71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- Speaker Harris: "House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear heavenly Father, we ask today that you give those in authority wisdom in every decision and help them to think clearly. Grant them discernment and common sense so they'll be strong and effective leaders. Help them to lead and govern with integrity, and may their integrity guide them and keep them on track. Finally, Lord, we pray for your protection over our Leaders. Protect their hearts and their minds as well as their bodies so that no evil may befall them as they do their work. Bless them as well, for they carry a heavy burden on behalf of this great state. And heal our state, oh Lord, of hatred and evil that has been allowed to permeate our society. And make whole so that we can truthfully say that we are one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. This we ask in your son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Harris: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Lilly."
- Lilly 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 Harris: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Greenwood is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Crespo is excused today."
- Speaker Harris: "Representative Welter is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side. Welter. Welter. Oh, Representative Batinick is here."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do wish I had his hair but...

 today we'd like to exclude... excuse Mark Luft, Tom Morrison,

 Dan Brady, and Keith Sommer. Thank you."
- Speaker Harris: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 69 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on February 17, 2022: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 1780; recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions is Senate Joint Resolution 48. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4572, House Bill 4644, House Bill 4999, House Bill 5064, House Bill 5549; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2423, House Bill 4071, House Bill 4526, House Bill 4545, House Bill 4564, House Bill 4647, House Bill 4662, House Bill 4674, House Bill 4729, House Bill 4735, House Bill 4736, House Bill 4763; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 5196, House Bill 5222, House Bill 5282; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4242, and House Bill 4343; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 614. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- Civil reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4248, House Bill 4627, House Bill 4786, House Bill 4939, House Bill 5047, House Bill 5102, House Bill 5131, House Bill 5246. Representative Guzzardi, Chairperson from the Committee on Housing reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4784, House Bill 4949, House Bill 5018. Representative Mah, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4412, House Bill 4665, House Bill 4773, House Bill 4797, House Bill 4922, House Bill 5357; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4430, House Bill 4501, House Bill 4603, House Bill 4629, House Bill 4658, House Bill 4676, House Bill 4706, House Bill 4769, House Bill 4848, House Bill 5048, House Bill 5128; and do pass Short Debate is also House Bill 5568. Representative... Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 260, House Bill 5304; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4434, House Bill 5286, House Bill 5369, House Bill 5395, House Bill 5496; do pass Standard Debate is House Bill 3919; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4696. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Economic Opportunity & Equity reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4818. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Immigration & Human Rights reports the

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4605, House Bill 4625, House Bill 5004; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4179. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4261, House Bill 4568, House Bill 4811, House Bill 4821, House Bill 4986, House Bill 5015, House Bill 5164, House Bill 5555; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 378, House Bill 3220, House Bill 3321, House Bill 4384, House Bill 4713, House Bill 4739, House Bill 4843, House Bill 5035, House Bill 5049; do pass Short Debate is also House Bill 5160, House Bill 5162, House Bill 5274, House Bill 5326, House Bill 5546, House Bill 5564; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 568; do pass as amended Short... the last one was House... do pass as amended Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 568; do pass as amended Short Debate is Bill 3820, House Bill 4203, House Bill 5108; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 4393. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4688, House Bill 4690, House Bill 4813, House Bill 5013, House Bill 5016, House Bill 5127; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4089, House Bill 4268, House Bill 4742, House Bill 4798, House Bill 4933, House Bill 5060, House Bill 5176, House Bill 5240, House Bill 5488, House Bill 5552; do pass as amended Short Debate Consent Calendar

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

is House Bill 5089, House Bill 5214, House Bill 5265; do pass as amended Short Debate House Bill 5285; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 4246. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is Bill 4410, House Bill 4639, House Bill 4666, House Bill 4931, House Bill 5093; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 47... correction, 3749, House Bill 3898, House Bill 4500, House Bill 4850, House Bill 4919, House Bill 5069, House Bill 5107, House Bill 5225, House Bill 5256, House Bill 5412, House Bill 5538, House Bill 5543; do pass Short Debate is also House Bill 5574, House Bill 5576; do pass as amended Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 5167; and do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2538 and House Bill 4116. Representative Guzzardi, the Committee on Prescription Chairperson from Affordability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4595, House Bill 4664. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4114, House Bill 4845, House Bill 5061; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4772, House Bill 5363; do pass amended Short 4452. Representative Debate is House Bill Mavfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4348; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4609; do

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4218. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 673, offered by Representative Caulkins; and House Resolution 675, offered by Representative Evans, are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Harris: "Members, an announcement. This is a reminder of House Rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers the nose and mouth. Face coverings may be removed when speaking on the microphone at your desk. To help reduce to 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 asks that all Members take these directive seriously to keep fellow Members and our staff safe. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, as pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Face coverings may be removed when speaking on the microphone at your desk. Thank you. Representative Delgado, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Delgado: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. For a personal... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Delgado: "So, I would like to share with the Body today that we have a very special celebration today. Representative Margaret Croke's birthday is today. So, I would love to have all of you guys give her a round of applause. Come by and wish her a happy birthday. Thank you."

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

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

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got two points to actually make. My first one is, I think it's time we go back to inperson committee hearings. Here we are in one room as a full House Committee conducting business. I think it's time we move our committees back into rooms so we can allow more discussion, better discussion, and also more interactions with people. The second request I have is that the Secretary of State's offices open up to allow customers inside the facilities. This day and age, or this time of winter, we went through the summer, we went through the fall with people standing in line. And when I see my constituents in their elderly years or even the young people having to stand outside in 90 degree weather, snowy conditions, ice conditions, it's very upsetting when we have big Secretary of State's buildings that these people could be inside. So, to the Secretary of State, I ask that you open up the buildings. And to this chamber, I ask that we go back to in-person committee hearings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Manley, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Manley: "Speaker, I move that Representatives Deb Conroy, Lamont Robinson, Thaddeus Jones, Jawaharial Williams, Kam Buckner, Katie Stuart, Carol Ammons, Avery Bourne, Dan Caulkins be allowed to participate and cast their vote remotely."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Manley has made a Motion that Representatives Deb Conroy, Lamont Robinson, Thaddeus Jones, Jawaharial Williams, Kam Buckner, Katie Stuart, Carol Ammons, Avery Bourne, and Dan Caulkins be allowed to participate and cast their vote remotely. This is a roll call vote. All those

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

in favor vote 'aye'; 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 Motion, there are 83 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present'. And the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Is Representative Ammons present?"

Ammons: "Representative Ammons is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons is present. Is Representative Bourne present?"

Bourne: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bourne is present. Is Representative Buckner present?"

Buckner: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Buckner is present. Is Representative Caulkins present? Is Representative Conroy present?"

Conroy: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Conroy is present. Is

Representative Jones present? Representative Jones, are you

present? Is Representative Robinson present? Is

Representative Stuart present?"

Stuart: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Stuart is present. Is

Representative Jawaharial Williams present? Representative

Robinson, are you present?"

Robinson: "I'm here. Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Robinson, would you please turn on your camera? Representative Robinson is present.

Representative Jawaharial Williams, are you present?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Williams, J.: "Present."

Jones: "Sorry, Mr. Clerk. I am present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jones is present. Representative Jawaharial Williams, are you present?"

Williams, J.: "Yes. Yes, Clerk. I'm present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jawaharial Williams is present."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that the following Representatives, Sosnowski, McCombie, Wilhour, Halbrook, Niemerg, Welter, Friess, Reick, Miller, and Chesney, comply with House Rule 51.5 and wear their masks while in the House chamber. Due to the Representatives', I listed above, failure to wear a mask in accordance with the House Rules, I move that Representatives Sosnowski, McCombie, Wilhour, Halbrook, Niemerg, Welter, Friess, Reick, Miller, and Chesney be removed from the House Floor and be allowed to participate remotely until such time they are willing to come into compliance with House Rule 51.5."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification purposes, can I... which Friess? We have two Friesses over here. Which Friess would the Representative like removed from the chamber? I just want that for clarification purposes. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Are you referring to Representative David Friess, Representative?"

Collins: "Yes."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Speaker Harris: "Representative Collins has made a Motion to move Representatives Sosnowski, McCombie, Wilhour, Halbrook, Niemerg, Welter, David Friess, Reick, Miller, and Chesney from House Floor for noncompliance with House Rule 51.5. Is there any debate? I'm... Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I guess that I'm glad that we finally circled around to this. I was beginning to think that the rules in the chamber didn't really matter or we can just apply them wherever we want, whenever we want. You know, we've gone through two years now of making it up as we go, enforcing rules as we go. Will the Sponsor yield? No, she wants to... she wants to kick us out of here, I think that she should yield for some questioning. Will you yield? Oh, come on. Come on. I'm a sitting State Representative and you want to kick me out of this Body but you won't confront me personally and you won't have a dialogue with me about this. That's pretty weak. Representative Collins..."

Speaker Harris: "Representative."

Wilhour: "...is that a cloth mask that you're wearing? Is that a cloth mask? You know... I mean, do you know... how many other people are wearing cloth masks in here? Clearly not me, because I'm not going to wear a mask that the CDC has already said is ineffective. I mean, what are we really doing here? We're kicking people out. It's a total lack of common sense. It's a total lack of critical thought. And the people of... the people of Illinois are done with it. They're tired of it. It's time that we set an example that sanity, sanity is going to make a return here in the State of Illinois and Springfield. We've lived under two years of tyrannical rule

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

for one person. And now we want to kick people out of here because this Body, this Body that we're in right now, has not been tough enough to do their job for the last two years. We haven't been tough enough to stand up to a Governor. We haven't been tough enough to stand up to a bureaucracy that is completely out of control. And today, the person that wants to kick us out of here because we're unsafe is not tough enough to answer questions from me."

Speaker Harris: "Representative, do you have a comment?"

Collins: "I really do not like to entertain befoolery. But what I will say is that this Body is doing everything that we can on this side of the aisle to make sure that the people's work is being done, while you all on that side of the aisle have been making this Body... this chamber a clown show. And so, if you choose not to wear your mask, do that outside of the chamber. But while we're in here, I ask that you respect the chamber's rules, wear your masks, get the work done. You have people that you have to represent just like I do, and I'm doing that. That's why I'm here. That's why I drove three and a half hours to get here. That's why I will continue to do that, to represent the people that I represent in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I find that statement, wearing your mask when you're outside the chamber, highly hypocritical that it would apply only in this chamber and not at functions that are off campus or at different events that... I'm not going to name names or say anything like that. But, folks, I've seen a lot of you at different events and see you

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

before on the House Floor not wearing your mask, and the second we're in Session the masks come on. And I stand here for the kids. Everybody that knows me, everybody knows what I stand for. What about the kids that are segregated in schools, being isolated, ostracized, and embarrassed because they decided to remove their masks? They've decided to follow the science. But for two years we've failed. We've failed. We're not sitting over here telling you to take off your masks. We're merely asking you to respect us, as we respect you. So, when you're making this vote, guys, think about when you leave this chamber and you're at these parties, these dinners, having a good time with everybody and you're not wearing a mask. Don't be hypocrites here today. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "I'm just going to be brief. This is in February of 2020. I didn't plan on being called out and taken from here. I literally, yesterday, leaving the chamber was with, in the elevator, several of us Republicans and there was Dem staffer in there and out of courtesy said, would you like us to mask? I literally just walked over there and talked to a couple of your members and put my mask on because I was going to be within six feet of them. Mind your own business. Mitigate your own risk."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you. You know, it's been two long years. In May of 2020, despite us not having much information, we all voted and we voted to put masks on. Most of us, I know I did. And information's come out. And I understand people have concerns, and we're all concerned about this. But, you know,

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

I asked all of you, all of you, that side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle ... and on this side of the aisle most joined me, not everyone... to join me and let's do our job as a legislature. Let's hold hearings. Let's find out what the science really tell us because we all know there are about 39 or 40 other states fully operational without masks. Now I'm not quite certain, and maybe the science would tell me if the Governor would share his science with us that we've asked for repeatedly, how it is that a disease travels so much differently in Illinois that we need to wear masks. And yet, 40 other states, most of them surrounding, many surrounding us, don't have to do this. But it'd be nice to know. I don't want to make any of you sick. I don't want to make any of your family members sick. I don't want to put them in jeopardy. And if wearing a mask after two years and what three sessions of dealing with this were really the answer, I'd be the first to have it on. I'd double and triple up for you, but we all know that what we're wearing, the studies have told us aren't doing a whole heck of a lot. This isn't about getting the job done here in Springfield. If we were going to do that, we would've considered the Bill I had a long ago, had actual hearings, and moved this state forward. We're just doing this now because one party has control over the other party. Come on. Let's just work together, put this stuff aside, and do all this. You know, this isn't pleasant. When we left here after Veto Session, ended up with a great sinus infection. I don't know if I'm still fully recovered, an ear infection, didn't hear. Got to go see an ENT to get a scar off my ear drum afterward so I could hear. And yet, we're

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

going to insist everyone sit here and wear these for what purpose? To what end? JCAR just voted that the mandate we were going to impose on our kids again didn't have to. Some of you voted for that. But yet, now we're going to vote to remove Members of the House that are completely on the other side of the aisle, solely because their wearing things that would be approved here and be okay if they were wearing them but the CDC has told us not to. Please, let's put politics aside and just do the work for the people. They've been waiting for us to do it for a long time. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I ask a question of the Chair, please? Can we speak without our masks on at our desks here? What's the rule today?"

Speaker Harris: "It was what we read earlier, that while speaking at the microphone at your desk you may take off your mask."

Reick: "We may take... thank you, Sir. Because if Tuesday I had spoken these words we would've had to have... I would've had to have our masks on. So, there is an obvious inconsistency in the way that the rules that you are so insistent upon enforcing are applied. You know they say virtue is the tribute that... or hypocrisy is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. And what that means is that those who would put on a virtuous error... we call it virtue signaling today in our society... they commit hypocrisy when they engage in a vice that they're trying to impose on the other as virtue. And I know, as my previous Legislators have said, we've seen you all outside in congregate settings without your masks on. I know that this is a rule here, and I do believe that the proper way to do

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

this is to amend the rule. But what we've done is we've allowed a Governor to come into this Body, we've allowed a Governor to come into this Body and dictate to us how we do our business. This is not right. There is a separation of functions here. The Governor has no business influencing the rules that are taking place in here. We have the ability ourselves to change this rule. And you know something, when we offered up that Motion the other day in JCAR to suspend the rules, I think we lanced a huge boil in this state because I know that the folks over on that side of the aisle, regardless of what they're saying now, feel the same way we do. You're not fooling anybody. Hypocrisy is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. And you are living examples of that statement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are following science today. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're following political science. Representative Collins, this is not about safety. Eight hundred people in City of Chicago has died of murder this last year. And again, you say nothing. You're worried about a cloth mask, absolutely you're worried about a cloth mask. But then you'll be in the break room, you'll be eating, and you'll be with lobbyist dinners, and you'll be outside these chambers is the height of hypocrisy. You say you're fighting for those without a voice, you're not fighting for anybody. Eight hundred people died in your city and you said nothing. But two years ago we rented a stadium and spent thousands of dollars. And then, as soon as we adjourned, all of you went out and you went to lobbyist dinners and you did fundraisers.

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Each and every one of you have done it without a mask. And again, you walk into these chambers as... you're virtue signaling. Why don't we do a virtue signal, Representative Collins? Why don't we save the people of Chicago? Why don't we save the blood shed? The terrible policies that you put forward if you're truly concerned about the safety of the people in this State, why don't we do that? But you don't say anything. You wear a cloth mask and talk about safety, why don't we protect the people in the State of Illinois? But again, you say nothing. Hypocrisy is no longer defined by Webster's Dictionary. Hypocrisy is known as the Democrat Party in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, it's unfortunate that we're having this vote today. But I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the time to end the mandates is now. Over a majority of our schools have gone optional. Our children finally have the option. I'm not advocating that we need to eliminate them, you certainly have that option. The CDC has announced that they are going to phase out their recommendations. All states in the Midwest have gotten rid of statewide mandates many years... or many months ago. We look at the statistics. And unfortunately, shut downs, lock downs, masks, mandates have had very little effect on the virus. Just to our north, our neighbors to the north have a lower per capita death rate due to COVID than the State of Illinois. Got rid of their mask mandate well over a year ago. The Governor has announced the magical date of the 28th. All of the sudden it will be okay

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

indoors. It has got to end now. We rise to say enough. I know that many of you on the other side of the aisle agree with us. We don't need the mandates anymore. I would call on those Members to please join with us, do not expel us from this chamber, and let's move forward and say enough is enough. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. I find it pretty unfortunate that this is the second vote we're having to remove Members of the Body. And we haven't taken one vote or held one hearing in two years on the Governor's mitigations. Not one single vote. You guys have chosen to abdicate your duty and provide oversight. Live with it."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "I'm going to be very, very, very calm when I respond to ignorance. Because you see, when you talk about the City of Chicago and 800 murders, let's not forget its mind sets like yours that created those murders. Your privilege. Your privilege to look down on people who are living in poverty, who do not have access to a simple grocery store. Who voted against every policy that we have presented in this general Session to uplift our communities, you voted against them. Anything that had to do with improving our education system, child care, everything, you voted against it. And to say that we are here playing games and that we're not doing real work, look at what you're doing? You're interrupting a Session that you know we have important Bills out there that we need to vote on. And instead, you all came into the chamber and you decided to be defiant. You decided to be the suckers of the

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

party to not wear your mask to interrupt the Session. I am a single mother. I am a former health care worker. I have compassion in my DNA. You, my Sir, you have hatred. And you can hear it in your tone and your voice. It's entrenched in your DNA, and you know that. That is why you are using this one thing to interrupt our Session. I don't have time to waste. I do have children at home. I do work one job. I am somebody who lives check to check, looked at eviction notices every month because the wages were too low, the rent was too high. And I was working at a facility taking care of loved ones like yours who needed my help every single day. So, when I got into office I made a commitment to do real work and not stand up here and try to call anybody out. I am asking you to simply follow the rules that are set in this chamber and that is it. What you do outside of this chamber is your business. I could care less. But when you're in here, respect the rules. That's it. So, you can attack me, you call me out my name. You can (unintelligible) of the City of Chicago day and night. But let's not forget, the poor whites that stay in your district, you ignored them. You ignored them. You don't fund them but you blame it on the Democratic Party, when the reality is that you take care of the wealthy in your district. Thank you. And you ignore the poor. You want to know how I know? Because I have Members that I represented that's in each and every one of your districts. And the story is the same as in my community, of folks who are still living in poverties today. So, every minute that we waste talking to you all while you're over there whining about a mask, those people are still suffering and they need our help. So, do

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

your job and comply with the rules in this House. If not, go remote. Simple. Happy Black History Month to you."

Speaker Harris: "The final speaker is Leader Durkin."

"Thank you. I'm not sure how we got here. It's very interesting. There's a lot of emotion in this chamber and that's what we do. We represent our districts. We represent our members... I would ask you to give me attention, guys. Please. At least offer me that respect and that courtesy. Over there against the wall. So, a week and a half ago, the Speaker sent me a letter about how we need to be more civil and work more collaboratively together. And I responded, and I said, I'm glad to do that, but civility is a two-way street. So, when I hear the debates today it makes me think, what happened with that letter that was sent to me on behalf of Speaker, the Democrat Leader of the Representatives? Now the action which we are about to undertake, which I think is a very, very serious sanction, it's within the rules. I understand it. The rules are the rules. We can have a discussion about that, but the previous speaker moving along outside of that debate into things that are not relevant to whether or a person should be removed or not does not help this caucus. It does not help me feel... and put me in a frame of mind that there is still a place for civility where we can actually have an honest discourse between both sides of the aisle. And clearly, based on what we have seen outside of this chamber, from the courts and also in our schools, I think it's a legitimate question to ask that why can't we at least have a full hearing in front of one of our committees about mitigation efforts? We've been

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

asking for it for two years. We've asked for the Governor's science, his data. We haven't received it. But we're here to make informed decisions about how we are to go about conducting the business of the day, which affects every one of our residence. So, as we move forward, I would like to say that civility is important for this. We have people watching us on a daily basis. And when people come back in here, sometimes I'm extremely embarrassed over what happens because people want to see their Government in action. And they see this picking back and forth, and I think it's wrong. So, I'm just going to ask, let's just keep the issues and this debate limited to the issues that we have. I don't think it's right for the process. And we can be a better, as the Speaker, said we can be a better institution if we follow that path. So, let's just take down the temperature a little bit. Okay? And if the Motion is going to be pursued, let's... let's see how the vote goes, and we'll accept the consequences of it. But my final thought is, let's just take the temperatures down a little bit guys. And I think all of us realize that if we are going to go down this path of, you want to talk about masks, our job is ... again, we want to hear, we want to hear the people speak on behalf or against an issue backed up with reliable science and evidence. It's not an unreasonable request. And what you seen over here is a growing frustration that is playing out all over the State of Illinois. It's not only in our districts, but it's in your districts as well. And respect the people you represent as well. But let's think about something that we all think collectively might be the right path for us to move forward. So, again, I appreciate this

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

time. And as the Speaker asked me a week and half ago to move forward in a more civil, collaborative effort, that was an attempt. And I think that we can do that with respects of how this chamber operates. So, thank you. Let's take the temperature down. Let's get to the business of the day."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "I ask, Speaker, that if those Members are listed do not comply that they be removed and allowed to vote remote until they comply."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Collins has made a Motion to remove Representatives Sosnowski, McCombie, Wilhour, Halbrook, Niemerg, Welter, Friess... Reick has come into compliance... Miller, and Chesney be removed from the House Floor and be allowed to participate remotely for failure to comply with House Rule 51.5. This is a roll call vote. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Oh, I'm sorry. For the remote voting, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Yes"

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative

Bourne."

Bourne: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bourne votes 'no'. Representative

Buckner."

Buckner: "Yes. Buckner votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "One more time, Representative Buckner."

Buckner: "Buckner votes 'yes'."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Clerk Hollman: "Thank you, Representative Buckner. Representative Buckner votes 'yes'. Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Conroy votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Conroy votes 'yes'. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Representative Jones votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jones votes 'yes'. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Yes."

Clerk Hollman: "Could you try that again, Representative Robinson, say your name also."

Robinson: "Representative Robinson votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Robinson votes 'yes'. Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Stuart votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Stuart votes 'yes'. Representative Jawaharial Williams."

Williams, J.: "Representative Williams votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jawaharial Williams votes 'yes'.

Representative Caulkins, are you present?"

Caulkins: "Yes, I am present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Caulkins, how do you vote?"

Caulkins: "I vote 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Caulkins votes 'no'."

Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 66 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Motion is adopted. Doorkeeper, please remove Representatives Sosnowski, McCombie, Wilhour,

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Halbrook, Niemerg, Welter, David Friess, Miller, and Chesney from the floor. As a reminder, Ladies and Gentlemen, you are welcome to participate remotely. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 48, offered by Representative West. Representative West is recognized. Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republican and a few friends request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Harris: "How long will you be? Was that an hour?"

Batinick: "One hour, please."

Speaker Harris: "Republicans request a caucus. Democrats will also caucus. I'm sorry. Leader Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Democrats would request a caucus meeting virtually, immediately or upon adjournment."

Speaker Harris: "There has been a request for caucus by both the Democrats and the Republicans. The House will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. We anticipate that to be at approximately 2... I'm sorry... 3:00. Representative Manley, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Manley, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Manley: "Speaker, I move that Representatives McLaughlin and Tarver be allowed to participate and cast their votes remotely."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Manley has moved that Representatives Curtis Tarver and Martin McLaughlin be allowed to participate and cast their votes remotely. This is a roll call vote. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

the record. On a vote of 77 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Chesney, are you present?"

Chesney: "LIS, we cannot hear anything."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Chesney, can you hear us now?

Representative David Friess, are you present?"

Friess: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative David Friess is present.

Representative Halbrook, are you present?"

Halbrook: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Halbrook is present. Representative McLaughlin, are you present?"

McLaughlin: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative McLaughlin is present.

Representative Miller, are you present?"

Miller: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Miller is present. Representative Niemerg, are you present?"

Niemerg: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg is present. Representative Sosnowski, are you present?"

Sosnowski: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski is present."

Representative Tarver, are you present?"

Tarver: "Present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver is present. Representative Wilhour, are you present?"

Wilhour: "I am present."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Wilhour is present. Representative

Chesney, are you present?"

Chesney: "Chesney is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Would you say that again, Representative Chesney?"

Chesney: "Chesney is present."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Chesney is present."

Speaker Harris: "Members, an announcement. This is a reminder of House rule 51.5. Please remember to wear a face covering that covers the nose and mouth. Face coverings may be removed when 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 keep fellow Members and staff safe. Again, please remember to wear a face covering, as pursuant to House Rule 51.5. Face coverings may be removed when speaking on the microphone at your desk. Thank you. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 48, offered by Representative West. Representative West is recognized."

West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand here before you to present Senate Joint resolution 48 to appoint the Honorable Michael P. McCuskey as Legislative Inspector General. Illinois deserves a Legislative Inspector General who is well respected, fair, and honest. Mr. McCuskey has dedicated his life to service, spending decades as a judge while earning praise from both sides of the aisle. And I am confident he possesses the integrity this position needs. He's a native of Peoria. And Judge McCuskey retired in 2020 from the 10th

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Circuit Court. And before that, he was on the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, where he served as Chief Judge for eight years. He was nominated by President Bill Clinton and confirmed unanimously by a Republican controlled Senate. Judge McCuskey started his career as a high school teacher and a baseball coach. And he retired as a respected state and federal judge. And he's ready to serve as the Legislative Inspector General. So, I'm a Member of the Legislative Ethics Commission. And I want to be proactive and talk about a word that we may hear a lot today, and that word is process. The process that we went through got us to where we are here today. So, July 14, 2021, our former Legislative Inspector General Carol Pope tendered her resignation and said that her last day would be at the end of the year. Per the statute, it was up to us to put together a four-Member search committee. Members who were appointed by the Speaker, the Republican Leader of the House, the Senate President, and the Republican Leader of the Senate. And by September 9 we had four Members together. I want to do a quick side road. This search committee was a search committee, not a citizen's oversight committee. Just for clarity and for the record, a citizen's oversight committee is a local agency independent of government or the agency to review complaints against agents of that said agency or to review the policies and/or practices of that said agency. That was not the intent of this search committee that was appointed by our Leaders. Their job was to review the candidates that were interested in becoming Legislative Inspector Generals and then provide to the Legislative Ethics Commission recommendations, up to

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

three recommendations, that we could look into. So, let me go a little bit deeper. We received two names that were given. And per statute, that is all right. It says up to three. And they were provided to us two names. We went through there process as the LEC to interview these candidates. And after the interview, we came to a place where we did not have a majority vote for any of the two candidates. The Legislative Ethics Commission, during one of our meetings, we then came together and collectively agreed to go back to the search committee and ask for a third candidate. That third candidate was given to us by the search committee. After interviewing the third candidate, it so happened, it just so happened that the Republicans liked... felt like there was qualified candidate and the Democrats felt that the third candidate was qualified. It wasn't made by design. It was based on the interviews that we conducted. So, come November 18, we found ourselves at an impasse. November 18 was 91 days ago. We've been at an impasse for who will be the next Legislative Inspector General for the past 91 days. During these past three months, many Motions were made by Democratic Members and Republican Members. A Motion to recommend one candidate over the other, impasse. The Democrats made a Motion to bring both candidates to this Body, impasse. I even asked myself to allow the LEC to have a second round of interviews for these two candidates that we cannot decide over. I got a resounding 'no'. After going through this process, within our meetings as a Legislative Ethics Commission... within our meetings, as you would imagine, anything that happens with the LIG or the Legislative Ethics Commission must remain confidential. But

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

without fail, after every meeting, it was leaked to the press that Democrats were slowing down the process even though the Motions were made throughout the process for us to find a way to get a candidate that we can bring to this Body. Let me remind you, 99... 91 days of an impasse. There's a saying that I... that resonates with me and how I live my life. There are those who do and there are those who wait for those to do. In this moment, it's time for us to end this impasse and do this. I heard a tale once that in order to end the last impasse that we saw... I don't want mention more about it 'cause we all know what I'm talking about... there were Legislators on both sides of the aisle... let me correct that. There were Legislators on my Republican colleague's side of the aisle who put politics aside to become doers and step out and do what needs to be done to get things done. This is where we are today. Judge Michael P. McCuskey is a person that lives above reproach and has an impeccable track record that one cannot deny no matter how hard you try. We went through the process and was met with political accusations of stalling the process. Well, now it's time to get things done. Therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDRED SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that we appoint the Honorable Michael P. McCuskey as Legislative Inspector General in accordance with subsection (b) of Section 25-10 of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act, endorsing him wholeheartedly as surpassing all statutory requirements and in full confidence that his character and integrity will

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

enhance the office of Legislative Inspector General and benefit the administration of the ethical foundation on which Illinois legislators and legislative employees operate. Thus, to my colleagues, I urge an 'aye' vote for Senate Joint Resolution 48."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Thank you. I'd like to start off and say that I know Mike McCuskey, and he's a decent man. He's a very good judge. And he's a person that can call balls and strikes appropriately. And he is a man of great integrity. And I've talked to him in great length over the last two days about this process. And I'm not going to divulge the conversations we had. But let me just ask you this, Representative. Just a little bit ago, when there was a Motion to expel some of our Members, it was brought up by the speaker, the person who made that Motion, how important it is for us to follow the rules of the House, correct? Do you remember that?"

West: "I do."

Durkin: "Do you believe that we should held... be held to that same standard when it comes to this process that is prescribed by statute?"

West: "We did."

Durkin: "Could you tell me when Mike McCuskey, when was his name submitted to the search committee and what was the... what recommendation, if anything, came from that search committee?"

West: "Judge McCuskey emerged after the committee process was over. The search committee's process was over."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Durkin: "That's not an answer. When did he... did he... is it yes or no, was he vetted by the four-Member search committee?"

West: "He was..."

Durkin: "That is prescribed by statute under the IG Act, which is the law. Which we just talked about, following the law, like following the House Rules."

West: "To answer your question, he emerged after the search committee. And as we all know, he is qualified. And..."

Durkin: "Okay. I understand that. I'm saying he's qualified. But I want to ask you something about... it's something extremely important. We have run through so many Inspector Generals and the last one ran out of the Capitol with her hair on fire based on what the Legislature did to deluding her office. Now I want to make sure that we do this thing, we should do it right. Now, under the statute, it states that the search committee shall stay in place until a individual has been confirmed by both chambers. The search committee shall be disbanded upon an appointment of the LIG. So, that committee still is in place. So, why can't you and your Members ask Mr. McCuskey to take a pause, go through the search committee, and then they'll revisit the issue after that, as the statute says that we should do. Not shall, not we should do. It says we shall do. It's not discretionary."

West: "At this present time, we are without a Legislative Inspector General. And we have pending cases that need to be addressed and are not being addressed."

Durkin: "How many cases are currently sitting on the desk at the LEC?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

West: "I think it's... as I... I'm aware of one, but as I said earlier, things that happen with the LIG are to remain confidential. So, I do not know if there is more cases that were unaware of."

Durkin: "There's nothing... you're not divulging any... one case.

That's my understanding too. So, it's not as if the..."

West: "My understanding as well, but it could also be more."

Durkin: "All right. Now I have right here in front of me, this is the vacancy notice for this specific position. Now, Representative West, you're probably familiar with this, correct?"

West: "Correct."

Durkin: "And it states that qualified candidates may submit resumes and references to the Illinois Legislative Ethics Commission by September 24, 2021. Has then been updated since then?"

West: "No, it has not."

Durkin: "So, there's been no vacancy notice, anything current. And there's been no... I would say there's no following of the state statute which requires a individual who has submitted their name to be reviewed by the four-Member search committee, correct? This has nothing to do with Mr. McCuskey's integrity and the work that he does 'cause he is a fine man. But we are just... what I'm just saying right now is that ultimately you're dismissing the statute, which we are bound to follow when it comes to appointing an inspector general."

West: "As I said earlier, Leader, we went through this process.

And we're not dismissing it. And if you recall, I said it's been 91 days since we've had this impasse. We've been going

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

through this process for 91 days. And now, here we are without an LIG. So, understand what the statute says..."

Durkin: "But we're going to make it an advisory. It's not binding on us. That's what you're telling me?"

West: "I'm just telling you what the process, as an LEC Member, what we did through this process."

Durkin: "So, Ladies and Gentlemen, what I'm hearing right now is that the Sponsor of the Resolution believes that the Illinois state statutes are not necessarily to be followed, that they are advisory in nature. And that is basically why we're here. Now you said that this has been 90 days, I know one of ... and I'm not going to get into all the imaginations of what happened and I know that everybody's got their own explanation of why certain people weren't selected. But one person in particular, I quite frankly don't know how he didn't get past your blessings, and this is a former federal prosecutor who is named by the Clinton Administration to be the lead prosecutor against Timothy McVeigh. I thought that was an easy choice. But it came to my conclusion that I think that he was probably too good. So, could you respond to that particular individual's worthiness to serve in that capacity?"

West: "Can you respond to the other guy's... his qualifications as well?"

Durkin: "If you had listened to what I had said earlier, I have...
I know Judge McCuskey. I know him well."

Speaker Harris: "Excuse me, Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "And I think Judge McCuskey would do a great job. But Hartzler went through the selection committee. And Judge

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

McCuskey hasn't. Can you explain why we haven't asked McCuskey, Judge McCuskey to go through the selection committee as required by law?"

West: "To go back to your original question, I am not saying that the first candidate that we interviewed was not qualified, nor the second. The third one that we interviewed was not qualified. We made a Motion to bring them both to this Body. The Motions that we... the people that we bring to this Body are recommendations of the LEC that this Body could either accept or reject. But through this process we are still in the impasses because it was turned down to bring both candidates. So, I'm not saying that he's not qualified. We tried to bring both candidates here to the floor to no avail."

Durkin: "So, why do we even have this section in here that states that a individual shall be vetted by the selection committee if you're not going to follow it? Why don't we just... why don't you add to the Resolution and strike that language?"

West: "Based on what I've read, Sir, it doesn't say what you just mentioned."

Durkin: "The word shall says... it's not 'may', it's 'shall'. That the selection committee shall conduct the reviews."

West: "And they did conduct the reviews."

Durkin: "The Legislative Ethics Commission shall establish a four-Member search committee within the commission for the purposes of conducting a search for qualified candidates to serve as Legislative Inspector General. Shall establish. They have established it. It has been established. I have made my appointment. And they're there for a reason."

West: "And we did that, Sir."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Durkin: "But did you do it for this particular gentleman?"

West: "We went through the process and we found ourselves at an impasse."

Durkin: "Representative West, was Judge McCuskey... was his name and was he submitted to the selection committee of the four appointees, myself, the Speaker, the President, and the Minority leader, in the Senate for vetting?"

West: "No, he was not. But..."

Durkin: "Thank you. Thank you."

West: "...we all know that he's qualified."

Durkin: "That's not the point. 'Cause you made that statement earlier. You're going to hear a lot about the process. And Mike McCuskey is a good man. He's a good judge. But when I hear Members of this Body take the extraordinary move to remove Members from their seats and their voting privileges because we have to follow a rule of the House, but now we're saying that we are just going to change direction and we're not going to quite follow the rules of the State of Illinois embodied within our statutes regarding the creation of the Legislative Inspector General. Is there any hypocrisy in that?"

West: "No. We went through this process. And I'm trying... Leader, I'm trying my hardest to keep this from sounding political. But we went through this process and it became political real quick. We find ourselves 18 days now without a Legislative Inspector General, and it's time to act. And this is what we're doing today."

Durkin: "Well you're not following the statute. And politics is a two-way street. Both sides will probably... we can say that

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

there both guilty of it. But if we're going to put the statute that is currently in place regarding the process for the recommendation of an Inspector General, for what I think is probably the most important decision that we're going to make this Session, and if we're just going to say that the statutes, which are the law of the land are advisory, we don't have to follow them, I think it's a poor reflection upon this process. It's not a reflection on Judge McCuskey, but I would just hope that you realize that we are bound by the laws of Illinois and just because of the Majority Party you just can't do whatever you want. I'm voting 'present'."

Speaker Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to move to the debate timer. It will be four minutes per speaker. Representative Marron is next."

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I got to tell you, this is a tough one for me. Yesterday when we interviewed Judge McCuskey, it was the first I actually got to have a one-on-one conversation with him, but I've known about Judge McCuskey for a long time. You see, when he was on the federal bench he presided in Urbana. Urbana is one of the communities... I represent part of that community, and it is a community that I consider home. And so, Judge McCuskey was a very positive influence in our community for a long time. And while I didn't know him personally, I know people that he knows. I'm friends with people who are friends with him. And about 15, 16 years ago, I actually served on a jury trial that he presided over. And I had nothing but the most favorable opinion of him through that experience. And so, the other day when his name surfaced I got excited. I thought, this is a

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

quy that's going to sail through the process that's prescribed in state statute and it's somebody that we'll probably all going to get behind and this is going to be good. I was somewhat shocked that he would actually be interested in this job after the frustrations Inspector General Pope have told us all about the limitations of the job. And then, also the process that the other very qualified candidates, two candidates that were unanimously approved by the search committee, the way they were treated in this process, I was shocked that somebody else would want to come forward. But I thought this is... this is a great deal we can come to a compromise. We can do something that will make the citizens of this state feel good about how we were about to work together and come to a compromise. And then, what happened? We do what we always do when it's beneficial politically to one side. We threw the process out the window. And in the process we damaged the integrity of this position. We had an opportunity that we wasted. What message does it send to the public when, we as a Legislature, are not willing to follow the laws that we write? What does is it say about how serious we are about ethics when we won't follow the process? It's sad. And we're going to take this honorable man who is willing to serve in this critically important capacity and we are going to put him in this position under a cloud of delegitimacy. And we're going to do it with less than unanimous support. We're better than that. We can do better than that. We can do the process better. We can do this House better. We can do the position better. We can do this honorable man better. I'm going to vote 'present'. I encourage

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

all of you to vote 'present' so we can go back, we can get this right, and we can do right by this honorable man, and we can give his position the authority that it needs. And we can send a message to the people of the State of Illinois that we're serious about ethics and we're serious about cleaning up this State Government. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

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

Mazzochi: "All right. Representative West, under 5 ILCS 430/25-10(b-5), with regard to the Legislative Inspector General, it says, 'A vacancy occurring other than at the end of a term shall be filled in the same manner as an appointment only for the balance of the term of the Legislative Inspector General whose office is vacant.' And that's what this position is right now, right?"

West: "Correct."

Mazzochi: "We need to fill it in the same manner as an appointment originally for a term, right?"

West: "Through a Senate... through a Joint Resolution, correct."

Mazzochi: "Right. And we also have in the statute a requirement that there will, in fact, be a search committee who will recommend up to three candidates, right?"

West: "Correct. Which they did."

Mazzochi: "And one of the candidates that was recommended by the search committee could not gain Republican votes, right?"

West: "I'm sorry?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- Mazzochi: "One of the candidates recommended by the search committee did not get Republican votes from the... by the Legislative Ethics Commission. True?"
- West: "One of the candidates that came from the search committee did not receive the majority of votes, correct."
- Mazzochi: "Right. And one of the… but one of the candidates that did come out of the search committee received two Republican votes, right?"
- West: "So two candidates came from the search committee. One received zero, the other received four."
- Mazzochi: "I'm sorry. One received?"
- West: "Zero votes."
- Mazzochi: "Right. And the other... and there were Republican votes behind the other candidate, correct?"
- West: "And this other candidate did not receive the majority of votes, correct."
- Mazzochi: "Right. So, it was Democrats who refused to put votes behind the second candidate, correct?"
- West: "The second candidate did not receive the majority of votes as per the statute."
- Mazzochi: "Correct. And did not receive majority votes because no Democrat was willing to vote for him, right?"
- West: "As I said, the candidate did not receive a five-three vote."
- Mazzochi: "Why do you want to keep dancing around it?"
- West: "I'm not dancing around it. I'm trying to keep this from being political."
- Mazzochi: "It's not a question of being political because the whole point is, is that the reason why you have to get a

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

majority of two Democrats and two Republicans on the commission is to guarantee that there will be a bipartisan candidate coming out of the commission, correct?"

West: "The later part of what you just said, correct."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, when you didn't get bipartisan support for a candidate... and the reason why there wasn't bipartisan support, it's not because Republicans didn't put votes up, it's because you didn't put votes up. Instead of calling it a failed search and starting over, you decided to pull another name out of the hat who didn't go through the process at all, right?"

West: "No."

Mazzochi: "Really?"

West: "Really."

Mazzochi: "Did that person go through the process of..."

West: "What we did was, as a Legislative Ethics Commission, made the request to the search committee to give us a third candidate of which they did."

Mazzochi: "But the third candidate never went through the actual process, right?"

West: "The third candidate went through the actual process."

Mazzochi: "The third candidate actually put a resume in before the September deadline for filing applications?"

West: "You're talking about someone else."

Mazzochi: "That's my point. When we..."

West: "The third candidate did go through a search committee. And put his application through the process before the deadline."

Mazzochi: "And did that... but that third person wasn't the person who's nominated in your Resolution, right?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

West: "Correct."

Mazzochi: "Okay. So, you had three individuals and Democrats could not put votes behind any of those three individuals, correct?"

West: "And Republicans could not put votes on a candidate as well."

Mazzochi: "But we do put behind one, right?"

West: "As I mentioned before, Representative, we... a Motion was made within the commission to send both candidates that received Republican votes the one that received all Republican votes, the one that's received all Democratic votes. A Motion was made to send both candidates to the General Assembly, and it was turned down."

Mazzochi: "Sure. But you understand that that's an illusory Motion..."

Speaker Harris: "Representative your time has expired.

Representative Reick yields four minutes to Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "...because to say let's send both to the floor, knowing full well that one of the... that the whole point of the search commission is supposed to produce a bipartisan candidate, you knew you were manipulating the process because what would happen is your Democratic candidate would get votes based on the majority on the floor and the Republican... and the candidate that actually had Republican votes would not get support on the floor, right?"

West: "Neither candidate was considered a Republican candidate or a Democratic candidate."

Mazzochi: "It's not a question of are they a Republican or Democratic candidates, who had actual votes behind them?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

West: "I'm just making sure that you know that because you keep on saying you did this, you did that. It came down to both candidates had an interview and objectively individuals from the LEC went with the candidate that they felt was more qualified. And it came down to an impasse. That's what it came down to."

Mazzochi: "Right. And the whole point is, when you have an impasse, then the whole point is you have to start the process again. You know..."

West: "We asked for a third candidate."

Mazzochi: "To the Bill. If a public company or a public body had followed the process that we're about the follow now, that would be considered to be a violation of due process. If one our school boards had done this, if one our agencies had done this, where there was supposed to be bipartisan or at least a majority of four and you only had two and two, the correct procedural process is to call it a failed search, and you start again. And the reason why you start again is to ensure that everyone has a fair chance for being considered for a job. Now one of the things that the Sponsor has said is that we would be out a Legislative Inspector General. I just want to remind the Body that there actually is a provision in law what to do when the Office of the Inspector General is vacant for a certain period of time and the Legislative Ethics Commission has not appointed any acting Legislative Inspector General. All complaints made to the Legislative Inspector General or the Legislative Ethics Commission then shall be directed to the Inspector General for the Auditor General, and so on and so forth. So, it's not as though there would be

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

a way... it's not that the Legislative Ethics process would come to a halt, all that would happen is that we would have more time to properly go through the process and things could continue to be handled. So, here again, what we really have... you know, we have procedures in place. And we talk about due process... precisely because when you adhere to the process, when it's drawn to be fair to both sides of the equation or both sides of the aisle, and then all of the sudden you decide well might makes right, and we're going to jettison the rules that were agreed upon as fair, and we're going to do new rules simply because we've got a larger number of seats in this chamber, that in and of itself is an abuse of process. Because what you're saying is, it's okay to change the rules as long as I have the power. And that is not a fair or proper procedure. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Keicher is recognized."

Keicher: "Thank you. Representative West, how you doing this morning? So, a couple questions for you. I'm the newest member of the LEC. So, I just want to make sure we go over a couple of things that will be in the FOIA record from our emergency meeting yesterday. First, we did have an emergency meeting yesterday, right?"

West: "Correct."

Keicher: "Okay. And during that meeting do you recall the candidate we spoke to saying anything on their preference regarding an acting versus a permanent appointment to this roll?"

West: "I do."

Keicher: "And what was the tenor and topic that was discussed?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- West: "He mentioned that he should be Acting LIG."
- Keicher: "And so, his preference was to be appointed an Acting
 LIG and then do what after that?"
- West: "Repeat your question. I'm sorry."
- Keicher: "So, after he expressed a preference to be appointed
 Acting LIG, what was his preference for the process to happen
 after that?"
- West: "Let me rephrase. He said that he would... he's open to being Acting LIG. Now with that being said, answer your question.

 I'm not trying to stall. Ask your question again."
- Keicher: "So, the process that he suggested after that regarding the search committee, reconstituting, and doing additional interviews."
- West: "Oh, yes."
- Keicher: "What was... would you agree with me that he suggested that we appoint him as Acting LIG, reconstitute a search committee, and conduct an additional search committee sharing names back with the LEC for suggestions?"
- West: "He mentioned that he's open to being Acting LIG. And that if he is the Acting LIG, that we need to bring forth a search committee and open it up to others to apply. Yeah, he did say that."
- Keicher: "Excellent. Okay. And from your knowledge or from staff's knowledge that's there with you, what is the functional difference between an interim and an appointed LIG?"
- West: "Oh, an acting and appointed LIG?"
- Keicher: "The process we are going through today as opposed to had we chosen to go through an acting designation?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

West: "An Acting LIG will fill the term of our former LIG, and then we'll be through this process all over again. Whereas, a permanent LIG can just be reappointed."

Keicher: "So, the permanent LIG position, when does their term
for this member expire?"

West: "June 30, 2023."

Keicher: "Okay. And that is the exact same date that the expiration of the interim title would expire as well, correct?

Unless otherwise appointed someone in his stead."

West: "That last part, say it again."

Keicher: "Okay. So, the date for expiration of the acting or the appointed LIG would expire in June of '23 unless, under the acting provision, we appointed somebody permanently in that role?"

West: "Correct."

West: "To be... subject to be reappointed."

Keicher: "So, yesterday do you recall us, as a committee,
 discussing a Motion to appoint Judge McCuskey as an interim
 LIG?"

West: "Yes."

Keicher: "And could you give a recap on what that looked like
 after the Motion was called?"

West: Impasse."

Keicher: "Impasse. And so, we had an opportunity yesterday in the afternoon to already have him in the role functioning as LIG. Instead we had our Senate peers take this process and run with it. Is that accurate?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

- West: "He's qualified enough to be the Acting LIG. He's qualified enough to be the permanent LIG. I can't speak for what the Senate did."
- Keicher: "Okay. So, yesterday, however, we had an opportunity as an LEC committee to appoint him without needing to go through this road show that the Senate started yesterday. Is that fair to say?"
- West: "Yes. And we have that opportunity to appoint him today as well."
- Keicher: "And I just want to be clear, we had the opportunity to already have somebody in this role, the exact same person we are talking about today, functioning in the exact same capacity and his tenor expiring at the exact same time but we choose to go through this process that apparently is not broken. To the Resolution. When I joined the LEC and replaced Representative Bourne, I came up to speed by reading materials and reviewing what had happened regarding this search because it's the most important thing that the LEC is currently engaged in. While I did that, I reviewed a number of things. And I also want to share with you from May 31, 2018, a quote from Barbara Flynn Currie concerning the Legislative Inspector General in her statements. 'And we've established a search committee so that each Legislative Leader can appoint a judge or a former prosecutor to make a recommendation to the LEC about who ought to be the Legislative Inspector General. I think this is a way of making sure we're going to be encouraging people who have very strong qualifications to be on that job.' Senator Steans said in the Senate, 'There were a couple of critical pieces I think needed to be included

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

in reform on the Legislative Ethics Commission, making sure there was a new process in place to select the Legislative Inspector General.' We had an offer in compromise to have someone in this role yesterday. As I reviewed and we talk about the three candidates or up to three candidates that suggested by the recommendations of committee, there's an email dated October 15, where the search committee only forwarded two names. The search committee under their own pen confirmed that they did not have more than two recommended candidates from this search process. When the Legislative Ethics Commission went back and asked for a third candidate, they were denied. And under the pen of the search committee, they replied that we do not have a recommended third person to forward to you. So, that third vacancy, up to three in the search committee statute, still stands today. The reason this is so important, folks, is we are talking about the integrity of the institution. And earlier today we had a lively and distracting debate on following the rules regarding masks. But we frequently see suspension of rules and not following the statute where it suits the other side of the aisle. We get suspended rules all the time. Folks, here we are talking about integrity and ethics. We're talking about a fine candidate who we agreed could have been in this role yesterday, but we chose instead not to do that. And I think that shame falls on us. On Inauguration Day I heard the new Speaker say that it is a new day, and I think I also heard him say we would be putting ethics first. I think the result of what I've seen over the last two days calls that commitment and that action into

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

question, not for the Representative defending the Bill today, but in the process we need to do better so that we can do better for the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, a quick inquiry of the Chair on what the vote threshold is for this Resolution to be approved? Did I miss your response?"

Speaker Harris: "I just wanted to make it excellent. Seventy-one."

"Thank you. To the Resolution. The author of this Butler: Resolution, my friend from Rockford, very rightly said some people wait to do. Those of us on this side have been waiting for the Majority to do ethics reform for this General Assembly and the previous General Assembly and the previous General Assembly and the previous General Assembly. The four that I've been here. We are still waiting to do true ethics reform. Carol Pope, a constituent of the 87th District, left this job, as we all know, because of her concerns over how this office is structured and the powers of this office. And let me quote Carol Pope in a story from last year. 'I'm thinking that the Legislature knows the limitations of the power of the LIG and that they want it that way. That's why I said I'm a paper tiger.' That's why she left the job. We have suggestions. We've offered them up on how we can change... make this a much more ethical Body, change the process for the LIG's Office, but those have been refused. Those have been shoved aside. And that's the reason we're here today because a very competent person who I know well left the job because you all did not want to give her the powers that she needs.

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

And that's a shame. Yes, this is about process. To the Sponsor, this is absolutely about process. This whole place is about process. This whole place is about rules and statutes and laws. That's what we are, about process. And when the Majority continually flaunts the process... the Representative from the 9th District earlier gave a tremendously passionate speech in response during debate about how important it is to follow the rules. And again, we see the will of the Majority flaunting their status as a supermajority to get what they want done. If I remember correctly, I wasn't here for one of these at least. Carol Pope, Julie Porter, Tom Homer, there really wasn't any controversy around their appointments as LIG. I know Judge McCuskey. He will be very competent in this role. I believe that. I just wish we would've gone through the process properly like we have in the past, to properly vet him and let the process work. That's why I'm going to vote 'no' on this because the process is not working. It's nothing about Judge McCuskey. It's about how the Majority has done this. And let me just close with this. In the Speaker's letter to Leader Durkin a week ago, he said, 'It's our unity that help us forge a brighter path for tomorrow.' There is no unity here today, folks. There wasn't unity here earlier. There isn't unity here on this vote. And that's on you, because of the way you run this chamber, and flaunt the rules of this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Kelly Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Judge McCuskey is a highly respected Judge. As an appointee to the federal bench, he's been vetted thoroughly. He's also been a state

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

judge, a university board member, a great public servant. He was interviewed at length by the Members of the Legislative Ethics Commission, all of whom, including the Republican Members, acknowledge his experience and suitability for the office. So, what we're hearing about is process. But we've had an extensive and, frankly speaking, as a Member of the commission, an exhaustive process to fill this position. And the process was deliberately stalled by our Republican Members for political purposes. We know Judge McCuskey is highly qualified for the position as Legislative Inspector General. He is smart, forthright, and fair. There is no reason, none at all why a member of this Body should not vote 'yes' to appoint Judge McCuskey. We need to stop playing politics and put this well-qualified individual to work as our Legislative Inspector General. A 'no' vote is a vote to keep the office vacant and to keep complaints from being investigated. Vote 'yes' and fulfill our duty to appoint a Legislative Inspector General."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

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

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. Representative West, earlier you talked

about doing and waiting, correct?"

West: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "So, today we are doing something that we waited from yesterday, right? We could've filled that position and had somebody in that position yesterday, but we chose to wait until today. For the same person. Is that correct?"

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

West: "Today we're putting in Judge McCuskey in as a permanent LIG. Yesterday..."

Davidsmeyer: "Who would've been put in yesterday as an Acting LIG with the same power as the actual LIG?"

West: "That did not receive a majority of votes."

Davidsmeyer: "Because you wanted... because your side wanted to wait to do. The wait to do."

West: "He did not receive the majority of votes yesterday. So, here we are today."

Davidsmeyer: "Because you chose to wait. Okay. So you chose to wait. Earlier in your opening statement you talked about the... the history of how we got where we are right now. You talked about the most recent Legislative Inspector General Pope turning in her resignation. What you left out was her reasoning for turning in her resignation. Do you recall that?"

West: "Yes, I do."

Davidsmeyer: "Would you like to expand or would you like me to?" West: "Feel free."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, she basically said that the reason she's stepping down is because this Body, under the guise of ethic reform, chose to water down that office. Chose to water down that office. She said that office, not just her herself, but that office is now a paper tiger. A paper tiger. It's a dog, right? All bark, no bite. You took the power away from that office. Until we get serious in this Body about ethics reform, it doesn't matter if we appoint Mother Teresa to that position. It doesn't matter if we appoint Jesus Christ himself to that position because this Body has taken the power away from that position. This Body has, just recently under the

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

guise of ethic reform. So, if you actually care about ethics reform... and I'm not talking about the individual that's up there, right? There is a process prescribed by law, not by rules like we were talking about earlier, but by law there's a process. There's a committee and I... would you assume if we create a committee that the individual should go through that committee or do we just create it just for the heck of it?"

West: "That's not a rhetorical question?"

Davidsmeyer: "No, no, no. It shouldn't be."

West: "We utilized the search committee. We did utilize the search committee."

Davidsmeyer: "You used the search the committee for two people that were recommended."

West: "Three people who came out of the search committee."

Davidsmeyer: "You grabbed a third person who was not recommended by the search committee."

West: "That the LEC collectively agreed upon."

Speaker Harris: "Representative, could please bring your remarks to a close?"

Davidsmeyer: "I certainly will. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, my point here is, we need to fill this position, but we need to get serious about ethics reform in this place, right? I'm sure you're tired of people walking around saying, oh, you're just a politician, one of those dirty politicians, right? That's what people think, the majority of people. That's why Congress has a 20 percent approval rating. This place probably has a similar approval rating. Because we're not serious about holding ourselves and colleagues accountable. And until we

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

get there, it doesn't matter who we put in this position. I urge a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Avery Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the audio okay?"

Speaker Harris: "We can hear you, Representative."

Bourne: "Thank you. To the Resolution. It was almost exactly three years ago to the day that I got to carry Senate Joint Resolution to appoint Carol Pope to be Legislative Inspector General. And I was nervous, as I'm sure Representative West is now, because I knew how important this position is. We have a crisis of confidence in the Legislature being able to police themselves. And I knew, because he's talking about impasse, we had an impasse. We had an impasse with years that went by without a Legislative Inspector General. ultimately, that impasse got broken and we passed reforms that included this new search committee process because we wanted the selection process to be beyond reproach. We are giving the vetting to people who are not politicians. People who know what it is to be a good investigator. People who know what it is to have somebody who can do the investigation, not be political, and have a fair finding. Because the work of the LEC and LIG is as much to protect the institution as it is to protect the public. And we knew that. So, when we went through the search committee process it was unanimous. I'd like to... if you want, you can look up the Resolution. It was Senate Joint Resolution 48 from 2019. And on that, the cosponsors were all of the Members of the LEC. And some others, including the would be Speaker of the House, Chris Welch, was a cosponsor. It was so bipartisan because we knew

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

how important this position was and that it not be political. That is... that's the process we went through and it worked. The process we went through with the search committee can work and should work. But what you're seeing today is a total distortion of what we should have in this Body. It is beyond disappointing. Because we were proud then to appoint a permanent LIG who would police this Body and restore honor to that office and start a process of true ethics reform in the House. Instead we've seen a complete reversal from that from the Majority. And we're seeing today the ultimate reversal from that. Instead of going with a process that makes the selection of the LIG beyond reproach, they're politicizing it to the nth degree by making it so that it's not a bipartisan process. Instead it's one where the supermajority gets to pick their own watch dog. How's the public going to take that. Oh' we have a Majority, we get to pick who gets to be the legislative watch dog for the next three years. It's nuts. It's nuts. We deserve better than this. The people of Illinois deserve better than this. I cannot believe what I'm hearing now, that instead of appointing an acting LIG so that the process would begin in 2023 with a search committee, appointing a permanent Legislative Inspector General today means that they get to circumvent the search committee process when this is up. They can just reappoint him and no search committee can ever happen. If we want a truly independent watch dog and to restore the confidence of the people of Illinois and the people in our own Body that we can police ourselves, we've got to do better than this. This isn't just about process. This is about whether or not you actually want

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

to have a Legislative watch dog that's respected and that could be a watch dog over the General Assembly. And with what you're doing today, it's clear that you don't."

Speaker Harris: "Leader Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I could not be more honored today to stand here and speak of someone who is from my hometown. Justice McCuskey is a man that, quite frankly, I don't know if he's a Democrat or a Republican. What I will tell you about Justice McCuskey, is that he's a good man. He's honest. He's a man of integrity. He's a man whose opinion carries weight. And he's fair. When looking at the role of Legislative Inspector... of LIG in this state, we know that these are all qualities that we want that particular position to embody. The strong reputation that Judge McCuskey brings to this position is certainly not something that we should ignore in this moment. And it certainly isn't something that we should politicize. When talking about the fact that I really don't know what his party affiliation is, the reason why I believe that is important in this moment is because clearly we've gotten to a place where we have become so polarized that even an individual who has lived their life in a way that all would consider as bipartisan is something that is used as political fodder in this moment. And frankly, it's sad. Judge McCuskey has a strong record, proven experience that he can do this job that we are asking him to do. This job, this role is far too important to leave vacant. One of things that I would share is a moment that I remember a few years ago because Judge McCuskey... in the community that we live in a lot of the judges don't fancy around in the

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

community. The judges are kind of tucked away. And they do their job. And they go home and they do what they do. I remember being at a community event about four or five years ago. And I saw Judge McCuskey sitting there with some other community leaders. And frankly, I didn't know who he was. And the way that he spoke in this community event I wondered, like, who is this man with this strong voice? Who is using, clearly, his power and his willingness to stand up for people who frankly could not do anything for him. That's how I try to judge people. How do you treat people that can't do a lot for you? A lot of folks will go leaps and bounds for people who they think can return the favor. But how do individuals treat people and look for nothing in return? And at this particular community event, I saw this man with this booming voice speaking to an issue that frankly spoke to my soul. And I didn't know who he was, but I did see him with some of the veterans and some of the elders of the community. And I saw them gravitate towards him. And as a young woman, as a daughter of Peoria, I've always respected those that have come before me. Those who have been in the trenches and who have put in the work over the years. And what was so clear to me was that this was a man who has been entrenched and doing the work for a very long time. Although he may not have been on the front lines and being seen, he was someone who had the respect of everybody in that room, Democrat, Republican, old and young, rich and poor. Again, I could not be more proud to stand here and encourage the support of the candidacy of Justice McCuskey."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hoffman."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Hoffman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I'd like to also reiterate some of the things that the previous speaker indicated. Like Leader Gordon-Booth, it is indeed an honor for me to stand before you on the question of whether Michael McCuskey should be the next Legislative Inspector General. Let's not think of anything other than what this question is. The question here is, today, shall Michael McCuskey be voted the next Legislative Inspector General? That's this vote, period. That's what it is. We can talk about process. We can talk about what has been. We can talk about a 91 day impasse. But that is not what this is about. It's not about other candidates. It's about whether Michael McCuskey, Judge McCuskey, possesses the attributes of honesty, fairness, integrity, independence to be the next Legislative Inspector General. That's the question. You can hide behind all the process statements you want. That's what we're voting on here today. I submit to you that if there is 1 or there are 20 complaints before the Legislative Inspector General, it doesn't matter. One is too many to have this office vacant. I would submit that a 'no' or 'present' vote today is saying no to oversight, it's saying no accountability, it's saying no to ethical oversight, and obviously saying no to filling the vacancy for Inspector General. On a personal note, I've known Judge McCuskey for over 30 years. I first met him when I was playing baseball at the Illinois State University, and he was a very active alumni and played there 10 years before me. I've seen him as a Circuit Judge in Peoria. He then was the youngest Appellate Court elected Judge in the state in the Third Appellate

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

District. He served there eight years, two years as a presiding judge. He became a Federal Judge for the Central District, and he was nominated by then President Clinton. Carol Moseley Braun gave his nominating speech. And in a bipartisan manner, he was approved unanimously. So, not only did Senator Braun and Senator Durbin as Democrats support him, but Senator Orrin Hatch supported him, Senator Strom Thurmond supported him, Senator Jeff Sessions supported him in a bipartisan manner. During that time... during that time, he was 1 of only 11 people who were named by William Rehnquist, a very known liberal, right? William Rehnquist to the Federal and State Jurisdiction Committee of the federal bench. Then current Justice John Roberts put him on the Budget Committee, 1 of 11 people in the entire United States. I have heard people say that he is beyond reproach. He is highly respected. He would be very competent in this job. I've heard nobody on that side of the aisle that that would not be the case. So, when you vote today, when you make your decision today, make the decision based on one thing, should Judge Mike McCuskey be the next Legislative Inspector General, period. That's it. That's what this vote is all about. And I would submit that he possesses the honesty, he possesses the integrity, he possesses the fairness and the independence to do one heck of a job. So, I support the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Harris: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I have listened to a number of people on both sides of the aisle speak to the character of Judge McCuskey. Personally I don't know the judge, but I will take the word of many of the people

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

that I deeply respect on both sides of our aisle. The previous speaker stated that a 'no' or a 'present' vote would be a vote against a qualified individual. That's not how I see it. The way I see it, a 'no' or a 'present' vote is a vote to uphold the process that we have in statute for replacing the Legislative Inspector General. What we're doing here today is flawed. What we're doing here today should not be put on Judge McCuskey. We should not be putting a competent person in this position under this flawed process. Ladies and Gentlemen, don't do this to Judge McCuskey. Don't do this to the Legislative Inspector General's position. Ladies and Gentlemen, put this aside until we put the judge through the correct process. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "The final speaker will be Speaker Welch."

Speaker Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, I come to the Floor and rise today because it is time to fill this important position. The time to act is now. Let's end the gamesmanship. Let's stop playing politics. Let's get down to the important work that we're all here to do. We've got eight weeks ahead of us. A lot of work to do in that eight weeks. Let's stop the games and get some important work done today. Let's all appoint someone that everyone here today, everyone, everyone that I've heard speak here today, has said is exceptionally qualified. I think the time to act is now to appoint an exceptionally qualified, honorable jurist of the federal bench to serve as our Legislative Inspector General. The time to act is now. And let's come together and appoint the Honorable Judge McCuskey to serve as our Legislative

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Inspector General. We have heard over and over today our colleagues on the other side of aisle talk about process, process. But let's be clear how we got here. More than a month ago our former Legislative Inspector General disclosed there was a complaint that needed to be pursued. That complaint is still pending because she subsequently announced that she would not start the investigation. For weeks a complaint against someone in this Body has been sitting there unopened. And we want to take ethics seriously, right? We want to make sure that complaint gets investigated. Properly addressed because we care about ethics. That's why the time to act is now. Leaving that complaint unopened, uninvestigated is plain unacceptable. We have watched over the last few weeks our friends on the other side of the aisle hold press conference after press conference demanding that the position be filled. But only, I quess, if it's filled by a person that you all select. Someone that's handpicked. Someone that clearly would be partisan. Because clearly we all agree that this person is exceptionally qualified. That's what we did here today. We brought before you an exceptionally qualified person who wants this job, who will do a great job. No one has questioned his integrity. No one has questioned whether he would be independent. Every single person that has spoken here today has said what an honorable person Judge McCuskey is. Now today our friends come here, the second part of the day, with quite a different tone. It's all about doing better and being better and working bipartisan. You want to work bipartisan? Start today by voting for this exceptionally qualified, honorable jurist to be our Legislative Inspector General. Let's not

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

hide behind a process argument. We know what you mean by process, you know that means slow everything down. Let's slow everything down and grind it to a halt, like some of you have said in the press... in those conferences that you've been holding. Let's slow everything down like we saw here today and yesterday, when we know it's committee deadline week. And we're here on the floor arguing about House Rules that have been in place for two years. Arguing about something as simple as putting on a mask to protect the health and wellbeing of everyone in this chamber. Why are we arguing about masks today? To slow everything down. To bring this place to a halt. Let's slow it down. Even on something as monumentally important as filling the role of Legislative Inspector General. Even if an exceptionally qualified jurist is brought before us. You heard it from Representative West. This impasse should have never happened. You can be moan the process, even while you ignore your own side's culpability in that process because you certainly can't stand up here and deny Judge McCuskey's qualifications. Every single person that spoke praised Judge McCuskey. He's an honorable man. Sadly, our best efforts for four months, four months the process has failed because, as you've said in the media, you want to bring it to a screeching halt. As you use our rules here every single time we've come here over the last 13 months to slow everything down. Let's get to work. The time to act is now. The games stop today. If you want to vote down or vote 'present' on an incredibly talented individual to fill this very critically role, be my guest. But know this, and the honorable Lady from Macomb that I have so much respect for,

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

but I highly disagree. Because a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote here today truly is the wrong vote. A 'no' vote is a vote to leave the office of the Legislative Inspector General vacant. A 'no' vote is a vote again oversight. A 'no' vote shows exactly where your party stands on ethics, understand that. A 'no' vote shows where you all stand on ethics. You should join us today and support ethics, support an honorable jurist being our Legislative Inspector General. A 'no' vote belies all your talk because the next time you get up in front of the press all they need to do is look at your vote today to know whether you're serious about ethics or not. I'll be voting for an extremely qualified Legislative Inspector General here today. I'll be voting for someone who has been praised by Republicans and Democrats for his fairness, for his impartiality, and his integrity. I'll be voting for oversight and ethics. I hope you on the other side will join me and our colleagues as we put ethics first here today and put an end to these games. I urge us all to support the Honorable Judge McCuskey. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Harris: "Representative West to close."

West: "I want to thank my colleagues for this spirited debate. And want to make sure that we know that this Senate Joint Resolution is to end the political game around the position of LIG. The impasse, yes, did not have to happen. We are the Majority Caucus. We could've easily ended it months ago, but we wanted to respect the process. But in turn, the process wasn't respected by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. And I dare say not colleagues on the other side of the aisle of this chamber. One of our favorite journalists in his

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

daily articles, just a couple days ago, a Republican Member of the LEC reached out to me yesterday and that he goes on to say that when I reached out to the Democrats none of them returned my call. This Senate Joint Resolution is to end the political game. Every one of us believes that Judge McCuskey is qualified. This is the time for us to vote bipartisanly for an LIG so that we can keep working for the people and they'll know that there's someone... a watch dog there to oversee what we're doing and were going to keep restoring trust in this state. Senate Joint Resolution 48 ends the political games. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Harris: "Representative West moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 48. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Ammons votes 'yes'. Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Bourne votes 'no'. Representative Buckner."

Buckner: "Buckner votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Buckner votes 'yes'. Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "I vehemently disagree with the Speaker's remarks. I vote 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Caulkins votes 'no'.

Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "He votes 'no'."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Chesney votes 'no'. Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Conroy votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Conroy votes 'yes'. Representative David Friess."

Friess: "Friess votes 'present'."

Clerk Hollman: "Friess votes 'present'. Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Halbrook votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Halbrook votes 'no'. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Representative Jones votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jones votes 'yes'. Representative McLaughlin."

McLaughlin: "Representative McLaughlin votes 'present'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative McLaughlin votes 'present'.

Representative Miller. Representative Miller."

Miller: "No. No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Miller votes 'no'. Representative Niemerg."

Niemerg: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Niemerg votes 'no'. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Representative Robinson votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Robinson votes 'yes'.

Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "No."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Sosnowski votes 'no'.

Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Stuart votes 'yes'."

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Stuart votes 'yes'. Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Tarver's a 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Tarver votes 'yes'. Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Wilhour votes 'no'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Wilhour votes 'no'. Representative Jawaharial Williams."

Williams, J.: "Representative Williams votes 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "Representative Jawaharial Williams votes 'yes'."

Speaker Harris: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the question, there are 77 'ayes', 16 'nays', 19 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meyers-Martin for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to offer the Black History Month moment for the Illinois Legislative... I mean... I'm sorry... Illinois Democratic Caucus."

Speaker Harris: "Please proceed."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you. Unfortunately, this is my one pleasure today. But that is to present the Black Caucus moment recognizing Carol Moseley Braun. Today we celebrate Carol Moseley Braun, a Chicago native. Carol graduated from Parker High School and went on to earn a B.A. in political science from the University of Illinois. Carol fulfilled her dream by graduating from the University of Chicago School of Law. She financed her education by working in the post office and in

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

grocery stores. Carol was elected to the Illinois House of Representatives, where she pledged to make education her top priority. Therefore, she sponsored Bills to reform education and to ban discrimination in housing. After only two terms in the House, Carol Moseley Braun was selected to become the first woman and the first African American in Illinois history to serve as Assistant Majority Leader. Carol didn't stop there. She was elected to the United States Senate. She was the ... only the second African American elected to the U.S. Senate at the time. Carol was named to the Judiciary Committee, the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, Small Business Committee. She authored Educational Infrastructure Act, which was designed to channel education funds into the areas most needed by low income communities. In 1999, President Clinton appointed Carol Moseley Braun United States Ambassador to New Zealand. And I'm happy to say that I had the pleasure to work with Carol Moseley Braun on several campaigns in the South Suburbs. So, today I recognize Carol Moseley Braun."

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

Gonzalez: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Harris: "Please state your point."

Gonzalez: "I want to talk to yous today about something that happened in my district last month. On January 22, 2022, Melissa Ortega, a immigrant from Mexico, a CPS student at Emiliano Zapata Academy, an eight-year-old girl was shot and killed in Little Village. Let me emphasize again, eight years old. She wanted to play baseball in the Little Village Little

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

League and do TikTok dances with her friends. Her mother, Araceli, moved to Chicago motivated by the desire for a better life and the American Dream. They had been in Chicago for just six months and Melissa was taken from us by the scourge of gun violence that has plagued many of our communities. The day after she was pronounced dead at Stroger Hospital, there was a vigil at the corner of 26th and Pulaski where Melissa was shot. While community and neighbors join in her memory, a little girl began to cry. She said she was afraid to leave her house because she didn't want to get shot. A little girl, afraid to leave her house because she didn't want to get shot. You're not supposed to worry about that at eight years old. You're supposed to be in school at eight years old. You're supposed to be playing with your friends at eight years old. You're supposed to be alive at eight years old. This isn't normal. We need to work together across the aisle because honestly each side probably thinks they have the ultimate answer to end gun violence, but without investing systemically in our community, without supporting our local organizations and street outreach programs, without clearing our streets of these guns we will not know peace and we will not know justice. I will reiterate what I said less than a year ago when Adam Toldeo was shot. Chicago needs peace, Little Village needs peace. We cannot normalize this and we must act now. Thank you."

Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Appropriations-Public Safety will meet in Virtual Room 2. The recessed Elementary & Secondary

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Education: School Curriculum & Policies will meet in Virtual Room 3. The recessed Insurance Committee will meet in Virtual Room 5. The recessed Health Care Licenses Committee will meet in Virtual Room 1. The recessed Judiciary - Criminal Committee will meet in Virtual Room 4. Meeting in one hour will be the recessed Housing Committee."

- Speaker Harris: "Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution #50, 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 Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 17, 2022, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 22, 2022 or until the call of the President; and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, February 18, 2022, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 22, 2022 or until the call of the Speaker."
- Speaker Harris: "Leader Greenwood moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Greenwood moves that the House stand adjourned until Friday, February 18, at the hour of 10 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Corrected Committee Report from Labor. Representative Evans,

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4410, House Bill 4639, House Bill 4666, House Bill 4931, House Bill 5093; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3749, House Bill 3898, House Bill 4500, House Bill 4850, House Bill 4919, House Bill 5069, House Bill 5107, House Bill 5225, House Bill 5256, House Bill 5538, House Bill 5543, House Bill 5574, House Bill 5576; do pass as amended Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 5167; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2538, House Bill 4116, and House Bill 5412. Committee Reports. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee Executive reports the following committee action on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4750, House Bill 5188, House Bill 5189, House Bill 5190, House Bill 5191, House Bill 5192, House Bill 5501; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4682, House Bill 4717, House Bills 4863-4914, House Bill 5186, House Bill 5205, House Bill 5220; do pass as amended Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4489, House Bill 4924, House Bill 5187; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 5185; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 1167. Representative Stuart, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on February 16, 2022: do pass Short Debate Consent Calendar is House Bill 4816, House Bill 5070, House Bill 5175, House Bill 5414, House Bill 5500; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4618, House Bill 5315, House Bill 5408, House Bill 5464, House Bill 5506; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2942, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2974, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3103, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3132, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3174, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3498, offered by Representative Frese, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3616, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Senate Bill 3895, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3957, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3988, offered by Representative Avelar, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 4024, offered by Representative Hirschauer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Second Reading of House Bills on the Consent Calendar-Second Reading-First Day. House Bill 4070, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4105, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4163, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4164, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4170, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4200, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4245, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4251, a Bill for an Act concerning

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

local government. House Bill 4256, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4257, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4270, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4271, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4272, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4274, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4284, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4292, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4313, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4320, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4321, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4322, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4335, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4338, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4342, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4349, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4364, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4366, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4367, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4382, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4383, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4408, a Bill for an Act concerning health insurance co-pays. House Bill 4422, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4433, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4435, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4442, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4450, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 4451, a Bill for an Act concerning

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

government. House Bill 4459, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4461, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4481, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4528, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4542, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4559... the previous Bill was House Bill 4559, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4589, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4608, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4672, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4680, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 4689, a Bill for an Act concerning finances. House Bill 4766, a Bill for an Act concerning sweet corn. House Bill 4915, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 4937, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4990, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4998, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 5026, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5042, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 5078, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5170, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 5263, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 5283, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5316, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5328, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5334, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 5400, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5416, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 5542, a Bill for an Act

71st Legislative Day

2/17/2022

concerning veterans. House Bill 5581, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5585, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of these House Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5695, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5696, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 5697, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5698, offered by Representative Buckner, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."