. And that is why I believe that the Illinois Health and Hospital Association is neutral. I assume they are a member of that association."
Durkin: "Well, you know... and I got it right from the horse's mouth."

Hoffman: "But that was... that was the... a different Bill. This Bill has been amended, it has been changed, it has been worked on with providers."

Durkin: "Seven to six percent? That’s the big give?"

Hoffman: "It has been negotiated."

Durkin: "Oh, my gosh. All right. I don’t think the changes are really... does anything to change what is being attempted here. I look at this as a situation as not a way to bring a fair settlement but, to me, it's settlement by duress. I have no further questions."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Tarver, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Jay, how are you?"

Hoffman: "Good."

Tarver: "Good. Will you yield?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "Awesome. So, I had a little chance to look up children's... Lurie's Children's Hospital, 'cause we're talking about small nonprofits. Annual budget is one point... annual revenue 1.28 billion. That's up 12 percent from 2 years ago, right? So, over the course of the last year, toward their $500 million capital campaign, they raised $324 million. So, let's just be clear about what we're talking about when we say small nonprofits. And nobody's denying the fact that they do great work. But let me... let me get a little bit more into what actually happens in practice when we talk about days in court, if you'll indulge me. Here's what happens. There's a pandemic,
plaintiff files a lawsuit. There's no real negotiation from defendants at times, and defendant says, let's go to trial. You know what's not happening right now? Trials. 'Cause you can't put 12 people in a box. So, what happens? Plaintiffs are penalized, right? 'Cause you can't put 12 people in a box. So, saying take me to trial is not a real thing. But to the Bill. I want to make sure I understand... and just to give you one other little tidbit of information. Catholic Charities, $140 million annual revenue. Small nonprofits. Okay. So, the Bill that passed... what was... what was it, 3360? Was initially nine percent. So, now there's a three percent reduction, which is, what, a third? Thirty-three point... thirty-three percent. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "Okay. And it's told if the plaintiff voluntarily dismisses their case, right? 'Cause in Illinois we have a right to voluntarily dismiss a case and bring it back within a year, right? Okay. So, it's told for that time period. So, there's no incentive for a plaintiff to file suit, start to collect prejudgment interest, dismiss the suit, and come back and refile it. Can't do that, right? Okay. So, it encourages plaintiffs to move their cases along. And then, if there is an offer by the defendant, the plaintiff had 90 days, 3 months. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "They can't sit on it. They have to respond within 90 days. If they reject that offer and all of a sudden it goes to trial... 'cause everybody gets to go to trial if they would like to go to trial. Okay. My understanding is that is that
then, if the actually judgment is equal to that amount or a lesser amount, plaintiff gets no, no meaning zero, prejudgment interest. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Tarver: "Okay. So, this is a situation where only if a plaintiff gets a judgment, which means... a judgment means the defendant gets to go to trial and prove their case. That's how you get a judgment. So, only if a plaintiff does that and there's a judgment, then we start to calculate prejudgment interest. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "That's how you would... if you go to judgment and then the calculation occurs, based on the judgment amount, yes."

Tarver: "Right. Okay. So, there's no prejudgment interest without a judgment. That's the operative word, judgment, right? Okay. I'm making sure... I'm trying to make sure I'm not missing anything here. Okay. So, we're in a situation where defendants get to go to trial, that's what they want. They get to prove their case. Plaintiff's only get to collect prejudgment interest if there's a judgment in their favor and if they did not reject a reasonable offer from the defendant of that amount or less. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "And 46 states have some variation of this?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Tarver: "Okay. So, that puts us in the last, I mean, four states left. What's that, eight percent? Okay. Seems to make sense to me. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much for your time."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative."
Speaker Harris: "Next speaker is Representative Batinick."
Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."
Batinick: "Representative, I just wanted to clarify something. The docs are against this. I believe the business groups are against this as well, correct? IRMA, retailers, some other business groups?"
Hoffman: "I've not heard from those folks regarding this Amendment. But I... they were against the original Bill, and they were against Amendment #1. I... I can only assume."
Batinick: "Okay. You can only assume. I would... I... my understanding is that they are with who I've reached out to. Look, I'm going to go straight to the Bill. I have a... telling stories about when I first ran for office, I had a constituent come to me. He had a son that has a certain medical condition. Has to drive to Wisconsin... has to drive to Wisconsin to get health care because the doctors say it's too expensive to have insurance in the State of Illinois. And that type of health care that his son with special needs, needs can't be done in this state because the doctors have been chased out. Look, folks, we are at the end of the line. We are ranked 51st overall in our overall taxation. You can't keep taxing people out. The last thing... the only thing that's left to fix, the mess that we're in fiscally, is our regulatory climate. If we keep going down this road with our regulatory climate and making it worse... I mean, I almost feel like the Majority Party doesn't recognize that doctors are leaving, that businesses are leaving, that people are leaving. This just exacerbates that situation. I mean, we have a loss of population for a
reason, and it's Bills like this. I mean, keep this up guys, there's going to be no one left. No one left to sue. No one left to tax. Nobody else left to be landlords. No manufacturers left to provide jobs. No one left to blame. I urge a 'no' vote. And I strongly... I'm going to request a verification on this. Thank you."
Speaker Harris: "Members, a verification has been requested. Final speaker for Republican side is Representative Mazzochi."
Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Harris: "He indicates he'll yield."
Mazzochi: "Mr. Hoffman, has the Governor's Office indicated that he is in support of this Bill as currently amended?"
Hoffman: "I have not discussed this with them."
Mazzochi: "All right. So, you're... you're filing this Bill to try to... presumably because you know that a veto is likely going to be coming in connection with the prior bad Bill that I also argued about... against during the lame duck Session. So, now we're in another hurry up and wait type of scenario. And you don't even know if the Governor is going to be willing to support this one. So, how many of these interest Bills are we going to wind up seeing over the course of the next several months? This is a..."
Hoffman: "I'm..."
Mazzochi: "Well, no... I mean, you don't know. Now, to the Bill. We've had doctors working tirelessly during COVID to try to make people well. They've been working to the bone. They've worked in conditions of fear, and they stepped up to the plate and served the people. And what reward does the Democratic Party in Illinois want to give back to them? Are they going
to give them some relief? Maybe in an improvement in Medicare reimbursements? No. Instead, they're going to say, if you made a mistake, now you have to even pay more. And you may not have even made a mistake. Because if you want to go to trial and defend yourselves, the trial lawyers have so written the rules in the State of Illinois that you have to also live in fear that you can't get an honest judgment if you even try to defend your rights in court. And that's why they settle. Now, you heard my colleague say, oh, well how unfair is it that the lawyers haven't been able to go to trial and make their money. Is this what this is about? Because when I look at this Bill, this is a Bill written by the insider lawyers for the insider lawyers because they want to get even more of their pound of flesh out of normal people in Illinois, people just trying to do their job. Doctors, small business owners, these are the... nonprofits. These are the people that you're trying to punish with this Bill. Now, you've said that this is a Bill that is taking a prejudgment interest statute that we have in other states. Well, guess what? You don't get to cherry pick the particular things you like about the prejudgment interest and then ignore the caps that those other states put on in exchange for these kinds of things. Those other states have caps on tort law damages awards. Those other states have much more strict oversight by the courts over these types of judgments. Those other states say that the only thing you can get prejudgment interest on is the actual damages award, not the expansive scope of what we've put in here. So, what I would say to the people of the State of Illinois, this is not... this is a Bill that is not about
actually trying to help the poor little guy. This is a Bill that's going to help the trial lawyers screw the little guy even more, to make sure that the settlement calculations are so awful he's not going to be able to go to trial and defend his rights. He's going to have to settle earlier on. And you know what? If you go and look at the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association and just what they've donated over the course of the last couple of years, you will see millions of dollars going into the attorneys and the Democratic Party of Illinois who is backing this Bill. When we, in Illinois, should be doing everything we can to try to help our small businesses, help our business owners, help the people... or doctors who are actually trying to do their job and do it well, you've chosen to protect your insider group that funds your campaign coffers, and that's really shameful. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just to... I would just like to thank the Illinois Health and Hospital Association as well as the Health Care Council of Illinois. I know that this is not an easy issue, but it is the right issue. We worked together. We got... we addressed their concerns. They now are neutral on the Bill. I would like to just, kind of, address some of the points that were made. The issue here is whether we can have a disincentive for defendants to unduly delay payment of a judgment, payment to injured people. Those are people that we're talking about here. You act as though those aren't real people that have been injured, that have been wronged because of someone else's negligence. It affects their lives. It
affects their family's lives. It affects their entire future. And to have an insurance company... and I'm not saying it’s the hospital, and I'm not saying it’s the doctor. And I applaud and I thank them for everything they've done during this pandemic. But the insurance companies who are using the pandemic because there are no jury trials, because you can't get a jury trial, and they aren't settling the cases. If you want to be angry, call them. If you want to be upset, get mad at them. If you want to talk about the costs going up while defense lawyers bill, put it at their feet, as they try to starve out people who have been injured for someone else's negligence, someone else's wrong. Could be strict liability, not just negligence. It could be an intentional act. Yet, we're going to say that it's okay to starve them out and have their families not be able to provide because they are injured. Indiana, the red state on our border, has between 6 and 10 percent prejudgment interest. The average is eight percent. Wisconsin, when it comes to the offer and acceptance language, is very similar to what is in this Bill. I've tried extremely hard, extremely hard to address the issues that have been brought before us, yet provide a disincentive to starve out injured workers and their families. That's what this Bill would do. Let me just real briefly go through the list of concessions that were made in this Bill, as opposed to the initial Bill that went to the Governor's desk. Number one, the trigger mechanism. We said that now we're going to begin accruing interest at the time of filing, not the notice to defendant. That's number one. Number two, we removed the state from prejudgment interest.
Number three, we allowed for voluntary dismissals that... if a plaintiff voluntarily dismisses case, the interest isn't going to accrue. Number four, we said that interest would not accrue on punitive damages. Number five, we moved the interest rate from nine percent to six percent. Number six, we said... and as you talk about attorney's fees, we said there won't be prejudgment interest on costs or statutory attorney's fees. Statutory costs or statutory attorney's fees. We indicated that if... that it will only accrue for five years and that there will be an offer and acceptance mechanism that will lower the prejudgment interest rate. I think this is reasonable. We've addressed many of the concerns of the providers and that is why I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification. Please vote your own switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 72 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this issue, there are 67 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the Constitutional Majority... I'm sorry. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative... oh, I'm sorry. Representative Batinick withdraws his verification. On this question, there are 67 voting in 'favor', 40 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, on Senate Bills Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 168, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 168, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Willis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Can I have the Floor Amendment adopted, please?"

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis moves that Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 168 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk... I'm sorry. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Willis and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Floor Amendment 3... I thought it was wrapped into Amendment 2, but okay. Let me hold on, please. Okay. Mr. Speaker, I actually only want Floor Amendment 3. So, I would like to accept Floor Amendment 3, which is a gut and replace. So, it'll work out fine."

Speaker Harris: "So, Representative Willis has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 168. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment 3 is adopted."

Willis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "One moment. Any further Amendments? No further..."

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

Speaker Harris: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."
Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 168, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis on Senate Bill 168."

Willis: "Thank you, Members of the House and Mr. Speaker. You'll be happy to know that this Bill is a noncontroversial Bill, and I actually believe we have bipartisan agreement on it. It flew out of committee. And the reason we have the Amendments was just clarifying some last minute language on there. What this Bill does, it allows us to reopen Westlake Hospital. As you recall, a couple of years ago, the Speaker and myself had a hospital close in our district. We tried valiantly to keep it open, but we were unsuccessful. But we put in place other measures to hopefully slow down closures of hospitals. And you've seen actually, in the health care pillar that we passed earlier today, more of those measures taking place. We recognize that we need to keep our community hospitals open in our districts. And now, we are happy to tell you that, through a lot of diligent work, we actually are able to now say that Westlake hospital can reopen, but it needs a little bit of help from us. There are some guidelines that we put into this Bill to help expedite that addition… that mission of reopening the hospital, keeping it a community hospital. One of the things that we put into Amendment 3 was clarifying. Because, unfortunately, the previous owners of Westlake Hospital, even though Westlake would have qualified as a safety net hospital, failed to make sure that they did that with all of their paperwork. So, we are calling this a hospital that would be, previously, a generally acute care hospital that had at least 40 percent of its clients
determined to be in need. And that is what we're looking at. So, that was the clear up that I had promised to come forth with when we talked about this is committee the other day. The other issues that the hospitals need to make sure to do as they reopen, it is only specifically for a hospital that is closed between January of 2019 and December 31 of 2020. So, it is a very short window. There was... we're asking for an exempt... a certificate of exemption in order to reopen the hospital. The reason we're asking for a certificate of exemption instead of a certificate of need, which is what normal hospitals need to have, is we want to expedite this. We have a buyer ready to go. They also have committed that they will reestablish the hospital with at least a $20 million buy-in. They've done that. That's what it cost to purchase a hospital and the land around it. They've committed to also keep the same number of beds that the hospital had prior. And that was all part of in the cleanup that we put in. There was a technicality on how we called the bed. So, that was just a technical clean up there. That has also been put through by the new buyers. They also have promised to keep in a charity ward for at least two years, and they will accept Medicaid and Medicaid managed care patients. They also have promised to be the owners for five years. That is truly important for us. That will show stability in the community and it will keep us going. That is what we want to see. This is a success story. There is no cost to the state. This is just a matter of us helping to expedite these new owners to put back a much-needed community care hospital in our area that not only will have the same number of hospital beds, but it will also have
our behavioral health beds. And we know, right now, in the time of this pandemic, the extreme need for more behavioral health beds. With that, I respectfully ask for bipartisan support in this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, can you please excuse Representative Reick for the rest of today, please?"

Speaker Harris: "Thank you. Representative Reick will be excused."

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

Speaker Harris: "Indicates she'll yield."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, we had this Bill in committee just yesterday. And I'm going to try and boil this down quickly to just a couple of very brief questions that'll help everybody on my side of the aisle understand what we're trying to do. We want to help a hospital reopen that was closed, and we're putting it on a fast track to do it. Is that right?"

Willis: "Yes, Sir."

Wheeler: "Is there state money involved in this process?"

Willis: "No, there is not."

Wheeler: "Okay. One other sidebar question. Does this hospital going to have to go through the same pretrial interest that the last Bill had? Do you know the answer to that question?"

Willis: "I'm sorry. I missed the part of your question."

Wheeler: "The last Bill we just passed that had to do with pretrial interest, would this hospital be exempt from that or be subject to that?"

Willis: "No, it would not be exempt."
Wheeler: "Thank you. And I... just to the Bill here, very quickly, everyone. This is a chance for us to work together to get a hospital open in an area that needs a hospital. We are working together to get something done that's a benefit of a community that needs it. I'm grateful for the support of everyone. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Robinson. Please leave your mask on while you're speaking, Representative."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues, each of you are aware I have been fighting tooth and nail for six months to maintain quality health care to low income communities in my district. Trinity Healthcare, which is one of the largest and most profitable health care systems in the United States, is closing. The first founded hospital in the City of Chicago, which also just so happens to be a safety net hospital. I've heard from thousands of constituents, physicians, workers, clergy, and community groups, all who share similar concerns as to where low income patients will go if Mercy Hospital no longer exists. The most interesting element of this debacle is that Trinity also owns other hospitals in Illinois. However, those hospitals serve residents of more affluent communities. So, they are not at risk. This trend of shuttering hospitals serving poor communities across the State of Illinois must end. The Bill Sponsor, Representative Willis, Representative Wheeler, and Speaker Welch have recently witnessed the devastation this disinvestment caused in their communities. I'm going through it right now myself, along with Representative Mah, Representative Harper, and Representative Buckner, and Senator Hunter. We will not give
up this fight. We, as a Body, hold many levers of power when it comes to the allocation of state resources and the regulatory authority for these hospitals and health systems. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure accountability and resources we expend across the state. We have to make sure that everyone, no matter of their color or financial ability, can get quality health care across the State of Illinois. In the interim, I commend the Bill Sponsor for bringing forth this legislation. I will stand with her and ask that each of you stand with me as we fight for more equitable health care system in Illinois. I ask that you also work with the Governor to put together a health care plan for all Illinoisans. It is by time we have a plan to make sure that everyone in the State of Illinois has quality access to quality health care. Thank you, Representative Willis, for bringing forth SB168. And I can recommend a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Good afternoon, Speaker. It's really hard to follow Representative Robinson. We heard the passion. We heard the urgency in his voice. And while we know that a lot of people this year, this past year, have died because of COVID, we also know that health care has never been more important than now. I represent a district that has two safety net hospitals serving primarily low income Latinx communities. Over the past two years we have seen large health care systems more focused on profits than people, abandon communities of color that do not have what they consider to be desirable payer mixes. This trend must stop. We, as a Body, need to do
whatever we can to ensure health care across to low income communities across the State of Illinois. Let me repeat. Across the State of Illinois. Every community, urban, rural, suburban, should have access to health care. I commend the Sponsor for bringing forward Senate Bill 168, which seeks to help to reopen safety net hospitals that had recently been abandoned in low income communities. The Bill is limited in scope but ensures that incoming owners and operators must make significant financial investments and still pass all licensure requirements, via the Department of Public Health. I am proud, very proud, of my two safety net hospitals and the work that they do to provide quality health care to under-resourced communities. This is why I am glad, on this late time of 7:18 p.m., to stand with the Sponsor of this Bill, because we know how critical and vital it is to return those resources to that community as soon as possible in my colleagues' district. I stand with the Sponsor, and I commend her for bringing forth the Bill. And I urge, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Willis to close."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask and point out two other issues that I forgot to do in the opening thing. Through the negotiation, the Hospital Association is neutral on this. We had them on our call yesterday when we were talking about this. And the Health Facilities Board is okay with this, and that was part of the cleanup language. We made sure that we addressed a couple of their technical concerns. As you heard from my colleagues, this is bipartisanly supported. Thank you
very much. I think we're all happy that it's getting close to the end of the day, and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 168 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears House Resolution 132, offered by Representative Morgan. Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for everyone's indulgence. It has been a long day. So, I appreciate your attention. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of House Resolution 132, something I don't do lightly. It's condemning the actions of Illinois State Representative Chris Miller. This Resolution raises a very simple question for this Body. What is conduct unbecoming of a Legislator? What is conduct unbecoming of a Legislator? The 118 of us all come to this General Assembly from each and every corner of the State of Illinois. And our constituents expect us not just to fight for our own home towns, but to work with other Legislators to make this a better state for everyone. Our districts demand fierce advocacy but also decency in getting the job done. We can, and often do, make mistakes. We all made mistakes even today. But at the end of the day a Legislator must, above all, be true to his or her oath of office, which is the point of this Resolution. Some of my colleagues will dismiss this Resolution. Some think the Resolution goes too far. Frankly,
some think it doesn't go far enough, that Representative Miller is entitled to his opinion, or he didn't mean to cause any harm to anyone, or that this was simply a mistake. However, I am here today standing on behalf of this Resolution to argue that, no, this was not a mistake. This was a pattern of behavior from our colleague, Representative Chris Miller. Here are the facts. Representative Miller and his spouse, his wife, Congresswoman Mary Miller, were both at the Save America rally on January 6, 2021, in our Capitol. We know what happened after that in the press, but, specifically, Representative Miller posted on his campaign account a Facebook Live post at 12:35 p.m. Just minutes, just minutes after former President Trump had given his remarks and concluded. During that Facebook Live post, he said, 'We are engaged in a great cultural war to see which worldview will survive, whether we will remain a free people under free market capitalism or whether they will put us under the tyranny of socialism and communism, under the dangerous Democrat terrorists that are trying to destroy our country.' 12:35 p.m. Just minutes earlier at 12:30, hundreds of those who had been at the rally had already reached the Capitol and their security barrier. By 12:53, the Proud Boys and others from the rally breached the security gates. By 1:00, the Capitol had been stormed and overtaken. Less than 20 minutes, less than 20 minutes after Representative Miller posted and ended his Facebook Live. The insurrection was in full swing just a full... few blocks away. The attempted coup, as we know, took several lives, including the death of Capitol Police Officer Brian Sicknick. We do not know what Representative
Miller did before or after that video. I would argue it's not as relevant, except for the fact that he was there. We know his truck was parked at the Capitol, not surprising. But then, when we see photos later of his truck in the parking lot of the Capitol, with protestors of the insurrection still in the parking lot, we see a sticker on the back of his truck with the Roman numeral III. And the Roman numeral III represents the Three Percenters. For those of you who don't know, the Three Percenters is a paramilitary hate group, identified by the Anti-Defamation League as having the goal of overthrowing the United States Government through violent, revolutionary tactics. It's what they stand for. Representative Miller admits it was his truck. He admits the sticker was on his car, has given different explanations as to why it was on his car, but we know it was there. We know it was on his truck. I don't think any of us will ever forget January 6 and the images and the video of the Capitol being overrun, the near misses of unspeakable harm to our former Vice President Pence, Speaker Pelosi, other Representatives and Senators. But on that day, that day Representative Miller stood with the insurrectionists. That’s undisputable. But if Mr... if Representative Miller regretted his words, remorseful for his actions, he hasn't shown it. Which again, I think, is the most critical element of all of this. How do we know? One month later, on January... February 8, at a town hall meeting, he again referred to his colleagues of the other political party as the enemy that’s attacking our freedoms. The enemy. The time has come, my colleagues, for Democrats and Republicans to make a choice about what it means to be a
Member of the General Assembly. We owe the 13 million people of the State of Illinois a bright line that shows where we stand when we have to choose between upholding elections and the ideals of the republic, regardless of our political persuasion, or choosing insurrection. Insurrection when our favorite candidate loses, like some chose on January 6. Can't we agree, here today, in a bipartisan way, that Representative Miller's behavior has so greatly crossed the line that we can say enough, no more, this has to stop. This has to stop before someone gets hurt. We can disagree all day long on politics and on policy, and we will, and we shall. This is not about that. This about right and wrong. It's about the oath of office that we all took to serve in the General Assembly. Deep down I know each and every one of you know that. You know that the behavior of Representative Miller crossed the line. He betrayed the oath that we all took to the General Assembly, to the State of Illinois, and that behavior was unbecoming of a Legislator. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Harris: "This Resolution shall be in the Order of Standard Debate. That is three Members on either side, including the Sponsor. The first speaker from the Republican side is Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Let me first start off and say that that date in January is one of the saddest days that I've witnessed as an American. And, as the Leader of the House Republican Caucus, we reject and denounce anybody who was involved with taking over our U.S. Capitol and injuring our men and women who were defending the Capitol. But it's really unfortunate that we are here to take up this
Resolution. It's really unfortunate on many levels. Now, Representative Morgan, you and your colleagues may disagree with Representative Miller, on his views, on many issues. And I understand that, and that's fine. The same could be said about myself and Representative Miller, as we certainly don't agree on a lot of things either. So, guess that's how this building works. Now, I've witnessed, over the past few years, a lot of statements about the Republican Party, which have been... which you've sought to attribute to us on many times. We pass it off. Some of them are very damaging. But we know that that's what happens in this building. That's part of the world we live in. So, let me just say that I've read your Resolution many times. But over reading through it so many times, I believe that this Resolution goes beyond those disagreements that we often have during the many times where we are having debates. Things get heated. That's what we do. That happens, and that's part of this process. But let me also say that, within your Resolution, you make very bold, broad claims and conclusions, which you are asking us to assume as factual. Let me just state that there is another place for us to take this and it currently is happening. I will recommend that the proper place for this issue to be resolved is currently with the Legislative Inspector General. The Legislative Inspector General received a complaint from the Democratic County Chairman and is making a determination of whether or not what happened on that date regarding Representative Miller. We know that. It's been much publicized. I think a prudent person would say, why don't we wait to find out what the conclusions are? 'Cause there is a
chance that IG could determine that this is an unfounded complaint, and then we'll have a Resolution which is completely opposite, one that did not have the benefit of an investigation into the allegations. But I also want to just remind us here of what we're doing. What we are doing is we're setting a new precedent, a new standard of how the men and women in this chamber are to be judged in their private lives with this Resolution. This will open a Pandora's box. That's reality. I will just state that there is a place for someone to lodge their objections, their complaints, and that's with the Legislative Inspector General. And I know that the IG will do her job. She'll do a thorough job, as she always does. But let me also remind you that it was only about a year ago, last May, when there were protestors outside of the Bank of Springfield Center, that were signs... terrible signs that were comparing Governor Pritzker with Adolf Hitler. I confronted one of them. I was very, very disgusted by that. I had to explain to that person what exactly she is doing with that image. Republicans on this side of the aisle, we won't stand for that type of behavior, and we've proven it. But I will just say we are human beings. We are emotional, but we also need to be very careful about the precedent that we set with our actions. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of my colleague, Representative Morgan, and this Resolution here today. Someone wrote me after this incident took place and suggested that this is an issue of free speech. We're here today to discuss free speech, something every one of us is a
proponent of. It is quite literally our job, here at the Capitol, to protect free speech. But today's topic, which is Representative Chris Miller's participation in an insurrection on January 6 that led to the death of multiple citizens, as well as the injury of countless others. Now, it's been reported that Representative Miller said he attended because he supported Trump, which is perfectly fine. He just wanted to be patriotic. He wasn't aware that the very large decal on his truck is a logo of a far right militia group, the Three Percenters. Representative Miller was just 'exercising his freedom of speech'. But let's take a moment and delve into what Representative Miller said on January 6 and some of the ideology that this Three Percenter group actually promotes. Representative Chris Miller said, and it was repeated here already, on his Facebook Live, not... not a video, live on January 6, 'Trump supporters engaged in a great cultural war to see which worldview will survive, whether we will remain a free people under free market capitalism or whether they will put us under the tyranny of socialism and communism and dangerous Democrat terrorists.' In order for us to fully understand the situation before us, we must know what the Three Percenters are. A quick Google search will bring you to the Anti-Defamation League's Web site where it says the following, 'The Three Percenters are the anti-government extremists who are part of the militia movement. They compare their hostility to the freedom... federal government with the opposition of American patriots to the British during the American Revolution. The term itself is a reference to a false belief that the number of Americans who
fought against the British during the Revolutionary War amounted to only three percent of the population at the time. Historians said, of course, that is incorrect. Three Percenters believe that, just as a small revolutionary vanguard overthrew the tyrannical British rule in America, a dedicated group of modern patriots could rid the United States of today's alleged tyranny.' When we consider these beliefs, and hold them up next to what Representative Miller's Facebook Live comments were, we find very similar messages, very dangerous messages, messages saturated with misinformation and anti-American rhetoric, which we believe led to the murder of several in Georgia just the other day. It was no accident that Representative Miller was on the Capitol on January 6. His own wife praised Hitler in a speech at a rally that very morning. It's clear to me that Representative Miller knew exactly why he was there, and he got caught. So, now he's backpedaling. To reiterate, I'm no opponent of free speech. Fighting for your constitutional rights is something I, and everyone here, really takes seriously and have dedicated our lives to. What I am opposed to is when that speech incites violence that led to the lynching of thousands of African Americans from 1882 to 1968. Black men and women were murdered just by hearsay, similar views that were espoused on January 6. If someone cried wolf, they'd be lynched that very night. These are not words of rhetoric. This is historical fact. Words absolutely matter. And, as public servants, we must take extra responsibility for the words we share with our constituents. We must realize that our words have ripple effects. It was irresponsible and unconscionable for
Representative Miller to spread hateful misinformation and un-American rhetoric, and we must hold him accountable to the office he holds. I will be voting 'yes' on this Resolution today because it is not just about the words, but those words translate into hurt and harm and, in some cases, even death of our citizens. And we must stand against this rhetoric because it is spreading like a vial disease in this land, to an era we had thought was once pass gone, but obviously have not. I stand in support of Representative Morgan's Resolution, and I encourage our colleagues to do the same."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Could you wear your mask while you're speaking, Representative?"

Miller: "She just... she didn't wear it. The last Representative didn't wear her mouth piece, but I'll be happy to put it on. In early January, I drove my farm truck to Washington, D.C. for my wife, Congresswoman Mary Miller's inauguration and to move into her apartment. Having been granted a security credential to park at the U.S. Capitol parking lot, I drove my wife to the Capitol steps for her freshman picture on January 4. I parked my truck there on Monday morning, and my truck remained at that location until Friday afternoon. On Wednesday, January the 6th, I went to the Save America rally at Ellipse Park, just south of the White House. After attending the peaceful rally, I listened to all the speeches, I met with groups of constituents on the Capitol Mall for photos, and then I walked back to my wife's office. Upon arriving at the Longworth Building, the building was put on
lockdown and I was not allowed to leave the premises 'til after 8 p.m. that evening. I had no part in the violent events at the Capitol that day, and I condemn any and all violence. I can assure you that my dedication to the safety and security of our state and our country's citizens is second to none. We may disagree on policy, but, at the end of the day, all of our commitments to our constituents is making Illinois a better place and all these ideals are one in the same. I am hopeful that we can focus on our shared priorities for the Illinois and work towards those goals this spring in Springfield. Thank you very much."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Resolution. On January 6 we witnessed something in America that we had not seen in 160 years. What we witnessed in Washington was not a peaceful transfer of power. It was a violent transfer of power. President Trump summoned his violent followers. He urged them to storm the Capitol, and he whipped up a murderous mob directed at the Vice President to the United States, Members of Congress, and the staff and police officers present on that tragic day. There are some who will say that Representative Miller is not responsible for these evil acts because he merely attended the pro-insurrection rally, and he never could have known that they would actually follow through with it. Just like he thought that the racist, anti-American symbol that he put on the back of his own vehicle was just a cool decal. How many times do we have to hear Representative Miller call Democrats terrorists or the enemy before we can start taking his words
seriously? How many times does Representative Miller have to accidentally find himself supporting the overthrow of the United States Government before we can stop pretending we don't see what's going on here? We've all heard the unconvincing defenses of Representative Miller's conduct. The bad faith, hair splitting, and half apologies are untenable on the fundamental question of American democracy. There is nothing admirable about cleverly towing the line between politics and incitement. Everyone must stop tacitly accepting such dangerous behavior. There are always some people who, in the aftermath of heinous and tragic event, want to quickly forget, want to just move forward. It's a natural instinct. Good people don't want to think about awful things. But the 24 hour news cycle is not the only way to understand America. The memory of history is much longer. Today's Resolution is a part of righting that history. Supporting this Resolution means that, decades and centuries from now, you stood with Democracy and against violence, that actions have consequences, that killing police officers is not an acceptable response to losing an election. Until we take a bipartisan stance against violence and the politicians who incite it, I fear it will not end. So, I urge an 'aye' vote today. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Couple of inquiries of the Chair. This is in front of the Legislative Ethics Commission, and it's our understanding that we probably shouldn't prejudge that. Should people who are Members, or could be
Members, of the Legislative Ethics Commission, should they refrain from voting on this particular Resolution?"

Speaker Harris: "I believe that they may be requesting that shortly."

Batinick: "Okay. So, we're allowing some extra time for nonspeakers to state their..."

Speaker Harris: "We want to be sure that we're doing that correctly."

Batinick: "Okay. And is there... is there a mechanism regarding this Resolution if the Legislative Inspector General's report comes back one way or another? If it's founded, unfounded, what happens to the Resolution?"

Speaker Harris: "The Resolution would pass today. Any other action would be subsequent to this."

Batinick: "Okay. And is this a voice vote or a roll call vote?"

Speaker Harris: "It would be a voice vote."

Batinick: "Okay. I think we would want to request a roll call vote, especially... we are requesting a roll call vote."

Speaker Harris: "Roll call vote has been requested."

Batinick: "Okay. And I'm... I was not going to speak on this... on this Resolution, and I guess I'm more speaking towards... towards the debate. Words matter, and one of the things in this particular role that... that I have is you have to be extremely careful when you're talking off the cuff constantly. But words do matter. And regarding the events of January 6, I do believe I have some... some creditability in terms of how deplorable I think the actions were and the lack of action by the President on that particular day, and said so at the time. But I heard somebody say on the floor during
this debate that words matter. And I believe that individual... that was the same individual that accused our entire caucus, during lame duck Session, of reading The Turner Diaries, which I didn't know what The Turner Diaries were. Words matter. So, if words matter, please don't accuse me of being a racist and reading something as a playbook that I've never heard of before in my life. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Bourne, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's only one body that determines if conduct is unbecoming a Legislator, and I serve on that body, the Legislative Ethics Commission. And for that purpose, I, and my colleague Norine Hammond, will be voting 'present' on this Resolution."

Speaker Harris: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Burke, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative West and I also serve on the Legislative Ethics Commission, and we also will be voting 'present'."

Speaker Harris: "Thank you, Representative. We've have three speakers on each side. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 57 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', this Resolution is adopted. Representative Butler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a parliamentarian inquiry."

Speaker Harris: "Parliamentarian inquiry, please go ahead."
Butler: "Could you please recite to me House Rule 51.5(a)(1), please?"

Speaker Harris: "I cannot recite it from memory."

Butler: "Could you have the parliamentarian please recite that for me?"

Speaker Harris: "We'll get the... we'll get some rules. We'll be back to you."

Butler: "I... I would like it now, please. Rule 51.5(a)(1). Would you like me to save the time? Would you like me to read it for you? Okay. So, 51.5(a), 'to the extent medically able and except as reasonably necessary for eating or drinking, wear a face-covering that covers the nose and mouth.' Do we have anyone, out of 118 Members of this General Assembly, that has submitted a medical document that says they are not supposed to have their mouth covered, by face and mouth, while they're on this floor?"

Speaker Harris: "I don't know the answer to that, Representative."

Butler: "Representative... Mr. Speaker, I have worn a mask every time I have spoken since last May. I have seen multiple Members, mostly on the Majority side, not wear their masks while speaking. There have been some on our side. When you clearly saw a Member of your Leadership team, mind you, not wearing a mask, and yet, you called out one of our Members right after she spoke for not wearing a mask, that is why we chafe under the House Rules. Please enforce this rule as we go forward, across the board. Everyone. Everyone. That is the rules of House that we adopted last year and you guys have ignored them. So, please enforce them going forward."
Speaker Harris: "Representative, I will just point out that I've also, just since I've been up here, reminded Members on our side of the aisle of that also. But I think it’s a good reminder for everyone in the chamber. When you're speaking, you must wear a mask. So, thank you. The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is not granted. Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the posting requirements be waived so that the following Bills can be heard. In Judiciary - Criminal Committee, House Bill 0588. Mr. Speaker, they didn't give us permission to waive... to take them in one Motion."

Speaker Harris: "We're going to have a roll call vote on this, Representative."

Ammons: "Okay. So, we will take House Bill 0588, House Bill 3295, House Bill 3762, House Bill 3423, House Bill 3934, House Bill 3915, House Bill 3161, House Bill 3160... 3561, House Bill 3252, House Bill 3564, House Bill 2831, and House Bill 3575."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Ammons has moved the posting requirements be waived so the following Bills can be heard... so that those Bills can be heard in Judiciary - Criminal. This is a record vote. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? With a vote of 67 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
Clerk Hollman: "The following committee has been canceled. Police & Fire was canceled. Meeting immediately after Session via virtual links, is Revenue & Finance in Room 3 and Restorative Justice in Room 2. Meeting immediately after Session."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Morrison, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Morrison: "Thank you. May I have the Body's attention, please? So, we know that Illinois is home to many outstanding schools. One of them is the Illinois Math and Science Academy. And it came to my attention, from an alumnist of IMSA, that this evening they had invited a guest speaker. I'm not sure if it was to address the students or faculty, or a collaboration of those affiliated with IMSA. But as we heard in a previous Resolution, words about domestic terrorism, threats to the country, words and actions that have consequences. I think the Body needs to know who the speaker was who was invited this evening. She was Angela Davis. And for those of you who don't know her, I would encourage you to look her up. Look up her history and question whether or not she was an appropriate speaker to be addressing this academy or any public school in the State of Illinois. I'm going to read just a few words, not from some right wing newspaper or Web site. This is from the People's World. This is the Communist Party USA's Web site. The headline from 2019, 'Angela Davis praises Communist Party USA for its history of militant struggle.' And she goes on to say, in her own words, 'I join you in celebrating the Communist Party USA and its one-hundred-year history of
militant struggles for working-class democracy, racial, and gender, and environmental justice, for socialism, which is the only viable future for our country and the planet.' She goes on to talk about how proud she has been to work in this effort. And she closes the letter this way, 'With its century-old history of struggle, the Communist Party is well-positioned to offer expertise, experience and Marxist analyses that will assist the resistance movements to grow and develop.' So, again, when we're talking about words, actions... one of the things I learned about Ms. Davis' history was that weapons that she had provided resulted in the death of a judge and others in a court case in California. So, I would urge the Body to look into who invited Ms. Davis to speak, was she paid? According to the Speaker's Bureau that she's a part of, apparently she gets fees between 10 and 20 thousand dollars per speaking engagement. So, please let's look in to this and be very, very careful and cautious about who we're inviting to speak our students. Thank you.

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Harris: "State you point."
Mazzochi: "Thank you. To all of you who spoke in support of the prior Resolution, I just want to remind you of your privilege. You have the privilege of being able to libel people on this floor, if you choose, and not incur civil liability in a court of law because we give people those protections here on the floor. Before you go on social media and crow about how moral your vote was today, remember how you are protected in your
speech on this floor. You may not necessarily be protected the same way outside this chamber. You uttered a lot of the words you did today precisely because you know that Chris Miller has enough grace that he is not going to retaliate against you. He's not going to try to do you harm, which, of course, undermines the whole theory of the Motion. How many of you have the courage to go say what you said today to Chris Miller in his home, on his farm, where maybe the consequences of your words would actually have consequences. Thank you."

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

Representative Chesney. House Resolution 129, offered by
Representative Chesney. House Resolution 133, offered by
Representative Moeller. House Resolution 137, offered by
Representative Zalewski. House Resolution 140, offered by
Representative Murphy. House Resolution 141, offered by
Representative Morrison. House Resolution 142, offered by
Representative Davis. House Resolution 143, offered by
Representative Stephens. House Resolution 144, offered by
Representative Lisa Hernandez. House Resolution 145, offered
by Representative Batinick. House Resolution 146, offered by
Representative Batinick. House Resolution 147, offered by
Representative Morgan. House Resolution 149, offered by
Speaker Welch. House Resolution 150, offered by
Representative Mason. House Resolution 151, offered by
Representative Mason. House Resolution 152, offered by
Representative Ford. House Resolution 153, offered by
Representative Stephens. House Resolution 154, offered by
Representative Elik. House Resolution 155, offered by
Representative Ness. House Resolution 156, offered by
Representative Robinson. House Resolution 157, offered by
Representative Buckner. House Resolution 159, offered by
Representative Tarver."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Manley moves for the adoption of the
Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; the opposed
say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.
And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please
read the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution #24, offered by
Representative Harris. Be it
RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDRED SECOND GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the Senate
adjourns on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, it stands adjourned
until Tuesday, March 23, 2021 or until the call of the
President; and when the House of Representatives adjourns on
Thursday, March 18, 2021, it stands adjourned until Tuesday,
April 13, 2021 or until the call of the Speaker."

Speaker Harris:  "Leader Manley moves for the adoption of the
Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; those
opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And now, leaving...
allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Manley moves
that the House stand adjourned. All those in favor say 'aye';
opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
have it. And the House stands adjourned."