64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

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

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Gracious and sovereign God, great creator of us all, for it is from you, oh God, that all of our help come and it is from you, oh God, that all of our blessings flow. Look upon this august Assembly that has gathered here today. May your blessings be upon the Speaker of this House, its Leaders, all of its Members, all of their families. May your blessings be upon all of those who are afflicted and sickened. May you comfort their bodies and restore their health. May you bless them today, oh God, to be as one, to be kind, to be gracious, to be loving, to be patient, to be forgiving, not holding any grudges or any animosity toward one another. I pray today, oh God, that you would hold their hand and order their steps in your ways and in all of their actions that they may be a reflection of you. That you would grant them gentle hearts to serve with passion and to serve with purpose. That they would have minds to acknowledge and hearts to seek diligently after which is your greater good. Bless them, oh God, today with power, the power of your might. Assist them today, oh God, with your guidance of wise counsel. May all of their endeavors be pleasing in your sight. That they may find themselves doing that which is

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- the good and that which is the most precious, and that which is the most perfect will of God. This we ask now, Amen."
- Speaker Hoffman: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Mah."
- Mah et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Greenwood is recognized for excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle. Leader Greenwood. Leader Greenwood."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record show that Representative Lilly is excused today."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Since we do not see Leader Batinick to recognize him for excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle, we will skip that. Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 62 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 5, 2022: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 705, House Bill 1766, House Bill 2381, House Bill 2769, House Bill 3090, House Bill 3118, House Bill 3150, House Bill 3637, House Bill 3659, and House Bill 2196. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Redistricting reports the following committee action taken on January 5, 2022:

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 928."

Speaker Hoffman: "This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers the nose and mouth. Face coverings shall remain on while speaking on the microphone at your desks. Again, they should remain on while speaking on the microphone at your desk. To help reduce the spread of COVID-19, we ask that Members refrain, as much as possible, from eating or drinking on the House Floor and refrain from congregating in groups. We ask that all Members take these directives seriously to help keep our fellow Members and staff safe. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, including while speaking on the microphone, pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Leader Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republican request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Hoffman: "The lone Republican has request an immediate caucus. How long do you think, Leader?"

Batinick: "Hour. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "We shall remain... the Democrats will not caucus. The Republicans shall caucus. We shall remain at ease to the call of the chair. Members, for the purposes of an announcement. This is, once again, a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers the nose and mouth. Face coverings should remain on while speaking in the microphone at your desk. To help reduce the spread of COVID-19, we ask that Members refrain, as much as possible, from eating or drinking on the House Floor and refrain from congregating in groups. We ask that all Members talk... take

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

these directives seriously to keep your fellow Members and staff safe. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, including while speaking on the microphone, as pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Thank you. On page 2 of the Calendar, under Order of Resolutions, we have House Resolution 595, offered by Leader Harris. Leader Harris is recognized."

- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 595 is an extension of the sunset of the rule that allows Members of the House who are absent due to COVID related purposes to vote remotely. If you remember, we put this in place and we've extended it, I believe, twice at this point as the epidemic has spread and as more people have been impacted by it, either themselves or their families. With this new variant that is spreading more rapidly, we believe it's prudent, so that we can continue to do the will of the people during the next couple months, to have in place a remote voting protocol. This is for the purposes of people who are affected or their families affected by COVID that prevents them from being here and would extend until the 1st of June of this year."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Welter, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Keith Wheeler and Steve Reick are excused for the day."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The record shall so reflect. Leader Butler on the Resolution."
- Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Hoffman. And that big screen up there makes you look very nice now with the new big screen. It's

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

very bright. A few questions of the Sponsor on the Resolution, please?"

Speaker Hoffman: "You don't look half bad."

Butler: "I know. That's a big screen up there, man."

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

Butler: "Thank you. Leader Harris, appreciate you bringing this forward. And just... I know we've talked about this a few times, but you had mentioned COVID related reasons for being able to vote remotely. We don't have... there's nothing in here that gives standards for why people can participate in remote voting is there?"

Harris: "There are not specific standards."

"I would just... I would just hope, as we... as we move Butler: forward with this, 'cause I'm... I assume this is going to be something we're going to continually do in the future, that we take a hard look at having some standards around this. The last time we did... the last time we were in Session... the last day we were in Session, at the end of Veto Session, we had three people who clocked in remotely at the beginning of Session. And we ended the evening with 12 people voting remotely. Several of which who were obviously in their vehicles or at their hotel rooms. I don't believe that's the purpose of this. It's for specific extenuating circumstances. And I would hope, as we move forward, that we can have some discussions about maybe how that we could change that to make sure that we put some standards around this. So, I'm going to be a 'no' vote on this. But I appreciate your work on this, Leader Harris."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition,
 Leader Harris moves for the adoption of House Resolution 595.

 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 69 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no',
 2 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Leader Harris."
- Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I move the following Members be added to the roll call and allowed the cast their votes remotely: Representative Carol Ammons, Representative Eva Dina Delgado, Representative Angelica Guerrero-Cuellar, Representative Anna Moeller, Representative Jennifer Gong-Gershowitz, Representative Ann Williams, Representative Will Guzzardi, Representative Amy Grant, Representative Chris Miller, Representative Dave Severin, Representative C.D. Davidsmeyer, and Representative Charlie Meier."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Harris has moved to allow the listed Members to cast their vote remotely. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's 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 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Motion passes. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Is Representative Ammons present?"

Ammons: "Yes, Representative Ammons is present."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons is present. Is Representative Davidsmeyer present?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yep. Representative C.D. Davidsmeyer is present."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Davidsmeyer is present. Is Representative Delgado present?"
- Delgado: "Yes, Representative Delgado is present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Delgado is present. Is

 Representative Gong-Gershowitz present?"
- Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes, Representative Gong-Gershowitz is present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz is present. Is Representative Grant present?"
- Grant: "Yes, Representative Grant is present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Grant is present. Representative Guerrero-Cuellar?"
- Guerrero-Cuellar: "Yes, Representative Guerrero-Cuellar is present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guerrero-Cuellar is present.

 Representative Guzzardi?"
- Guzzardi: "Present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guzzardi is present. Representative Meier. Is Representative Meier present?"
- Meier: "Present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Meier is present. Is Representative Miller present?"
- Miller: "I'm present. Yes."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Miller is present. Is Representative Moeller present?"
- Moeller: "Present."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Moeller is present. Is Representative Severin present?"
- Severin: "I'm here. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Severin is present. Is

Representative Ann Williams present?"

Williams, A.: "Ann Williams, present."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ann Williams is present."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Butler for the purposes of an announcement."

"Thank you, Leader Hoffman. I appreciate that. And it's Butler: my great honor today to introduce to the chamber our newest Member of the role of Members of the House of Representatives. To my right here is Sandy Hamilton, the new Representative for the 99th District. And Sandy is a tremendous person in our community here in Springfield. She's lived in Springfield for over two decades. She is a tremendous realtor here in the capital region, and what she's really known for is Coach Hamilton. She's a long time volleyball coach. Just stepped down as the volleyball coach for Sacred Heart-Griffin after about a decade. But more than that, she's a champion volleyball player from the University of Illinois. On two Final Four volleyball teams when she was in school at the University of Illinois. So, please join me in welcoming Representative-Coach Sandy Hamilton to the Illinois General Assembly."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hamilton."

Hamilton: "Thank you. Thank you, Tim, for the nice introduction.

I'll just say briefly, again, Sandy Hamilton. Originally from

Downers Grove. So, I'm from the suburbs. Went to University

of Illinois. My husband is originally from Springfield. So,

we ended up to root our family here. And been here, like Tim

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

said, over 20 some years. And I'm excited to be here. Married with three boys. So excited. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome, Representative. Leader LaToya Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce and welcome our newest Member of the House Democratic Caucus, Representative Michael Kelly of the 15th District. Welcome."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, everybody, for the warm welcome. I'm excited to be here and looking forward to working with everybody here. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome. Representative Katie Stuart, for what reason do you rise?"

Stuart: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Stuart: "Thank you. I just wanted to take a minute to recognize with the Body. We had a tragic occurrence in Edwardsville on December 10 of last year. Many of you were probably aware, we had some severe storms and tornados. They ripped through the Southern and Midwestern United States. There was damage to homes and businesses all around Edwardsville. Tragically, six employees of one our Amazon warehouses lost their lives. I just wanted to take a minute to recognize those victims. Deandre Morrow, 28, of St. Louis. Kevin Dickey, 62, of Carlyle. Clayton Lynn Cope, 29, of Alton. Etheria Hebb, 34, of St. Louis. Larry Virden, 46, of Collinsville. Austin McEwen, 26, of Edwardsville. We also had a victim of some severe injuries, Craig Yost. I just wanted to take a moment to let the Body send our thoughts to the families of those

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

who lost their lives and to send our wishes for recovery for Mr. Yost. I hope that we are continuing to look into what we can do to protect the health and safety of workers in the future. I do have a Resolution filed on behalf of these families. And I would urge... I would hope that all Members of the chamber would be willing to sign on to that Resolution in support of the families. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Body shall observe a moment of silence.

Thank you. Representative McCombie, for what reason do you rise?"

McCombie: "A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

"If I could just have order please in the... I know McCombie: everybody's quiet but just ... in the early hours of December 4, Lieutenant Garrett Ramos of the Sterling Fire Department died in the line of duty when a floor collapsed beneath him while battling a house fire in the neighboring Rock Falls, Illinois. Garrett was born October 27, 1983 in Sterling Illinois to Edward and Jeannie Ramos. He grew up spending his time with his family, playing team sports, especially exceling at basketball and thriving in any team environment. Faith, family, and sports laid the foundation for the man of character he would become. Garrett attended St. Mary's Grade School and graduated from Sterling High School in 2002. He attended the South Carolina Fire Academy, following his graduation from Illinois State University. He then followed his father's footsteps, beginning his firefighting career in North Charleston Fire Department in Charleston, Carolina, a destination he loved visiting as a child and

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

vacationing there. In 2012, Garrett returned to his hometown, Sterling, where he would serve his community at the Sterling Fire Department and would later build his life centered around what mattered to him most, his family. Garrett married the love of his life, Brittney Berger, on July 23, 2016, traveling together before the birth of their two daughters Ruthie and Kepa. He was a devoted and loving husband and father. And those who knew him praised him for his positive attitude and infectious demeanor. Garrett was a perennial community volunteer, in addition to his nearly 10 year service at the Sterling Fire Department, where he served as Union President for Local 2301 before serving as Acting Captain for the year prior to his death. The City of Sterling promoted him after his untimely death to the rank of Captain. During the service, Chief Dettman noted that he was to replace him down the line. Garrett will be missed by his family, his wife, Brittney; daughters Ruthie and Kepa; parents Ed and Jeannie Ramos; Sister Jennifer (Aaron) Brannon; Nieces: Joslyn and Isla; his nephew Drake; his mother in law Sue (Liz) Roberts and father in law Rick (Linda) Berger; several aunts, uncles, cousins, and countless others who loved him dearly. There was an extreme outpouring of love for all that knew Garrett. There was thousands that attended his visitation and his funeral. Garrett will be missed by his brothers and sisters on the department, his friends, his family, and a very grateful community and state. We extend our sincerest condolences. Speaker, when the Resolution is filed, I would ask that all Members be added to it. And I ask for a moment of silence to recognize Captain Garrett Ramos, last call."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Speaker Hoffman: "We shall have a moment of silence. Thank you.

Representative Haas, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Haas: "Thank you. Last week, the Bradley Police Department lost a highly valued member of their force. Sergeant Marlene Rittmanic was shot and killed while responding to a call. She has served as a police officer for 21 years and was promoted to sergeant in 2014. In 2020, she was recognized as the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year for her outstanding service. Sergeant Rittmanic was known for being able to meet her community members where they were at and work with them to create long-lasting, effective solutions. Outside her job as a police officer, she was a published poet, an amateur photographer, a film producer, and an avid dog rescuer. She is survived by her wife, her father, her five sisters, a brother, and many nieces and nephews. I am proud to have had such a dedicated law enforcement officer and an incredible person serve the 79th District. My prayers are with her family, friends, colleagues, and loved ones. May Sergeant Rittmanic rest peacefully. I would ask for the honor for Sergeant Rittmanic with a moment of silence."

Speaker Hoffman: "We shall observe a moment of silence. Thank you. Representative Scherer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Scherer: "As I look around the floor here, and I see that we have men and women from all walks of life from all over our great state. And this effects all of us everywhere. And that is the

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

very dear loss of Deidre Silas, the DCFS worker from right here in Sangamon County who was murdered Tuesday while investigating in a home with six children present under the age of seven. This is a catastrophe. We've got to do something about this. I wish we all knew the answer right now. I can't stand to say this is unsolvable problem. It's a little too close to home because my niece is a DCFS investigator at a private facility. And I know she walks into those homes every day. So, we've got to do better folks. It affects all of us every walk of life, every social economic level. So, please, please put your thinking caps on, think outside the box. Let's figure out a way that we can assure that this never happens again. Because somebody didn't go home to their family Tuesday night from work. And we've just got to do better. So, our thoughts and prayers are with Ms. Silas' family, and friends, and coworkers, and her peers throughout the state and throughout the country. She is a hero, and everybody that takes on one of those jobs as an investigator is a hero. And they're are often times the forgotten heroes. So, please know, if you're out there and you're one of those, we care about you, and we'll do anything we can to make it better. And I would like to ask for a moment of silence."

Speaker Hoffman: "We shall observe a moment of silence. Thank you. Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

West: "I just want to stand with Representative Scherer on what she just mentioned. And she said, put our thinking caps on, on what we can do. It takes nine... six to nine months, closer

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

to a year, for people who apply to work for the State of Illinois to get a job. In between that time, people usually turn away and find another job. None of our DCFS workers should be doing home visits alone. But since we have a shortage, because the applicants are many but those who get hired are few, one thing that we can do, as a Body, both in the House and the Senate, is to urge the Governor's Administration to find a way to expedite the time of which people apply for a job to work for our great state and then get that job to serve our community. It should not be taking over six months from my application to the time I get to my final round of interviews for me to find out if I'm working for the State of Illinois. That's one thing we can work on together. I hope that we can do that moving forward for the sake of ... or the legacy of the individual who lost their life yesterday. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To Representative Sue Scherer, I'm so sorry for your loss. And I want to take a moment to say, as Representative Scherer just stated, this should never have to happen. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, you need to understand, families across this state are in pain, and they're hurting. They need help. And instead of helping, sometimes we come in with strong arms because we can, as opposed to dealing with the tools in our toolbox already about keeping families together, reuniting families. There's many of opportunities out there that we could help these families, because we all fall short. And until such time we start looking at these families as one of

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

us... Representative Scherer just stated, these people come from all walks of life. And it could happen to each and every last one of us. So, I'm begging you, when you think about DCFS, do not necessarily put a negative connotation, do not be too quick to separate the family. What can we do? And if we can keep them together. And if we can't, we have to make sure that what happened in Sue Scherer's community, in other communities around this state, never happen again. But if we continue to perpetuate this, it would only get worse. It will only get worse. And there will be a lot more people as well... adults as well as children hurt by these situations. So, yes, let's put our thinking caps on, and let's think about families, reunification when we can. Let's operate on the laws that we have in regards to intact families. And those families that cannot be held together, we have to look for some other families to take them. But let's start with the right thing first, and that's still with intact family. Thank you very much. And thank you, Representative Scherer. And again, I'm sorry for you loss."

Speaker Hoffman: "Members, twice I've read House Rule 51.5, which requires the wearing of face coverings on the House Floor. I noticed there were several Members that I hope have just forgotten to place their face coverings on. I... we just went through and talked about some terrible tragedies where we, as Republicans and Democrats, both share the sorrow of many. Do we really want to go about enforcing House Rule 51.5? Because if I have to, I will. So, you can make the decision whether you want to wear your mask or be... have House Rule 51.5 enforced. Halbrook. Representative Halbrook, would you please

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

place your face mask on, please? Thank you. Representative Kifowit."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

"Thank you, Speaker. I ask the Body to rise to Kifowit: memorialize one other person. The Fox Valley lost its last known Pearl Harbor survivor. He died at 102. Everett 'Jim' Schlegel, who was the Fox Valley's last known survivor of the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 that sent the United States into World War II. He was a beloved U.S. Army veteran. And he died on New Year's Eve in his Elgin home surrounded by his loved ones. And we have to say that he enjoyed shining a spotlight on him. I met him several times at the Aurora annual Pearl Harbor Day luncheon. He was 22 years old and attending to stable duty near the Army Schofield Barracks in Hawaii as a member of the Mountain Troop when Japanese planes began unexpectedly flying over the base, giving the young man a front row seat to the history that was being made. It was because Schlegel was more than a veteran with a good war story, he was also... we were intrigued by listening to his eye witness accounts of how those enemy pilots were flying so low he could see the expressions on their faces, even responding to their waves, as he had no idea at first what was happening. And Schlegel, who had only arrived a few months earlier to the base, recalled he was ... it was his job to make sure those around him were fully armed, yet when he finally got around to getting his own weapon for guard duty, all that was left was .45 with a measly seven bullets. Schlegel was always active to talk about his time,

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

and he was always available to talk to anybody who would want to listen to about Pearl Harbor and World War II. He always talked about others. And he always was there for, as I said, the annual Navy League's Pearl Harbor Day luncheon, and he attended it for the last 16 years. He was supposed to be there again this year, due to health constraints and obviously he was unable to attend. So, I ask the Body to give a moment of silence to the Fox Valley's last surviving Pearl Harbor Day survivor, Everett Schlegel, who was 102."

- Speaker Hoffman: "A moment of silence. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Rules Report. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 5, 2022: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 1953; referred to the floor, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 928."
- Speaker Hoffman: "On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3512, under the Order of Concurrence, Representative Slaughter."
- Slaughter: "Happy New Year, everyone. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3512. The provisions in this Bill reflect agreements by various stakeholders across the public safety spectrum. There is no opposition on this Bill. The sole and only purpose for HB3512 is to provide fixes that facilitate the implementation of the following three components of the Safety Act signed in January of 2021. First, on pretrial services. As our state emerges as a national model

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

for pretrial fairness, it is critical that our Circuit Courts throughout the entire state be able to provide effective, quality pretrial services. HB3512 puts forth agreed language to promote the hiring and training for pretrial services in counties where these services do not exist. This allows 53 circuits in Illinois who are currently without pretrial services to establish them, as required by the Illinois Pretrial Services Act of 1987. 1987, we're 34 years late, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill allows us to begin to comply with this requirement. This language is requested by the courts to help them with implementation. Secondly, detainee phone calls and the right to communication. We're talking about individuals' rights after they've been detained. As of January 1, detainees must be given three phone calls within three hours of being detained. This Bill outlines an agreed upon enforcement mechanism that deems statements inadmissible when this statute is violated. But equally important, provides an avenue for prosecutors to overcome these inadmissible statements. The other agreements in this section are regarding record keeping and reporting requirements for law enforcement as it relates to tracking placed phone calls and documenting exigent circumstances that prevent officers from timely compliance. This Bill also provides an important clarification for the definition of 'place of detention'. The State's Attorneys Association, the Cook County Public Defender's Office, and the Law Enforcement Coalition all coming together here to agree for the sake of workable implementation. Third, and the final component of this Bill, moves back the effective dates of two initiatives. The

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

proposed changes in the SAFE-T Act to both are mandatory supervised release system and our new police decertification system are moved to July 1 of this year. In regards to police decertification, this is at the request of the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board that's been tasked with overseeing this new program. The delay is not only due to the pandemic, but they simply need more time to make critical hires and to build out this brand new division of their office. If you recall, the SAFE-T Act lays out a very robust framework for this new decertification program. And in this Bill, stakeholders continue to collaborate to facilitate its implementation when it does go live. Some important agreements to highlight include adding a civilian to the certification review panel, recalling more racial, ethnic, and geographic diversity in a certification review panel, adding a member to the certification review panel that represents smaller municipalities. This Bill also clarifies automatic decertification elements and provides a host of technical language changes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill. Thank you for your indulgence. I want to definitely reiterate, there is no opposition on this Bill. I want to commend all the entities that were at the forefront of these discussions. This Bill reflects a strong collaboration with all stakeholders. Compromise, agreement, and implementation are the themes of this Bill. And, once again, and I've done imploring this Body to honor the this before, Ι**'**m collaboration and the effort that went into this initiative. I urge a 'yes' vote on this important concurrence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. The Chair is going to limit a three-minute timer, debate timer. However, we will allow individual Members to yield their time. Representative Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

- Windhorst: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Slaughter. Seem to remember we were in a similar position in a different building last year, last January when this underlying Bill passed. And several Members of our caucus who were allowed to speak at that time raised concerns about that underlying Bill. So, I want to clarify some things that maybe are or are not in this trailer Bill. Is there anything in this trailer Bill that deals with the elimination of the cash bail system or reforming the cash bail system?"
- Slaughter: "No, not indirectly. However, the pretrial services component of the Bill does allow us to move forward in being prepared for January 2023 when the no cash bail provision does go live."
- Windhorst: "And if you recall, last January, there were several serious violence... there were serious... several serious violent offenses that were... are not listed as possible detainable offenses pretrial. We discussed that. Is there any change to the list of detainable offenses pretrial in this Bill?"

Slaughter: "No, it isn't, Representative."

- Windhorst: "Is it your intention to address that at some point in a trailer Bill going forward?"
- Slaughter: "It goes in effect in January of 2023. Yes, I'm open to collaboration, of course, with this Body."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Windhorst: "So, you... is there intention to do that or just you're open to hearing suggestions?"
- Slaughter: "Yes. My intention is to be collaborative."
- Windhorst: "Do you anticipate there will be a Bill run to address those offenses that are not included?"
- Slaughter: "I intend to be collaborative. And, yes, I intend to work with you on concerns. So, if that is a concern, it will be prioritized."
- Windhorst: "Well, that will be good because, to this point, in the discussions that have occurred prior to this Bill being drafted, the Republican caucus has not been included in those discussions. So, it would be important for us to be included. With regard to the three phone calls..."
- Slaughter: "Mr. Speaker, I'm having a little trouble hearing."
- Windhorst: "With regard to the three phone call rule that... one of the changes is to move from custody triggering the three hours to place of detention. Is that correct?"
- Slaughter: "That's correct, Representative."
- Windhorst: "And the three phone calls starts each time detention...

 place of detention is changed. Is that accurate to say?

 Meaning if a person moves from a city police department to a

 county jail, at each place of detention they have a separate

 three hour, three phone call right."
- Slaughter: "No. The clock does not start over once you move from place of detention to place of detention."
- Windhorst: "Are you allowed three additional phone calls or is that only three phone calls once you're taken to any place of detention?"
- Slaughter: "You're allowed only three phone calls."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Windhorst: "So, if you were moved from a city..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, Representative Stephens yields his time."
- Windhorst: "Thank you. So, if an individual is moved from a city lockup to the county jail, they're only allowed three phone calls during that time?"
- Slaughter: "That's correct. You're allowed three phone calls in three hours."
- Windhorst: "I believe by the..."
- Slaughter: "You don't get repeated three phone calls as you move from detention... from place of detention to place of detention."
- Windhorst: "So, that is going to be an additional burden on law enforcement, especially in rural areas where individuals are transferred from places that do not have a county jail, they have a regional jail. Those three phone calls will have to be monitored by law enforcement will require additional burdens on law enforcement."
- Slaughter: "I apologize you are correct. The... you do get an additional three phone calls at the new place of detention.

 I stand corrected."
- Windhorst: "There is also a requirement that law enforcement... and this is under the phone call provision again, subparagraph (g), 'In accordance with this Section, the following records shall be maintained: (i) the number of phone calls the person made while in custody; (ii) the time or times the person made phone calls; and (iii) if the person did not make any calls, a statement of the reason or reasons why no calls were made.'"

 Slaughter: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Windhorst: "There does not appear to be a prohibition... or a restriction, I should say, that that's only limited to that three-hour window. It appears that if someone is in jail for 5 days, 10 days, 6 months prior to trial, that law enforcement has to keep track of all the phone calls that individual makes during that period of time. Is that the intention of this Bill?"

Slaughter: "No, that is not the intention of this Bill."

Windhorst: "So, it's only limit... the record keeping is only limited to that three-hour window. Is that your intention?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "With regard to the pretrial services portion of the Bill, I understand that this is going to be a new individual employed by the state that will be assigned to different counties and circuits. Is that... that do not presently have pretrial services."

Slaughter: "That's correct. They presently do not have pretrial services."

Windhorst: "Are you aware that there are some counties that have individuals who operate as pretrial services officers, but there is not... because of the size of the county, there's not a separate pretrial services division?"

Slaughter: "Yes, I'm aware of that."

Windhorst: "So, that..."

Slaughter: "The intention of the Bill is to provide services where they don't exist."

Windhorst: "I guess what I'm saying, the map that's been provided by the AOIC shows some of those counties which have people

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

working as... in pretrial services as not having those services."

Slaughter: "This Bill does not pertain to them then."

Windhorst: "My concern with this provision is we are going to be taking the local court system, which is operated by people who are elected by the local voters or accountable to the local voters, and introducing someone from the state who is not accountable locally and is only accountable to someone in Springfield. Is there any purpose or intention that that individual hired would be accountable, meaning could be hired, fired, disciplined, by the local circuit judge as is currently occurs with probation officers?"

Slaughter: "No, the current apparatus that is in place would be responsible in that case. Under this Bill, in establishing services where you do not have that, then yes, the local Circuit Court would be... that would be under purview of the Circuit Court in regards to, again, that area not having the pretrial services."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Marron, would you be willing to yield your time? Three more minutes."

Windhorst: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Windhorst: "Last January, we raised many serious concerns about the… what's been called the SAFE-T Act that became law. Those concerns have not been addressed by this Bill. And there is concern on my part and many others that there will not be adequate efforts to address those concerns in future Bills. What is done here is just something to cover over things that

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

I believe are larger mistakes with insufficient corrections.

So, for that reason, I would urge those to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Durkin: "Representative, what is the current state of the law regarding phone calls by people who have been detained under the Illinois statute? What is the current law? And how many phone calls is someone allowed under current law is someone allowed under current law to make if they're detained by the police?"

Slaughter: "Okay. As of January 1, just a few days ago, the current..."

Durkin: "No, no, no. Right now."

Slaughter: "Right now, right now, you're allowed three phone calls within three hours."

Durkin: "So, this is... what you have in here is already currently law? I'm looking at the Amendment that says that each person shall have three phone calls to a family member or an attorney. You're saying that's currently the law?"

Slaughter: "That currently went effective January 1. That's correct."

Durkin: "All right. Let me ask you a few things about this. You said that a person who is detained gets three phone calls while they're in custody, correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Durkin: "Do you know that when it says here, I'm going to read the language, 'persons who are in police custody'. When we talk about somebody's in custody, a court has historically

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

stated that it means that that is when someone is not free to leave. Would you agree with that? That is what our courts have said. When a person is in custody they are not free to leave. You understand that?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Durkin: "So, when a person is picked up and placed inside a squad car, and they're handcuffed, are they free to leave?"

Slaughter: "They're not free to leave."

Durkin: "So, at that point, while they are in a squad car, will they have to be given three phone calls at that point?"

Slaughter: "No. This would not apply. If you're in a vehicle..."

Durkin: "Where does it say... where does it say it's not going to..."

Slaughter: "You said if you're in a squad car?"

Durkin: "Yes."

Slaughter: "This would not apply to that."

Durkin: "Why not? He's in custody. He's not free to leave. That's what your Bill says. Persons who are in police custody. That person's in custody while he's in a squad car."

Slaughter: "No, the Bill says that it's about the place of detention."

Durkin: "No, it doesn't. It says right here..."

Slaughter: "Which the Bill also goes on to clarify..."

Durkin: "No, no, no. Representative Slaughter, it says, persons who are in police custody shall have the right to communicate free of charge. Police custody means that they are not free to leave. That means that they are sitting in a squad car. And under the way you've drafted your Bill, that means that the police have to give that person three phone calls."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Slaughter: "Okay. Leader, please go to line 15, 'but no later than three hours of arrival at the first place of detention.'

So, I want to bring the Body back to the definition of place of detention."

Durkin: "No, this thing is totally contradictory."

Slaughter: "No, you went to the Bill."

Durkin: "I am going to the Bill."

Slaughter: "Yeah. So, I'm on line 15."

Durkin: "You're not even reading it right. Look, I've practiced law I understand this. You don't practice law. I'm telling you you're going to run..."

Slaughter: "Oh, here we go."

Durkin: "...into constitutional problems, okay? Answer the question. Is a police officer who's in the... if that person's detained in the squad car, he's not free to leave, right there it says that they have to give three phone calls to that individual. That's the way it reads."

Slaughter: "The right starts when you're in custody. The clock starts on the phone calls when it's the place of detention."

Durkin: "You know what? I'm reading something different. And you know what? Some defense attorney's going to read something different too. It says when police... persons who are in police custody shall have the right, custody. You have a conflict in this section between detention and custody. So, let's... let's move on. You're also saying that after that person has been at first place of detention, they will be brought down to the lock up, and they will be... let's say they're going to be brought from the, whether a squad or from the district, down

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

to the county jail. At the county jail they will be given another opportunity to get three phone calls, correct?"

Slaughter: "Can you repeat that? I'm sorry, Leader."

Durkin: "I'm saying is that, after a person has been apprehended, someone who has been suspect or someone's been detained, they are... what happens is they bring them down to... usually it's brought to a local district. Okay?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Durkin: "Okay. So, I say that you get three calls in a squad car.

When they get to that district that is a place of detention,
that will also require three phone calls... another three phone
calls, correct?"

Slaughter: "They only get three phone calls once they get to the place of detention."

Durkin: "Places of detention are... is a... let's say is the 10th District or the 11th District in Chicago. Is that a place of detention?"

Slaughter: "Yes. Yes. Yes."

Durkin: "When a person... okay. And when... okay. Then that's three phone calls right there. Then, if the charges are approved, they're moved from that place of detention to the county jail for a bond hearing. That is another place of detention. So, I'm looking at right now nine phone calls that we are giving someone under this Bill. Would you agree that 26th and California, the Cook County Jail, is also a place of detention?"

Slaughter: "Yes. The courthouse is not. But, yes."

Durkin: "So, I'm looking at it right now. You got six. I'm looking...
I'm actually... I argue it's nine. But there's already six phone

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

calls that are automatically going to be given to someone under those scenarios, whether picked up... they're picked up, they're brought down to the district station. The district station will write a report and say that we have probable cause. And it will go down to the county jail, and they'll have to sit for a bond hearing. So, we have... what?"

Slaughter: "Is this a bad thing? You're... you're saying... you're adding this up, right? Is this a bad thing that the detainee would get six phone calls?"

Durkin: "Is it what?"

Slaughter: "Is... never mind. Continue. I'm sorry. I interrupted you. I'm sorry."

Durkin: "No. No. So, we're looking at a minimum six phone calls you're going to give somebody who can make a... under any scenario within the State of Illinois, particularly in the City of Chicago, that you're going to give because a place of detention is a local... is the local district. And the local district is going... which is a place of detention. And then, the local district are going to transfer them to jail. That's another place of detention. So, you got six phone calls right off the bat. So, where, at the Cook County Jail, are these guys... where are these signs going to be placed which says they must be a sign that says that you have a right to talk to your attorney or public defender? I mean, you're telling the sheriff... this is a mandate on the sheriff. So, tell me how that's going to work out."

Slaughter: "So, the question is, where are the signs going to be placed?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Durkin: "Yeah. Yeah. Where are these sheriffs going to have to do when these guys are brought in? Where is the..."
- Slaughter: "It depends on the facility, but somewhere where it's visible to see them."
- Durkin: "All right. Look, I... look, I haven't been arrested. I'm pretty fortunate. But the fact is, people are going to be in this situation. Sheriffs are going to try to figure out where the heck they got to put these notices. So, I'm going to move on. Okay. So, let's get over to the other section that says that the person who is detained has a right to make a phone call to his attorney of his or her choice and members of his or her family, correct?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

- Durkin: "Okay. How is the law enforcement officer going to make...

 be able to determine that a phone call is being made to one

 of these individual's family members?"
- Slaughter: "We trust police officers to make more important decisions than that every day."
- Durkin: "Why don't you answer the question? Answer the question.

 How does the police officer going to know whether not their

 making a call to a family member? Since they're not allowed,

 under your Bill, to ease drop, nor to... it must not be

 monitored, ease dropped, or recorded. How are these guys going

 to know who the heck they're talking to?"
- Slaughter: "We're trusting their experience to be able to do this."
- Durkin: "No, you're not. No, no, no. You've created another mess, like you did with 3653. You've created another mess. So, here,

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

here's another one. So, it says that... what is... how far does a family member go by definition in your Bill?"

Slaughter: "One more time, Leader."

Durkin: "How far is... should the definition of family member be extended under this Bill?"

Slaughter: "Honestly, I don't think we define it in the Bill."

Durkin: "All right. Here's... well, okay. Here's what you're doing.

Now you would agree that this is a very... we live in a very violent society. And particularly when it comes to domestic abuse, correct?"

Slaughter: "Correct."

Durkin: "We have spouses who will violently attack their wife or their child. Under this Bill, when that family member has been charged or placed... or in a place of detention, and the abuser is a family member, you're allowing, under this Bill, that abuser to call that victim at the jail house, which they often do, in which they say, you know what? Don't charge me. Don't proceed with this. Or other type of intimidation. Do you know that?"

Slaughter: "This is a violation... what you're describing is a violation of the law though, Leader."

Durkin: "Yeah, but you're allowing this phone call to be made. You're saying that you can have... you're saying they can call up a family member. It doesn't make it... without any restrictions. And when that family member, whether they're a sexual assault victim, from a family, from an uncle, or from a father, is going to be allowed to call back to that other family to beg to the family or that child and say do not press charges against me. You've opened up... opened up a very bad

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

situation when it comes to issues of domestic violence and also sexual assault against family members."

Slaughter: "What you're describing is felony tampering of a witness, Leader."

Durkin: "Is what?"

Slaughter: "Felony tampering of a witness."

Durkin: "It doesn't make a difference. You're still allowing that phone call to be made. Sure they can get charged down the line, but the fact is, the call's going to be made. And they're going to scare the hell out of that victim who's been the subject of abuse by that family member. Have you ever heard about the... a few years ago we passed a Constitutional Amendment in 2014 called Marsy's Law. Sound familiar? It is for victims' rights. Passed overwhelming in the State of Illinois. It's now part of our Constitution. What it does is, it... that it quarantees that victims should be free from harassment from their offenders. And it guarantees the right of reasonable protection from the accused. How does this section, in which a family member who's the abuser is going to call up back to the house and talk to the victim, how does that comply with the Constitution of Illinois? How are they free from protection from the accused?"

Slaughter: "You can currently make phone calls. Nothing in the Bill is allowing to make phone calls to a victim."

Durkin: "It does. It allows for it. It says a family member. It doesn't preclude that. It doesn't say that you can talk to any family member, as long as they are not the victim of a crime that person is being detained for. That's not in your Bill. Like 3653, this is poorly drafted. This Bill was a mess

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

back in January. That's why we we're going through this process of having to clean up or they call trailer Bills. They clean up the mess that was created under that Bill because it was never properly vetted. We saw it with the three hours left in the Legislative Session at the end of last January. And the way I read this right now... because I do practice law. And words mean something when we put it into legislation. And, Representative Slaughter, what you have done with this Bill is that you've created a terrible situation and likely situation that's going to occur in those specific cases of domestic violence or sexual abuse that is been gone... that in which a family member has afflicted upon a minor. I would strongly recommend a 'no' vote. People, understand what we're getting into and what we're opening up. And, Representative Slaughter, you know that I... I worked with you on that Bill last year, and I'm speaking to you from the person who's practiced law, who has worked inside the Cook County court system for a number of years. I understand this. And the fact is, you've created a bad scenario that'll likely happen if you pass this Bill. Vote 'no'."

Slaughter: "Leader, and you know..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Slaughter, we're going to move to Representative Crespo for three minutes."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Crespo: "Thank you. Representative, I think it was yesterday or the day before we were talking the pretrial services, correct?

And I asked a question in terms of how much was it going to

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

cost to establish that. And I believe you stated around \$16 million, correct?"

Slaughter: "Approximately."

Crespo: "Yeah. And I did get a chance to look at the language and page 167. And it does state that the Supreme Court is encouraged to establish a framework. So, this is not a mandate, right? This is just asking the Supreme Court to try to put this in place."

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Crespo: "Okay. At a cost of at least \$16 million that you are aware of?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. I mean, that figure still evolving and being discussed."

Crespo: "Okay. And I sure do hope, Representative, that the Supreme Court follows the appropriation process, comes before the General Services, which I Chair, and try to make their case so we can vet this right way and see if we have to find some GRF dollars, I would presume, to pay for this. Second question. There's some references here to mandated training. I saw one on page 109 and 118. A mandated training at no cost to employee. So, who's responsible for the cost? Is it going to come back to the state to use GRF or is it going to be... or is it the local municipality or police department responsible for paying for their training?"

Slaughter: "Can you repeat that one more... what page are you on, Representative?"

Crespo: "I'm looking at least page 109 and 118, and there's references to mandated training at no cost to the employee.

And my question is, who's responsible for paying for their

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

training? Is it going to be... are they coming before us again and asking for GRF to pay for it? Or is the local police department or towns responsible for paying for the training?"

Slaughter: "Well, Representative, Illinois State Police will pay for state training, the local municipalities will pay for their... for their internal training."

Crespo: "Okay. So, this..."

Slaughter: "ILETSB pays for their training."

Crespo: "I'm sorry. What was that?"

Slaughter: "The Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards
Board pays for their training. The Illinois State Police pays
for their particular training."

Crespo: "Okay. So, this is additional training though, correct?

So, there's an additional expense, additional cost?"

Slaughter: "The Bill doesn't have any additional training provision."

Crespo: "I'm sorry, what was that?"

Slaughter: "It doesn't... this Bill does not provide for any additional training of officers."

Crespo: "But it's identifying additional training that's mandated under this... under this Bill. And again, my question is, who's paying for that?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Crespo, would like more time?

Representative Yednock yields three minutes."

Slaughter: "Representative, the Bill is just clarifying that the cost for the training is not on the individual officers.

That's what this Bill is clarifying."

Crespo: "I agree. I agree. And what I'm trying to ascertain here is, if they're not paying for the training and this is

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- additional training on top of what training they get today, who's responsible... Representative, I would imagine that they're not going to come to us for GRF funding, I hope. So, it's going to be a responsibility of the local police department or the town municipality, correct?"
- Slaughter: "Well, the local would pay for their training and get reimbursed by the Illinois Training and Standards Board."
- Crespo: "I'm sorry. They get reimbursed by whom?"
- Slaughter: "The Illinois Training... the Illinois Law Enforcement
 Training and Standards Board."
- Crespo: "I didn't hear you very well. I'm not sure I understand.

 So, again, it's a very simple question. Who's responsible to pay for that additional training?"
- Slaughter: "So, ILETSB does the training. But if locals do the training, ILETSB will reimburse them. And that money's been appropriated."
- Crespo: "Okay. I'm not going to belabor the point. My final question. I know there was some talk early on about the definition of tasers being identified as use of deadly force. I understand that there's been some conversations of us coming back in the spring to look at the definition of the tasers, correct?"
- Slaughter: "That's correct. But this Bill does not have provisions."
- Crespo: "It does not. But I think there is some understanding that it would be included in this Bill. It was not. And I believe that there's an understanding that we're coming back in the spring, and we're going to talk about the tasers and

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

the definition as to whether there considered deadly... deadly force or not, correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct, Representative."

Crespo: "Thank you. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard for three minutes."

Costa Howard: "Thank you. Representative Slaughter, can you tell me again who worked as part of this coalition to address the issues in the original Bill?"

Slaughter: "Sure. I mean, entities across the public safety spectrum. But, in particular, the Illinois State's Attorneys Association, the Illinois Chiefs of Police, Illinois Sheriffs' Association, Illinois State Police. Numerous advocates, of course, as well."

Costa Howard: "So... so in other words, law enforcement was at the table this time, working on this Bill to address the concerns that they had in the original SAFE-T Act. Is that correct?" Slaughter: "That's correct."

Costa Howard: "And, Representative Slaughter, as you know, like many of my colleagues here, I, too, am an attorney. And I, too, have actually worked in the criminal justice system in the suburbs, not just Cook County. And my state's attorney, DuPage County State's Attorney Bob Berlin worked on this Bill with you, did he not?"

Slaughter: "He did."

Costa Howard: "And, in fact, as you remember... I'm assuming you remember, Representative Slaughter, I was a 'no' vote on the original SAFE-T Act. So, I brought you my concerns at that time, correct?"

Slaughter: "I do remember, Representative."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Costa Howard: "Thank you. And, in fact, I want to thank you, once again, for working on and addressing all of these concerns. My point, Representative Slaughter, is that, while some of us may of voted 'no' in the first round of this Bill because we did not feel that the original Bill addressed many of our concerns, you, on your word, went back and worked with law enforcement to address their concerns. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Costa Howard: "I received a call today from... excuse me... I reached out to my state's attorney today to talk to him about this Bill and to make sure that, while it is not perfect, that the suburban aspects of our state's attorney's office worked on this Bill, including Will County, because they know how to do their jobs. They know that, even though this Bill passed, there were things that needed to be fixed. And they looked to us, as the elected Representatives, to do our job, to show up on time and to work on the fixes. So, I will be voting 'yes' on this Bill, even though I voted 'no' the first time around, because this goes a long way in addressing some of those concerns. So, I want to thank you, Representative Slaughter, and the coalition of law enforcement that worked on this Bill and continues to show up and do their job. Thank you. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

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

McCombie: "I just have one question, Representative. Does this

Bill address all of the concerns of law enforcement?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Slaughter: "Does it address all of the concerns?"

McCombie: "Does this Bill... does it... yes... all of the concerns of law enforcement."

Slaughter: "No. It addresses the concerns contained in those three major components that I articulated when I presented the Bill."

McCombie: "Okay. And does this Bill do anything to address the concerns with zero cash bail?"

Slaughter: "Yes, in that... again, in regards to the pretrial services piece, allows the state to certainly be more prepared for the go live date on January 1, 2023."

McCombie: "Okay, Representative. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi, three minutes."

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

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

Mazzochi: "All right. Representative Slaughter, on page 50 of Senate Amendment 1, subpart (h), lines 22 to 24, you have not limited the power of the board to suspend a certificate or to revoke a certificate, correct?"

Slaughter: "Representative, can you reference the Section one more time?"

Mazzochi: "Subsection (h), lines 22 to 24."

Slaughter: "Okay. Can you repeat your question?"

Mazzochi: "Right. The board... this board, in its revocation... certification process and revocation process you've created, a board can suspend, or restrict, or even revoke a certification for a police officer, right?"

Slaughter: "That's correct, Representative."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Mazzochi: "All right. And if the officer loses their certification, if it's revoked, they no longer have a job in Illinois, right?"
- Slaughter: "As a officer."
- Mazzochi: "Right. And you have... and with this Amendment, you're now making it mandatory that every single entity... government agency in Illinois that wants to have law enforcement officers, it's no longer voluntary, they are mandated to participate in this certification scheme, correct?"
- Slaughter: "That's already a part of law. What we're doing now is allowing for an appeals process. Due process for our officers, backing the blue."
- Mazzochi: "Well, let's talk about due practice for our officers.

 Because aren't all of these officers covered by the Supreme
 Court's Loudermill standard?"
- Slaughter: "What is the ... the what standard? I'm sorry."
- Mazzochi: "The Loudermill standard. U.S. Supreme Court's Loudermill standard. Do you not know what that is? Maybe you should."
- Slaughter: "Please articulate, Representative."
- Mazzochi: "Do you consider these officers to have a property or liberty interest in their public employment?"
- Slaughter: "Representative, it's not a license. It's a certification."
- Mazzochi: "Well, answer my question. Are officers still allowed, under your legislation, to have a property or liberty interest in their public employment?"
- Slaughter: "The Bill does not speak to what you've referenced, Representative."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Mazzochi: "Really? Well, I disagree. And this is why part of this is problematic because you can't take away, by statute, rights that are enshrined in the U.S. Constitution under Supreme Court precedent. When you're... let's go to the revocation of certification provision. Do you consider that a Loudermill pre-termination proceeding or is it part of a pathway to a post-termination proceeding?"

Slaughter: "What section are we at, Representative?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick, would you yield your time?"

Mazzochi: "Take a look..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Three more minutes."

Mazzochi: "If you'd like, take a look at page 64 of the legislation. You're talking about authority to decertify through a preliminary hearing. Is that a Loudermill pretermination hearing or not?"

Slaughter: "One moment, Rep. Representative, I'm not sure what you're referring to."

Mazzochi: "Take a look at page 64, line 11, preliminary... line 10, (e), preliminary reviews. Line 11 starts, one, where it talks about the board shall complete a preliminary review. Does that qualify... do you believe that qualifies as a Loudermill pre-termination review or not?"

Slaughter: "It's... Representative, it's up to court, but can I get you to go to page 81, line 13, 'The individual has no property interest in law enforcement certification at the time of initial certification or at any time thereafter, including, but not limited to, after decertification or after the officer's certification has been deemed inactive.'"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Mazzochi: "Yeah. Well, that gets back to my original point. Which is, under Loudermill, how can that provision possibly be lawful? When the U.S. Supreme Court has said you have a property and liberty interest based on the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, how do you say that can ever survive constitutional muster?"
- Slaughter: "Representative, I'm going to try to consolidate the Q and A on this. It's important for the Body to know that what we've done here is really gone from something that was nonexistent to now a robust decertification process. And all of the law enforcement coalition, all of the entities involved with the law enforcement coalition was at the table and has agreed upon... what the leadership and the Attorney General's Office has agreed upon..."
- Mazzochi: "No, no, no. Let's be very clear, they haven't agreed upon this. When you... when you file a Bill and you pass a Bill that basically says, dear law enforcement, we're going to break your arms and break your legs. And then, you come back with a trailer Bill that says, don't worry we're just going to punch you in the face. That's not exactly a way to say law enforcement has agreement. That's a way for law enforcement to say, yeah, we'd rather have a punch in the face than broken limbs."

Slaughter: "No, Rep."

- Mazzochi: "But that doesn't mean it's good legislation that they have agreed to, and they do not support this overall scheme you've created. So, let's get rid of that polite fiction."
- Slaughter: "No, Rep. In particular, not in this actual section.

 In the SAFE-T Act, the decertification language and what was

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

laid out had all of the entities, every single entity in regard to law enforcement coalition, signing off and agreed."

Mazzochi: "Did you have the nine Members of the U.S. Supreme Court there? Because that's my point, is that this is not compliant with the Loudermill standard. Loudermill standards..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative... Representative, we know the Loudermill standard. You've said it. Please... please bring your remarks to a close."

Mazzochi: "No, I've still got more questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Shocker."

Mazzochi: "I'm happy to move to other sections under... let's talk about this 'process'..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins gives you three minutes."

Mazzochi: "...this process that you've created. Now, during the prior committee hearing in connection with this Amendment, I raised a whole host of issues relating to due process procedural problems with this protocol that you put out. And even the Governor's... the people from Governor's Office recognized that there were some problems. So, since we raised those issues, you still haven't tried to make any Amendments that we raised as concerns during the committee hearing in connection with this legislation, true?"

Slaughter: "This is true, Representative. And... and, Representative, we certainly appreciate your time, energy, and effort that you've put into this particular section on decertification. Please remember this is being moved back to July 1. Not only myself, not only the Attorney General's Office, but I am sure the entire Body is open and will welcome

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

to collaboration with you to improve our decertification apparatus."

Mazzochi: "You haven't offered to collaborate on anything. We've...
we've raised issues..."

Slaughter: "I'm on the record offering to collaborate with you, Rep."

Mazzochi: "You haven't... you haven't taken a single recommendation that we made to try to improve this process into account. So, for example, under subsection (k), when a person is called before the board or the panel to give evidence for decertification, the officer and his counsel does not have a right to cross examine those witnesses, do they?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Mazzochi: "All right. And under subsection... and as we take a look at page 60, decertification conduct, the board has the authority to decertify a full-time or part-time law enforcement officer before..."

Slaughter: "That's correct. That's current law."

Mazzochi: "...before any hearing takes place, right?"

Slaughter: "That's correct."

Mazzochi: "How are you going to be able to square that with due process requirements that require at least certain threshold minimum pre-hearing termination standards?"

Slaughter: "It's current law, Representative."

Mazzochi: "It's not... your current law is not..."

Slaughter: "What page are you on?"

Mazzochi: "...compliant with federal standards for due process protections. Let's take a look at line 63... page 63. You've still got that the identity of a complaining individual is

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

going to be kept confidential and may not be disclosed without the consent of that individual, right?"

Slaughter: "Yes..."

Mazzochi: "So, how isn't..."

Slaughter: "...because the confidentiality granted by this section does not preclude the disclosure... keep reading..."

Mazzochi: "Right."

Slaughter: "...of the identity of the person in any capacity other than as the source of an allegation."

Mazzochi: "Right, but the officer does not have a right to confront their accuser, to cross examine them, or to otherwise get information from them, correct?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. It's not a criminal proceeding. That's correct."

Mazzochi: "Right. No... but even in civil proceedings you have the right to... to get information from people who are accusing you. And again, you are taking away someone's livelihood through this process. So, again, you're... I don't think you've really thought this through. If you..."

Slaughter: "I think we're improving the due process,

Representative."

Mazzochi: "Well improving a noncompliant process does not make it compliant."

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

Mazzochi: "Take a look at page 68."

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

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Mazzochi: "I still have further questions, Chairman. I'm sure someone on my side of the aisle would be happy to waive time." Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Willis."

Mazzochi: "All right. Take a look at page 67, subpart (f), where the investigation process has..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Willis."

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

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

Willis: "Thank you. Representative, I'm going to be very brief.

What happens if we do not concur with this Bill?"

Slaughter: "Representative, it's a good question. With some of the provisions going live January 1, we are opening up the state to some possible litigation, and therefore, do need these important clarifications, especially as it pertains to the phone calls provision and also the mandatory supervised release provision as well."

Willis: "So, the Bill that we passed last year, the SAFE-T Act that many Members supported, many Members still had some concerns on, is in effect. If we do not do these changes that are being... have been worked on by law enforcement..."

Slaughter: "That are agreements."

Willis: "...and things, we're going to... that's going to be what's going to be and there's not going to be any changes?"

Slaughter: "That's correct, Representative."

Willis: "Right. My other... so, therefore, it is important that we listen to law enforcement and other people that have been part of the coalition to make these corrections as we go forward so that they are in compliance with the Bill and have a step forward in the right direction. My other question to

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

you is, is this the end of the discussion on the SAFE-T Act or are there still going to be discussions on other things that are going to be implemented in it over the next course of the next couple of months?"

Slaughter: "We all know that this is evolving, ongoing discussion, Representative."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Willis: "Many of us voted for the Bill. Many of us were concerned and voted against the Bill. The bottom line is, the underlining Bill passed. It is law. This is a step in the direction of correcting some of the things, clarifying some of the intent, making sure that we hear law enforcement. As my colleagues have said, we've talked to our district attorneys, we've talked to law enforcement. Many of you have gotten... been reached out to by the state police. They are begging us to pass this concurrence so that they can go into the right direction. As the Bill Sponsor has stated, this is not the end of the discussion. We will continue to work on this reform. There will be additional Bills that will come forward. We need to give him the tools. We need to work in that direction. I urge everybody to vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question for the Chair. Mr. Speaker, will it be the intention of the Majority Party to cut off debate on all Bills related to criminal justice reform? Is that the new approach, the new day that we will

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

see implemented any time we're talking about serious issues for public safety and police officers?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader, we had agreed to a three-minute debate timer. She was yielded... I assume we're talking about one of the previous speakers. She was yielded, I believe, three different individuals. I asked, please bring your remakes to a close. And the Representative did not and refused. So, the debate timer had been yielded several, several times. If you would like to allow the previous Representative three minutes to bring her remarks to a close, we certainly would do that."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would recommend, if there is to be a limit on the number of times the members can yield time to each other, let's establish those perimeters at the beginning of the debate. Because I believe Members will structure their lines of question, the points they'd like to make accordingly. But let's not have it be the practice of this Body that debate is arbitrarily limited once we tire with a certain number questions of a speaker. I appreciate your offer to allow Representative Mazzochi to bring her remarks to a close."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi for three minutes."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. If this Body didn't constantly cut off debate on criminal justice Bills, maybe you wouldn't have bad legislation that gets passed that needs an endless round of Bills to get fixed. The Sponsor of the Bill says we need this new Bill to make a prior bad Bill more workable. We're still taking bad legislation and keeping it unworkable for all of our local law enforcement infrastructures. When the Majority Party passes a Bill that they realize is unworkable... first,

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

shame on the Governor for signing it without an Amendment in the first place, but second, the better course of action is to repeal the Bill and actually to do a good Bill to start with. HB3512 has been colloquially referred to as the SAFE-T Act. What a lie. This Bill is not making more people safe. This is a bad Bill. It was a bad Bill when it was first passed. It's a bad Bill today. And the Democrats are, once again, privileging criminals over people who want to abide by the law. And by the way, shame on the women from DuPage who supported this Bill the first time and who are supporting this version of the Bill because you have seen, in DuPage County, the rise in criminal activity that's been resulting from so-called criminal justice and restorative justice reforms that this chamber has passed. You've seen the increases in carjackings. You've seen the increases in felonies. You've seen the damage that this legislation is doing to what should be a safe DuPage County. And you keep voting for it. You are women who are supposed to be keeping our families and our streets safe, and you're undermining it with every single vote on these types of Bills that you take. And why? Nobody in this chamber is going to dispute that Chicago is full of dysfunction. But to take Chicago style dysfunction and potential Chicago proposed influences and say that somehow this is going to be great for the rest of the state, it's not. It's not going to work. This is going to continue to make our streets less safe and you should vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Welter... Leader Welter. Leader Bourne. Representative Slaughter to close."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Slaughter: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Listen, this Bill is about compromise. It's about agreements and implementation. also about the building... or the building the collaborative spirit that's definitely needed to push forward with sensible reforms. It's important to understand that we need to respect and honor the stakeholders that have been at the table for this initiative. We... it's almost sad. We've been pushed to a place where you can get agreement on the toughest, most difficult subject matter under the dome, and it mean nothing. I want to commend and thank the Illinois State's Attorneys Association, all the entities of the law enforcement coalition, that include the Sheriffs' Association, Illinois State Police, Attorney General's Office, the Sheriffs' Association, Chief of Police, Police Lodge. Thank you for your time, your energy, and effort on getting us to a place to where we can realize and push forward with these reforms. When we look at what we're doing on pretrial fairness and detainee rights, it signifies to communities all across the state, especially communities of color, that we're serious about addressing the disparities that we see in our criminal justice system. Again, when you also look at what we're doing on establishing and enhancing a more robust police decertification program, it signifies that we do indeed honor, and respect, and admire good quality policing. We can achieve reform. It is possible to do this and honor both sides of the public safety spectrum. This Bill is a testament to that. And as we head into the second year of this General Assembly, I pray that we can put

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

our differences aside and be a model for collaboration and good will. I urge a 'yes' vote on this important concurrence."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3512?' This is final action.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Davidsmeyer votes 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Ammons, for whatever reason, did not come up on the video board. Would you please return to Representative Ammons?"

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "There she is."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Davidsmeyer. Representative Davidsmeyer votes 'no'. Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Delgado votes 'yes'. Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz votes 'yes'.

Representative Grant."

Grant: "No."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Grant votes 'no'. Representative Guerrero-Cuellar."

Guerrero-Cuellar: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guerrero-Cuellar votes 'yes'.

Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guzzardi votes 'yes'. Representative Meier."

Meier: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Meier votes 'no'. Representative Miller."

Miller: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Miller votes 'no'. Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Moeller votes 'yes'. Representative Severin."

Severin: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Severin votes 'no'. Representative Ann Williams."

Williams, A.: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ann Williams votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, there are 66... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no'... 67 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3512. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 1953, under Order of Concurrence, Representative Stuart."
- Stuart: "Thank you. I move to concur with Amendments 1 and 2 to...

 Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1953."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Would you like to explain the Amendment?"
- Stuart: "Sure it just... very briefly. It just cleans up just four simple issues in the Election Code in relation to the 2022 election."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Welter."
- Welter: "Mr. Speaker, please let the record reflect that Representative Morrison and Sommer are excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect. Representative Butler... or Leader Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if Representative Spain wanted to say a few words on this side. Representative Stuart, can you kind of run through... I know this a... you said this is a cleanup. Can you kind of run through what the changes are?"
- Stuart: "Sure. Like I said, very briefly, it's just four issues. It clarifies that vote by mail ballots can still be picked up in person during the last five days before the June primary. It updates the petition affidavit language to account for the shortened petition passing period. Clarifies that the term 'State Central Committeeperson' includes committeewoman and committeeman. And then, it also updates the legislative blackout period to account for the new date of the primary in June."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Butler: "I'm always a little skeptical about election Bills from the Majority. But nothing else in there that would surprise us?"

Stuart: "No, that's it."

Butler: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Spain: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an elections cleanup Bill. It's a not the first, and it may not be the last that we've seen in this chamber, even though we're just days away from the beginning of circulation for candidates to begin the process of passing petitions throughout the State of Illinois. This is a Bill that makes a couple of small changes. The issue though is that they're making changes in correction of mistakes that have been made in the past. And I would just say, very sincerely, as someone who volunteered with great enthusiasm to serve on the House Redistricting Committee, to serve as the Republican spokesperson on the Ethics and Elections Committee, what a difficult and disappointing year this past year has been. And from the conduct of the Majority for redistricting, to the changes that have been made on elections, the mistakes that are now being corrected in this Bill, the problem is the lack of collaboration and the lack of transparency with the Majority Party in this chamber. And it's disappointing. And it didn't have to be this way. And, quite frankly, it shouldn't have been this way. So, here we are again, as we enter the election year, a very pivotal election year, an important election

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

year for all of us and for the State of Illinois. Here we are cleaning up more mistakes that have been made that maybe didn't have to made if we could've worked together genuinely in a bipartisan way, in a collaborative way as colleagues. In a way that understood the communities of interests I value throughout the entire State of Illinois, that serving our constituents have value, and that empowering people that participate in the political process is important and can be resolved by working together. We have come a long, long way from what should be very simple goals that both sides of the aisle could agree on. And as a result, I do not feel inclined to be in support of fixing these mistakes that were made by the Majority. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

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

Mazzochi: "You've indicated that you want to continue to... continue with this process of voting by mail and you want to clean some things up. But you are aware that in the last election there were vote by mail requests that were made by people who the clerk's office determined were actually deceased, right?"

Stuart: "If requests were made then those... and they were found to be deceased, then no ballot was delivered."

Mazzochi: "Well, but the sheer fact that deceased people are still existing on the ballot roll, such that they can actually be... maybe they were caught this time for a few of them but not necessarily for all of them. Doesn't that concern you at all, that people are still on the voter rolls?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Stuart: "The measure in this Bill is about in-person pick up for a vote by mail ballot. So, I have a hard time thinking that a deceased person would be making an in-person pick up of a vote by mail ballot."
- Mazzochi: "Right. No, but you still haven't made any effort to try to obligate the clerks to ensure that there are no dead people on the rolls, right? So, you've done all of these election modification Bills and you still won't actually make the Amendment that our county clerks must ensure that dead people are off the rolls, as opposed to what we currently have in Illinois law which is that they may be taken of the rolls."
- Stuart: "This has nothing to do with measure that's in front of us."
- Mazzochi: "And that's a shame, isn't it? Thank you. Vote 'no'." Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Brady: "Representative, to the actual petition form that will be used by many shortly here that are running for offices or reelection. Can you explain what this potential change here would actually do to what many are looking at as an existing petition form by the State Board of Elections right now?"
- Stuart: "Can you just clarify... well, I'll answer what I think you're asking. And let me know if I'm not answering what you're asking. But the election Bill that we passed in May, it shortened the passing period from 90 days to 60 days. And what we're doing in this is just updating the language that

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

goes on those affidavits that have to go with the petitions to account for that shortened period."

Brady: "So, it's actually a affidavit change in a wording verse an actual petition circulator language at the bottom of a petition. Is that correct?"

Stuart: "It's the affidavit that's at the bottom of the petition."

Brady: "So, the affidavit that's at the bottom of a petition that is Xeroxed or utilized by others..."

Stuart: "Right."

Brady: "...that technically right now then would need to have a change in it? In other words, a new petition."

Stuart: "Okay. So, the Board of Elections distributed information with the language of the 60 days. And so, we're making sure the statute matches the guidance that was already giving by the Board of Elections."

Brady: "Okay. So... and I think everybody in this chamber might be very interested in this. So, you are saying, for the record, that the present petition that has been not distributed but... but is something that is on the Web site of the State Board of Elections is correct and factual and not have to be changed by this legislation. Is that correct? The circulatory... the circular... the circulator part at the bottom?"

Stuart: "Can you just ask that one more time?"

Brady: "Sure. The circular... circulator part of the petition at the bottom, the present form that the State Board of Elections has, does that have to be changed under this new change to the legislation?"

Stuart: "No. This legislation is necessary to make that language correct."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Leader. Representative Stuart to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1953?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "No, thank you."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Davidsmeyer, is that a 'no' vote or a 'present'?"

Davidsmeyer: "That is a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Davidsmeyer votes 'no'.

Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Delgado votes 'yes'. Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz votes 'yes'.

Representative Grant."

Grant: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Grant votes 'no'. Representative Guerrero-Cuellar."

Guerrero-Cuellar: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guerrero-Cuellar votes 'yes'.

Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guzzardi votes 'yes'. Representative Meier."

Meier: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Meier votes 'no'. Representative Miller."

Miller: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Miller votes 'no'. Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Moeller votes 'yes'. Representative Severin."

Severin: "That'd be no, without a dog."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Severin votes 'no'. Representative Ann Williams."

Williams, A.: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ann Williams votes... Representative Ann Williams votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1953. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Welter, for what reason do you rise?"

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representatives Sosnowski, Keicher, and Halbrook are excused for the rest of the day."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect."

Speaker Harris: "Harris is the Chair. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 5, 2022: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 for House Bill 3138."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hoffman in the Chair. On Supplemental Calendar #2 appears House Bill 3138, under Order of Concurrence, Leader Hernandez."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Speaker. So, I Motion to concur Senate Amendment 1 and 2 on House Bill 3138. Senate Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment that included a technical change. And the Senate Amendment #2 makes five changes. One, it redraws subcircuits in circuits with existing subcircuits, including Cook County. The second is, it creates subcircuits in the 3rd, 7th, and 18th Circuits. The third is, it converts at-large judgeships in the 6th, 10th, and 14th Circuits to resident judgeships of Champaign, Peoria, and Rock Island Counties. Four, it creates a special filing period for judges to be elected in 2022 from new or redrawn subcircuits in the 19th and 3rd Circuits. And the last is, it corrects an oversight related to associate judges in the newly formed 20th and 24th Circuits."

Speaker Hoffman: "On the concurrence, Leader Welter."

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect the Representatives Luft, Niemerg, and David Friess are excused for the rest of the day."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Speaker Hoffman: "The record will so reflect. We will be instituting a three-minute time limit. However, we will take yields from other Members. Leader Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Speaker Hoffman. And should this measure receive the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification. A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Hoffman: "It is acknowledged."

Butler: "A few questions of the Sponsor please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor will yield."

- Butler: "Leader Hernandez, so this is not what we thought we were going to be doing at the beginning of the day. The Bill that we had discussed in committee this morning, or this afternoon, was a Senate Bill over here in the House. This is a House Bill that's come to us from the Senate. So, can you tell me this, is this the same Amendments that we had... I think Amendment 3 was the last Amendment I saw in the House. Is that correct? Is this the same as the House Amendment 3 that would've been posted?"
- Hernandez, L.: "This is the same Amendment... it's really the same thing that I... we discussed in committee. Nothing changed."
- Butler: "Nothing changed or is there... my friend here, Mr. Persico, says there might be a change in Lake County."
- Hernandez, L.: "Okay, other than there's just a small change of how judges are allocated in the Lake County subcircuit... district."
- Butler: "Okay. Can you... just a couple questions off the start. So, there's a couple dates here. Are these effective for the 2022 election or they effective for the 2024 election?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Hernandez, L.: "In some cases, existing statute is established that these would begin in 2022. But in most of the cases, we put these into effect in 2024 to allow clerks time to prepare."
- Butler: "Okay. And so, which... which are effective in 2022? That would be easier than listing, I guess, which are effective in 2024."
- Hernandez, L.: "Right. Lake and Madison."
- Butler: "So, only Lake and Madison. So, Cook and all the other circuits are not, except for Lake and Madison, are in 2024. Why, if those are effective in 2024, are we doing this today? Why don't we wait until we have better information that we can discuss this with the judiciary more or with... with people involved with the judiciary? Why don't we let the next General Assembly, the 103rd General Assembly, deal with this?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Well, Representative, passing it... if we pass it now, it gives courts, the clerks time to properly implement this. And it also gives potential candidates the time they need to make informed decisions."
- Butler: "Okay, then why don't we do all in 2024? Why do we have some in 2022?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Because there are some that have vacancy and are statutorily required."
- Butler: "But wouldn't there be vacancies in some of the other circuits? And what's the statutorily requirement for that?"
- Hernandez, L.: "So, this would be considered like the blueprint.

 You've got some that have to be done in 2022, and the rest in 2024."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Butler: "Why? What... what tells us that we have to do these in 2022?"
- Hernandez, L.: "There's stat... there's a statutory requirement for that to occur."
- Butler: "And what is that statutory requirement?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hamilton yields her time."
- Butler: "Her first official duty as a Representative. That's all right."
- Hernandez, L.: "So, there was a Bill back in 2021 that would require for us to implement the..."
- Butler: "That was... wasn't that a Bill that said that we were going to redistrict the subcircuits during the census year? So, we had to change it from 2020 to 2021 for all the counties that had subcircuits. All the circuits that had subcircuits. Not Madison, for one, 'cause Madison currently doesn't have subcircuits."
- Hernandez, L.: "My understanding is Lake County, it's required in 2022."
- Butler: "So, why would we do it for Madison? There's nothing in statute today about Madison."
- Hernandez, L.: "'Cause Madison..."
- Butler: "So, it's not a statutorily require... statutory requirement."
- Hernandez, L.: "There's vacancies."
- Butler: "And it was 2022 for all of them, correct? That was... was that the Bill that we passed?"
- Hernandez, L.: "So, let me make it clear, 2022, Lake County..."
- Butler: "Mr. Speaker, I'm having a hard time hearing. I don't know if it's the microphone or..."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Speaker Hoffman: "It is difficult with the mask so..."

Butler: "I know."

Speaker Hoffman: "...just, if we could speak up, Representative."

Hernandez, L.: "So, there was a vacancy for Lake County for 2022, and Madison."

Butler: "But Madison doesn't have subcircuits right now. So... all right. So, I know there's some other people that are going to talk. I don't want to go this at length because we talked a lot about this in committee today. But I want to talk specifically about the Seventh Circuit in which we sit today. So, my Circuit that I live in, which currently isn't subcircuited. It's one of three circuits now that are currently now subcircuited that will be subcircuited. How many... how many subcircuits are in the Seventh Subcircuit... or excuse me, in the Seventh Circuit?"

Hernandez, L.: "Seven subcircuits in the Seventh."

Butler: "Seven is a lucky number. I'm the seventh child in my family. So, I like seven. Why do... why do we have seven subcircuits in a circuit that has a county where one of them only has 5,000 people in one of the subcircuits?"

Hernandez, L.: "Well, I believe you have seven counties."

Butler: "Yes."

Hernandez, L.: "And then, you have Sangamon County, which is a heavily populated county, that it was... we moved forward to have two subcircuits. Obviously, there's a purpose behind that to bring diversity based on population shifts. That was... that was reasoning why we moved in that direction."

Butler: "So, the... so, the initial maps that were released two night ago had three subcircuits in the Seventh. And the maps

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

that were released... I don't know. I can't keep track anymore. Released earlier today, last night, whenever it was, have seven... have seven subcircuits. Why did Sangamon... or excuse, the Seventh go from seven to... or excuse me, three to seven?"

Hernandez, L.: "So, we... so, my understanding is that already the Constitution does require that each county have a judge. So, this is simply just basically going along those lines. That each county is... has a... well, they have a judge already. So, it's... it's continuing to have a judge, per county."

Butler: "So, the... the Constitution says that each county should have a judge?"

Hernandez, L.: "Each county, yes. At least one."

Butler: "Let me... let me read to you from the Constitution. Let me read to you from the Constitution. You are correct, according to the Constitution. But what says before that each county should have a judge, in the same sentence, 'unless otherwise provided by law'. That's us. We get to make the laws. 'Unless where otherwise provided by law, there shall be at least one Circuit Judge from each county.' So, if we did not want to have... not every county needs a judge. According to the Constitution, if we decide, as a Body, that that's the case. So, why... you as a Sponsor of this Bill, why did we decide to divide the Seventh Circuit into seven subcircuits? You don't have to do it."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Caulkins yields his time."

Butler: "We don't have to do it, according to the Constitution.

That's incorrect. We can do it by law. We can do whatever we want."

Hernandez, L.: "Well, we're making it by law."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Butler: "No. You just told me each county is supposed to have a judge by the Constitution. And what I'm saying is, the Constitution says, otherwise provided by law. There's no need to have seven subcircuits in the Seventh Circuit. So, what is the reason why you have seven subcircuits?"
- Hernandez, L.: "So each county could have a judge. It's laying it out there. We're simply now putting it in law."
- Butler: "Okay. Can you explain... I think there's going to be, probably, some other questions. Can you explain, kind of, how this is going to work for current judges, for resident judges? How's it going to work for the elections? Are people going to be able to run? Do they run in new subcircuits? I don't... I don't know. Judiciary can be very confusing to a lot of people and..."
- Hernandez, L.: "I know. I know. It's confusing, but, no, it doesn't change anything other than if there is a vacancy that comes up, then that's when... that's when there's an election or there's a change."

Butler: "Okay. To the Bill, Speaker Hoffman."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Butler: "You know, this is... this continues the trend that we've seen from redistricting throughout this entire year. Lack of engagement from the public, lack of input from anyone, maps that are drawn behind closed doors. What this is... without engagement from the judiciary, state's attorneys, judges, circuit clerks, no one's been consulted in this. What this is, is a continued power grab by the Majority. You decided to remake the Supreme Court and remake the Appellate Courts. And now, you want to remake the Circuit Courts so you can defend

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

the Governor's agenda in the courts eventually. That's where this is going, to elect more Democratic judges. It's not about diversity. It's about electing Democratic judges. That's what it's all about. There's no doubt about it. And I find it quite amazing that some subcircuits are elected in 2022 and some subcircuits are waiting 'til 2024. And one of the reasons I find that really amazing is the Senate Sponsor of this Bill... the Senate Sponsor of this Bill, the President of the Senate... you know, I was looking on the Internet, and I found that the President of the Senate, right here on the Cook County Democratic Web site, the President of the Senate, Don Harmon, is the chair of the Cook County Democratic Slating Committee for Circuit Courts. Oh, and by the way, from the 13th Ward, we have Michael Madigan. Those are your people that are making the decisions to slate judges in Cook County because ... waiting 'til 2024 so they can slate the judges that they want to slate and see all the crazy decisions that come out of Cook County. This is... I've seen a lot of crazy stuff over the last year when it comes to redistricting. This is the craziest that I've seen, the way this process is done on the subcircuits. For months I asked for information on this. For months I asked about this and was stonewalled on it. The... our Members of the committee have asked for a long time. No information. And we get maps that get rolled out 48 hours ago, that get changed 24 hours ago. And now, we're sitting here voting on them tonight. It's an abomination to this institution. It's an abomination to the people of Illinois that this is the way we conduct... and this is the... this is the perfect example why... why politicians shouldn't draw maps. This is the perfect

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

example why we need we need an independent, citizen-led commission to draw our maps, from the Legislative, to the Congressional, to the Judicial. And even the Cook County Board of Review. We need a citizen-led commission. This is ridiculous. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Bourne."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to follow up on something that was previously asked. The technical fix that you said was coming in committee, is that included in this Bill?"

Hernandez, L.: "Yes."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. Additionally, you said that the Madison County and others are in 2022 because there are vacancies?"

Hernandez, L.: "Correct."

Bourne: "Could you tell us those vacancies in Madison County?"

Hernandez, L.: "I... I can... give me a few minutes, and I can get back to you with that information. It's just..."

Bourne: "I've only got two at the moment."

Hernandez, L.: "I'm sorry?"

Bourne: "I've only got two more minutes at the moment."

Hernandez, L.: "Oh."

Bourne: "So, I'll go on to my next..."

Hernandez, L.: "Okay."

Bourne: "...question, if you could follow up with that..."

Hernandez, L.: "Sure."

Bourne: "...if your staff could get that to you. You know, you mentioned in committee that the reason that the 2022 ones

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

were picked, versus the 2024 implementation, was for vacancies. But I listened to the Senate hearing, and they said the reason for the discrepancy in the 2022 versus 2024 was that, 'The delegations representing those areas thought that they could implement this in their elections.' Which, I guess, says that the areas that are implemented in 2024 didn't think that they could implement those elections as expeditiously. So, could you tell me who you spoke with in the delegations representing the areas that wanted implementation in 2022? Are these election administrators? Are these Legislators? Who are we talking to?"

Hernandez, L.: "All right. So, I did get your answer from the previous. So..."

Bourne: "Okay."

Hernandez, L.: "...let me first answer this one. I haven't talked to any delegation. I'm... did you say that you heard that from... on the Senate side, that they spoke to a delegation? I didn't speak to a delegation."

Bourne: "The Senate President said that the decision to implement some in 2022, versus in 2024, is, 'The delegations representing those areas were the ones who thought they could more expeditiously implement those changes for the elections.' So, my question is, are some election administrators thinking they can do this and some not? Like, who are we talking to? Who did you talk to to make these decisions?"

Hernandez, L.: "Yeah. And well, I... I didn't have those conversations. Apparently, I guess, the President did, but I didn't have those conversations."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Bourne: "Okay. And then, the question in Madison County, what those vacancies are?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Oh, they are two. Two... give me one second. There are two vacancies being elected at the '22 General."
- Bourne: "Yes, but which ones? Are they currently unfilled?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Unfilled, yes. They're vacancies."
- Bourne: "There's not a single unfilled judicial position in Madison County."
- Hernandez, L.: "I'm sorry. I'm going to take that back. They're vacant but they get temporarily filled until their term is ended."
- Bourne: "Yes. So, my question is who those are."
- Hernandez, L.: "I... are you talking about the names? 'Cause I don't know the names. Is that what you're asking?"
- Bourne: "Names or what subcircuit they'll be..."
- Hernandez, L.: "Right now, there... there is currently no subcircuits. There's..."
- Bourne: "It seems to be a core... it seems to be a core part of the decision of implementation of this Bill, of why you would do it in 2022 versus 2024. So, I'm just asking who's impacted."
- Hernandez, L.: "I'm sorry. Ask me one more time 'cause I... I can't hear you very well, too."
- Bourne: "Sure. So, my question... I mean, it seems like your whole premise of why these are being implemented in 2022 versus 2024 is these vacancies. So, I'm just asking who it is."
- Hernandez, L.: "Right. So, if you're looking for names, I don't know the names. All I know is, it is two vacancies that are open in Madison County."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Bourne: "My guess is it's two Republicans. Do you know if that's the case?"

Hernandez, L.: "That's your guess. I don't know."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Bourne, Representative Swanson has indicated he will yield his time if you would like it. Or if you want just time to close, it's up to you."

Bourne: "I'll... I'll take the time. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Three minutes."

Bourne: "I'd like to move on. I briefly asked who these were in the delegation you were talking to. You said in committee you did not talk to judges about this map. Is that correct?"

Hernandez, L.: "That's correct. Yes, that's correct."

Bourne: "Can I ask you who you did talk to? Because I was at all of the committee hearings about these subcircuiting changes, and there wasn't a whole lot of input. So, my question is, where did the input come from? Did it come from partisan elected officials? Did it come from consultants? Did it come from lobbyists? Did it come from Legislators? Did it come from potential judicial candidates? Like, who was in the room?"

Hernandez, L.: "Okay. So, it... it is the prerogative of the Legislature. And we... we did take the information, the input that we did get from the hearings, to make some of the decisions here."

Bourne: "Yes, but my question is, who specifically? Because in committee, it was cited that you got input."

Hernandez, L.: "I would say for staff and Members."

Bourne: "Staff and Members of the General Assembly, not members of the judiciary or..."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Hernandez, L.: "Correct."

Bourne: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is..."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

"...if it weren't so bad, it would be hilarious that this Legislature is looking at what the Sponsor of the Bill in committee said was an independent branch of government. An independent branch of government in this partisan Body is taking partisan measures to totally recreate an independent body of government. We've gotten to this terrible habit, in this Legislature, in the last year, of not doing anything meaningful until the rest of Illinois is asleep. What a shameful thing, to pack the courts in a partisan way in districts that, by the way, may not even be anywhere near where you live. But let me tell you, this redistricts counties near me. And local people got absolutely no say in this. And it's all being done for partisan political reasons, to pack the courts and take over a third branch of government. It is shameful. And to do it at 10:00 at night, it just goes to show that you can't stand on your own work. You have to do it while everyone else is sleeping and jam it through as quick as you can to lessen the blow. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Elik."

Elik: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, she indicates she'll yield."

Elik: "Thank you. I have some questions, as one of the Representatives from Madison County. I've had multiple questions from judges, attorneys throughout the county, and they've asked me to try to get some answers to some of the questions that we have. So, I'll try to be specific to Madison

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- County. Can you tell me, what is the residency requirement for judges to run in the subcircuits, both now..."
- Hernandez, L.: "I'm sorry, I can't... I can't hear. Say it again."
- Elik: "Can you tell me what the residency requirement is for the judges to run in the subcircuit, both in 2022 and going forward?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I think I... what I'm going have to ask of you, Representative, is to be more specific on when you're talking about qualifications because it's just not residency. And as a matter of fact... I need more specifics to what you're asking. Like, what are... is it just residency that... is that the question?"
- Elik: "Yes. Yes. I think the judges are wondering, if I run for office, what subcircuit am I running in for the 2022 election and going forward? Do they have to move their residence? Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate additional time."
- Hernandez, L.: "So, you do..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "You are yielded more time."
- Hernandez, L.: "So, my understanding is, yes, you must reside in the subcircuit in order to run in that."
- Elik: "Okay. For how far in advance from the election in next November?"
- Hernandez, L.: "So, it... so, if it's a vacant seat, that is where they have to reside at the time that they will... they're running. But this does not, and let me make it clear, does not apply to retention."
- Elik: "So, when you decide to run, do you have to reside in the subcircuit that you're planning on being in?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Elik: "Okay."

Speaker Hoffman: "Would you..."

Elik: "Okay. I think there's still some confusion..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hammond will yield her time."

- Elik: "Thank you. I think there's still some confusion on that, and I'd appreciate further clarification because we have judges that are potentially going to be running for office in Madison County in 2022. Which, as we discussed, they don't have any lead time till 2024 like the other districts. But they're going to need some more clarification on that. So, let me... let me switch to a different topic. If we could look at the subcircuit map for Madison County, why is the Third Subcircuit in Madison County only getting two judges, even though they actually have a very slightly larger population than the Second Subcircuit? How was it determined that those... that that was the subcircuit that would only get two judges?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I believe it has to do with the volume of what is taking place in the... in the courts."
- Elik: "So, did you receive that data on the volume of the caseload in all the different areas? Was that a factor in the decision on this map?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Well, I think it's... it just makes sense that, in these urban areas, density of population, it's just a given.

 It is... it is considered."
- Elik: "Well, the population is very close, but there is definitely more people in the Second... or I'm sorry... in the Third than the Second. So, therefore, the Third has less judges than the Second."
- Hernandez, L.: "Is there a question, Representative?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Elik: "Yes. I was asking why there's only two judges allotted to the Third Subcircuit."

Hernandez, L.: "I thought I gave... yeah, I thought I gave you my answer."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, I... I thought that was answered, but would you like to re-answer?"

Elik: "Maybe I couldn't hear that."

Hoffman: "Go ahead, Leader."

Hernandez, L.: "So, I would... I would say to that that there... just there's more opportunity and diversity is very important."

Elik: "Okay. All right. So, I know we've... we've had discussions about the fact that judges are not being added. Have you reached out to the circuit clerk's office, the county, to see if there will be operational changes in the offices throughout the state that... where there's new subcircuits? My concern is that that could be quite costly. And I guess my next question then would be, who pays for those additional cost? Is that going to be borne by the county?"

Hernandez, L.: "We're not changing judgeships. We're not... there's not going to be a cost 'cause there is no change."

Elik: "So, you don't expect any operational changes within the clerk's offices or the..."

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Elik: "...judiciary offices..."

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Elik: "...in any way?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Elik: "Okay. All right. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Elik: "I represent a significant part of Madison County. Since yesterday, when we first became aware of this map, I've heard from judges and lawyers who are disgusted by this plan and how this was brought forth. Because they're judges, they're limited by what they can say. So, I will speak for them today. Madison County has a terrible distinction of being known as a judicial hellhole because decades of Democrat rule at all levels of county government, including the judiciary. So, isn't it telling now that Republican judges have been elected by the people, suddenly this Majority Party decides it's time to interfere? You had months to do this. You had months to get actual meaningful input from the court system. My county has had less than two hours, really, to digest this latest Bill. And I've still had their input, yet you couldn't ask for input when you knew months ago that you had put this forth. How sad that our judges didn't even have time to respond to their associations. So, I'll speak for them today. Being a responsible lawmaker, there are a lot of questions unanswered. And I would ask you to pull this Bill from the record and take the time for meaningful... meaningful input. And if you won't do that, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wilhour."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Wilhour: "Representative Hernandez, you and your party have the sole and exclusive privilege of drawing your own Legislative Districts. And in doing so, you did that explicitly to your own partisan advantage. Is that fair to say? It's in the Resolution. That's... clearly, that would be a fair thing to

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

say. And when you drew the legislative and congressional maps for Democrats, you drew these in some instances with certain people in mind to run for these offices, right? When you drew the legislative and congressional maps for Democrats, you drew... you drew these, in some instances, with specific people in mind, or certain people in mind, to run for these offices, right? Certain people that it would make sense for them to run for these offices."

Hernandez, L.: "I don't think this is relevant to what we're talking about."

Wilhour: "Well, I think that it... that it clearly is here. But we'll... we'll go on. For the judicial subcircuits that you are creating in this Bill, did the folks that drew these maps have people in mind to run for these new judicial subcircuits? Were there people in mind to run for these when these were drawn?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Wilhour: "No, there was not?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Wilhour: "How do you know?"

Hernandez, L.: "It's... I don't understand you."

Wilhour: "No, how do you know that there wasn't specific people in mind when you were drawing the maps? I mean, when you drew the congressional maps, you obviously drew them with people in mind that would be... that would be running them, if you look at the maps. When you drew the legislative maps, you drew that with people in mind, with partisan advantages in mind. So, you're telling me the... you're certain that that wasn't... that that wasn't the case?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Hernandez, L.: "The strong basis of why... of how we did the maps was based on population shifts and to diversify."

Wilhour: "Okay. No partisan advantage, no specific people? I mean, you know... you know where the people live. And the people that helped you draft this Bill, they clearly know how to draw a district to give... give people partisan advantages. They've proven that in the past. I mean, you'd agree with that, right?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Wilhour: "The people that drew these maps clearly knew how to draw them to a partisan advantage. Are you aware of any person who has plans to run in any of these judicial subcircuits that you're creating?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Wilhour: "Are any of them currently Legislators?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Wilhour: "I'm sure that your party certainly has some judicial candidates in mind for these... for these subcircuits. Would that... would that be fair to say, that your party has some people in mind that would run for... in the subcircuits that you specifically drew?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste yields his three minutes."

Hernandez, L.: "Are you waiting for... no. The answer is no."

Wilhour: "No? Okay, well that's interesting. I don't think anybody believes that, but... are you aware of any Legislators who have reviewed these subcircuits who have expressed any interest in running for judicial positions?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Wilhour: "Okay. Are you aware of any Legislators that have reviewed the subcircuits because one of their family members might be interested in running for that judicial position?"

Hernandez, L.: "I already answered these, Representative."

Wilhour: "No, I don't think you answered that."

Hernandez, L.: "Yeah."

Wilhour: "That's the first time I've asked that."

Hernandez, L.: "I... I did. I did."

Wilhour: "Okay. Well, I just want to be really, really clear. So, you're... you're telling us, the Members of this Body, that neither you personally, any other Legislator... any other Legislator, or any of the folks that drafted this map took into consideration the political advantages of a Legislator, or a family member of a Legislator, were they to make... make a run as one of these judgeships? That wasn't taken into consideration? You're a hundred percent? You're very clear that that wasn't taken into consideration?"

Hernandez, L.: "Anybody can run, Representative."

Wilhour: "Okay."

Hernandez, L.: "That's an attorney."

Wilhour: "Any... anybody can run, yes, clearly. But... but are you telling us today that none of these... none of these were drafted with... with any folks in this Legislative Body or any close family members involved to run for?"

Hernandez, L.: "Yes. That's... that's what I..."

Wilhour: "What if... what if you... what if you're in a situation where you believe that was happening? What if it did happen?" Hernandez, L.: "That's hypothetical."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Wilhour: "I mean, would it... okay. Okay. Would... would that be unethical? Would that be an ethical breach if something like that was happening?"
- Hernandez, L.: "How is this relevant to the Bill?"
- Wilhour: "It's very, very relevant. It's... it's extremely relevant, and I think they're questions that need to be answered. What if a... what if a very powerful, influential Legislator voted to create a new judicial... a new judicial district with full knowledge that one of their close family members are interested, and result of this new map, they would be very well positioned to run? Do you think that that would be inappropriate?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I would just consider that another hypothetical question."
- Wilhour: "Well, it's not... it's not necessarily a hypothetical where we're drafting..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, Representative Brady has indicated that he would... he would yield his three minutes."
- Wilhour: "We clearly have a... we clearly..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wilhour, so let's not be argumentative. If you have a question, let's ask it, and she'll answer."
- Wilhour: "I'm asking a lot of questions, with all due respect."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, and you're being argumentative. We would ask that you just ask a question, let her answer it, then you'll ask the next one."
- Wilhour: "Yeah, well, clearly we have conflict of interest problems in this state. You know, do you think that would be a potential conflict of interest if something like that was

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

happening? Would that be an inappropriate use of public position for... using your public position for personal gain? I mean, I think these questions are relevant in the State of Illinois, the corruption capital of the United States. I think these are things that we need to be thinking about, especially in regards to how the rest of this process has played out behind closed doors and everything else. I'll just go to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Wilhour: "The... the blatant political power gabs like this lead to corruption almost... almost every time. A situation that we outlined is not only very realistic, it's an example of public corruption and something that we all need to make for certain is not taking place on our watch."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

McCombie: "This Bill is nothing more than an unethical partisan scheme to elect more radical Democrat judges who are going to continue to be soft on the crime that is plaguing our state. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Mazzochi: "Representative Hernandez, do you live in DuPage County?"

Hernandez, L.: "No."

Mazzochi: "Did any judge from DuPage County reach out to you and say that DuPage County needs subcircuits?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

- Hernandez, L.: "No."
- Mazzochi: "Did the DuPage County State's Attorney reach out to you and say that DuPage County needs subcircuits?"
- Hernandez, L.: "No."
- Mazzochi: "When... in 2006, there were some suburban counties that were divided up into subcircuits but not DuPage. You're now doing this 15 years later. What's changed?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I think there's been population shifts."
- Mazzochi: "Well, there may have been population growth. A lot of it's actually, unfortunately, come from Chicago. But are you aware that the caseloads for the judges is actually decreased over the last five years?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Yeah, but I think that diversity is a very important piece to this."
- Mazzochi: "Oh, well, do tell. Tell the residents of DuPage County why you want to split them up into judicial subcircuits because of diversity. What are you thinking is going to lead to greater diversity? And what kind?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Well, I would say that people in where they live want to elect someone that they feel will represent... represent them. That... that's extremely important."
- Mazzochi: "Well, who in DuPage County have you talked to who said, you know what, we're the residents of DuPage County and we think we need judicial subcircuits?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Isn't..."
- Mazzochi: "You don't live there. No… nobody who's… you can't identify anybody who's lived there who actually wants it.

 None of the attorneys want it. The bar association doesn't want it."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Hernandez, L.: "Isn't DuPage diverse though?"

Mazzochi: "What does that have to do with anything?"

Hernandez, L.: "I'm just..."

Mazzochi: "Apparently... I mean, you just told the judges in Federal Court that we don't have racially polarized voting in DuPage County."

Hernandez, L.: "I was just pointing that out."

Mazzochi: "Mr. Speaker, can we have some order in the chamber?

Can you identify a single person who actually lives in DuPage

County, or who works with a court system in DuPage County,

who has said, we need subcircuits in DuPage County?"

Hernandez, L.: "No one's come to me from DuPage."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, you don't live in DuPage County. Nobody in DuPage County has asked you for this, but you're going to tell DuPage County how they've got to run their judicial system. What standard did you use to draw these boundaries for subcircuits in DuPage County?"

Hernandez, L.: "I think it was very important to take a look at the population shifts and to diversify."

Mazzochi: "Well, DuPage County was a unified judicial circuit. So, everybody was able to participate. Everybody's going to keep going to the same courthouse. So, what is it exactly... we didn't have any subcircuits before. You're creating all new subcircuits in DuPage County. So, what was your rationale for splitting things up into, number one, seven different districts, and why you drew the boundaries the way that you did?"

Hernandez, L.: "Population and diversity."

Mazzochi: "Which population?"

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Hernandez, L.: "Population shifts based on census data."

Mazzochi: "But all of DuPage County was a single circuit. So, there's no population shifts. It's all the same in DuPage County. It was one circuit."

Hernandez, L.: "I'm just pointing out that those are the two major..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Haas yields her three minutes."

Mazzochi: "Can you answer?"

Hernandez, L.: "I'm sorry. What's your question again?"

Mazzochi: "Yeah, you keep saying population shifts, but there were no preexisting subcircuits in DuPage. You're creating new subcircuits. So, you're actually discounting our population in DuPage County. There's no shift. There's no boundary that needed to be changed because we were one unified circuit. So, what's the rationale for why you are picking DuPage County and deciding you're going to just divide it into seven?"

Hernandez, L.: "Yeah, well... again, it's creating diversity. That has..."

Mazzochi: "How? Who? Where? Which circuit?"

Hernandez, L.: "That's empowering community."

Mazzochi: "What do you mean empowering community? Who's getting..."

Hernandez, L.: "When you diversify, you empower communities."

Mazzochi: "...empowered who wasn't before? Who's getting empowered who wasn't before?"

Hernandez, L.: "Is... is DuPage diversified? Is it diverse? Is it... that's my question to you. Because if it is, if you can answer that..."

Mazzochi: "Define diverse."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Hernandez, L.: "...then that is a great... that's a purpose why we do that."

Mazzochi: "Define diverse. Tell me why you think our current judges can't adequately represent DuPage without being split up into subcircuits. You don't live there. You don't know the judges there. All right, to the Bill. Once again..."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Mazzochi: "...we have a... once again, we have a situation where Democrats in Cook County have decided that they're going to tell people in DuPage County how to live, how to organize their judicial structure. The Sponsor of this Bill has admitted nobody from DuPage County came to her saying that this is something that we need. Nobody from DuPage County's judicial system came to her and said this is something that we need. This is not something that the people in DuPage County want, but the Democrats are going to impose it on DuPage County because somehow they think that our judges who have done a stellar job in DuPage County... it's not because she actually cares about diversity. It's not because there have been populations shifts. It's because they're trying to, once again, gerrymander a district. Because DuPage County, Republicans and Democrats, have historically rejected the types of judging that Democratic judges have offered. We've seen what happens in Cook County. We don't want it in DuPage County, but the Democrats are trying to make it come here anyways. We don't want it. You don't live there. Vote 'no'."

Hernandez, L.: "I just want to thank everyone who has participated in the redistricting process and the committees... the

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Hernandez to close."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

committee Members for seeing this through in a very extraordinary time of pandemic and census data complications. We got through it, and I just want to thank you. It's done. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Members, Representative Butler has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3138?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "No. Absolutely no."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Davidsmeyer votes 'no'.

Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Delgado votes 'yes'. Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz votes 'yes'.

Representative Grant."

Grant: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Grant votes 'no'. Representative Guerrero-Cuellar."

Guerrero-Cuellar: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guerrero-Cuellar votes 'yes'.

Representative Guzzardi."

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Guzzardi votes 'yes'. Representative Meier."

Meier: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Meier votes 'no'. Representative Miller."

Miller: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Miller votes 'no'. Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Moeller votes 'yes'. Representative Severin."

Severin: "No."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Severin votes 'no'. Representative Ann Williams."

Williams, A.: "Yes."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Ann Williams votes 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "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 66 voting 'yes', 34 voting... 34 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Ammons. Representative Andrade. Avelar. Representative Representative Buckner. Representative Representative Carroll. Cassidy. Representative Collins. Representative Conroy. Representative Costa Howard. Representative Crespo. Representative Croke. Representative Davis. Representative

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Representative DeLuca. Representative Didech. Delgado. Representative Evans. Representative Flowers. Representative Ford. Representative Gabel. Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Gonzalez. Representative Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Greenwood. Representative Guerrero-Cuellar. Representative Guzzardi. Representative Halpin. Representative Harris. Representative Barbara Hernandez. Representative Lisa Hernandez. Representative Hirschauer. Representative Hoffman. Representative Representative Kelly. Representative Kifowit. Representative Representative Mah. Representative Representative Mayfield. Representative Meyers-Martin. Representative Moeller. Representative Morgan. Representative Moylan. Representative Mussman. Representative Ness. Representative Nichols. Representative Ramirez. Representative Rita. Representative Robinson. Representative Scherer. Representative Slaughter. Representative Smith. Representative Stava-Murray. Representative Stoneback. Representative Stuart. Representative Vella. Representative Walker. Representative Walsh. Representative West. Representative Ann Williams. Representative Jawaharial Williams. Representative Willis. Rohr. Yang Representative Representative Yednock. Representative Yingling. Representative Zalewski. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Butler withdraws his... his request for a verification. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3138. And this Bill,

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hammond, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Hammond: "I know that we, on both sides of the aisle, we have a few new Members in the chamber this evening. And I would just encourage you to please come back when we're back in Session. This is not normally the way things are done around here. But I would like to... on behalf of our caucus, I would certainly like to wish everyone in this chamber a very Happy New Year. And for those of you that are driving home tonight, please do so safely. And we look forward to seeing all of you in the new year, whenever that might be. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. People who have been saying that Illinois is on the wrong track outnumber those who say Illinois is on the right track by a margin of two-to-one. And today's Session epitomizes why."

Speaker Hoffman: "So much for the kumbaya moment. Please proceed."

Mazzochi: "You know, a lot of that snark is exactly why we can't

manage to get a lot done in this chamber. And you know what?

Government 101 is that police arrest lawbreakers, prosecutors

file charges, violent people who are a danger to society can

stay in jail pending trial, our judges apply the law and try

to do their job to teach people... to keep people safe, and

teachers show up to teach their students. The Democrats in

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

this Legislature and the Governor don't believe in Government 101. The legislative policy for this Majority has been to attack police officers, make it harder to arrest violent criminals. Kim Foxx won't prosecute a whole host of crimes. won't even authorize filing the motions procedurally to lock dangerous people up. And while Judge Evans can go to the media and claim he's following the Constitution, it was his mandate and his decisions back in 2017 to set the lowest possible bail for each defendant and his bail policies that have repeatedly released criminals to commit more crimes again and again. And it was your Majority that gave more power back to the teachers' unions so that they can get paid more and teach less, or not at all if you're in Chicago. My office is in River North in Chicago, and people don't want to go there because they fear for their safety outside the building. And it's not surprising why. Just yesterday, it was reported that a Chicago man awaiting trial for armed robbery in a separate felony gun case managed to carjack a woman at gunpoint while supposedly on supervision with electronic monitoring. Heck of a job there. You call that restorative justice, and in the real world, it's utterly reckless. The Chicago Teachers Union just voted 91 percent to refuse to come back to school to teach kids in person, knowing how harmful it is to kids and their mental health and their educational development, knowing how hard that's going to be and disruptive for parents who count on them. They didn't care. So, here we are in Springfield, and what have been your legislative priorities today? Not locking up criminals. Not helping the hundreds of thousands of parents and kids who

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

just got screwed over by the Chicago Teachers Union. Not making it easier for people to get back to work. Not making it easier for people to get access to tests and therapeutics at home so they can try to maybe help treat themselves before they take up space in the emergency room and in hospital beds. No, you came here to pass three Bills. A political Bill to get more of your judges into power, precisely because you know you want to try getting niche people to actually vote for you judges. 'Cause as a whole, everybody rejects your judges when they get in power. You did a political Bill to tinker with election requirements. And a Bill to decertify police officers and deny them due process. But boy, you're going to make sure that the criminals get a least three phone calls every single time they get moved around in the process, even if they use those phone calls to threaten witnesses and intimidate them and try and incite destruction of evidence. This has been a great Session for the political activist insider class and the people who fund you, but it's utterly destructive for the normal law-abiding class in Illinois. Welcome to the out-of-touch Democratic Party in Springfield."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 543, offered by Representative Niemerg. House Resolution 544, offered by Representative Elizabeth Hernandez. House Resolution 545, offered by Representative Stoneback. House Resolution 546, offered by Representative Jawaharial Williams. House Resolution 547, offered by Representative Evans. House Resolution 548, offered by Representative Scherer. House Resolution 550, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Resolution 551, offered by Representative Gabel. House Resolution 552, offered by Representative Morrison. House Resolutions 553 and 554, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 555, offered by Representative Morrison. House Resolution 556, offered by Representative Robinson. House Resolutions 557 and 558, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 559, offered by Representative Morrison. House Resolution 560, offered by Representative Stuart. House Resolutions 561 and 562, offered Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 563, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 565, offered Representative Tarver. House Resolution 566, offered by Resolution 567, Welch. House offered by Representative Guerrero-Cuellar. House Resolution 568, offered by Representative Didech. House Resolution 569, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 570, offered by Representative Evans. House Resolution 571, offered by Representative Swanson. House Resolution 572, offered by Representative Ammons. House Resolution 573, offered by Representative Robinson. House Resolution 576, offered by Speaker Welch. House Resolution 577, offered by Representative Welch. House Resolution 579, offered by Representative Hurley. House Resolution 581, offered by Representative Buckner. House Resolution 583, offered by Representative Didech. House Resolution 584, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 586, offered by Representative Stoneback. House Resolution 587, offered by Representative Manley. House Resolution 588, offered by Welch. House Resolution 589, offered Speaker

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 590, offered by Speaker Welch. House Resolution 591, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 593, offered by Representative Robinson. And House Resolution 594, offered by Representative Ann Williams."

- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Greenwood moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Joint Resolution 41, offered by Representative Harris.
 - 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 two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, the Senate stands adjourned until the call of the President; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until the call of the Speaker."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Greenwood moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Members, for the purpose of announcement, please know that next week will be canceled. Next week will be canceled. There will be... (audio malfunction). And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Greenwood moves that the House stand adjourned 'til the call of the Speaker. All those in favor say 'aye';

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Bolin: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 549, offered by Representative Collins. House Resolution 564, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 574, offered by Representative McCombie. House Resolution 575, offered by Representative Miller House Resolution 578, offered by Representative Moeller. House Resolution 580, offered by Representative Stuart. House Resolution 582, offered by Representative West. House Resolution 585, offered by Representative Smith. House Resolution 592, offered by Representative Moeller. House Resolution... House Joint Resolution 57, offered by Representative Demmer. Resolution 58, offered by Representative... House Joint Resolution 58, offered by Representative Wilhour. House Joint Resolution 59, offered by Representative Halbrook. House Joint Resolution 60, offered by Representative Kifowit. And House Joint Resolution 61, offered by Representative Bennett. These Resolutions are referred to the Rules Committee. First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4200, offered by Representative Nichols, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4201, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4202, offered by Representative Carroll, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4203, offered Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4304 (sic-4204), offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

4205, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Bill 4206, offered House Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning foster youth. House Bill 4207, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4208, offered by Representative Nichols, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4209, offered Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4210, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. House Bill 4211, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4212, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for concerning local government. House Bill 4213, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4214, offered by Representative Vella, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4215, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 4216, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4217, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4218, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4219, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 4220, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 4221, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4222, offered by Representative Ortiz, a Bill for an Act

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

concerning education. House Bill 4223, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4224, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4225, offered by Representative Costa Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 4226, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4227, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 4228, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4229, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4230, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4231, offered by Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4232, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4233, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4234, offered Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4235, offered Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 4236, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4237, offered by Representative Caulkins, a Bill for an Act 4238, concerning animals. House Bill offered Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4239, offered by Representative Niemerg, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4240, offered

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4241, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4242, offered by Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4243, offered by Representative Mason, a Bill for an Act House Bill concerning education. 4244, offered Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4245, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4246, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4247, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4248, offered by Representative Friess, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4249, offered by Representative Friess, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4250, offered by Representative Friess, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4251, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4252, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4253, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4254, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4255, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4256, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4257, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

concerning education. House Bill 4258, offered by Representative Avelar, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4259, offered by Representative Carroll, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4260, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4261, offered by Representative Yang Rohr, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4262, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4263, offered by Representative Grant, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4264, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4265, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4266, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4267, offered by Representative Vella, a Bill for an Act Bill 4268, concerning education. House offered Representative Mason, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4269, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4270, offered by Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4271, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4272, offered by Representative Croke, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4273, offered by Representative Welter, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4274, offered by Representative Guerrero-Cuellar, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4275, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

criminal law. House Bill 4276, offered by Representative Yang Rohr, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4277, offered by Representative Gong-Gershowitz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4278, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4279, offered by Representative Walker, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4280, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 4281, offered Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 4282, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4283, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4284, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4285, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4286, offered by Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4287, offered by Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4288, offered by Representative Ness, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4289, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4290, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4291, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4292, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4293, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

education. House Bill 4294, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4295, offered by Representative Stoneback, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4296, offered by Representative Stoneback, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4297, offered by Representative Welter, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4298, offered by Representative Nichols, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4299, offered by Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4300, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4301, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act Bill 4302, offered concerning regulation. House Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4303, offered by Representative Yednock, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4304, offered by Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4305, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning minors. House Bill 4306, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4307, offered by Representative Tarver, a Bill of ran Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4308, offered by Representative Harper, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4309, offered by Representative Harper, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4310, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 4311, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4312, offered by Representative Moylan, a

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4313, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for concerning regulation. House Bill 4314, offered Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4315, offered by Representative Vella, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4316, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for concerning education. House Bill 4317, offered Representative Stoneback, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4318, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4319, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4320, offered by Representative Halpin, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4321, offered by Representative Halpin, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4322, offered by Representative Tarver, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4323, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4324, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4325, offered by Representative Friess, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4326, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4327, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4328, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act revenue. House Bill 4329, offered Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue.

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

House Bill 4330, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4331, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 4332, offered by Representative firearms. House Hirschauer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4333, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4334, offered by Representative Buckner, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4335, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4336, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4337, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4338, offered by Representative Hernandez, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4339, offered by Representative Williams, Ann, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 4340, offered by Representative Avelar, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4341, offered by Representative Marron, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 4342, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4343, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4344, offered by Representative Elik, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4345, offered by Representative Elik, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4346, offered by Representative Elik, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4347, offered by Representative Elik, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4348, offered by Representative West, a Bill for

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4349, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4350, offered by Representative Vella, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4351, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health. House Bill 4352, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4353, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning training. House Bill 4354, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 4355, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4356, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4357, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4358, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4359, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4360, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4361, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4362, offered by Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4363, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4364, offered by Representative Tarver, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4365, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4366, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4367,

64th Legislative Day

1/5/2022

offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4368, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. House Bill 4369, offered by Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4370, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."