58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Rabbi Ilana Baden who is with the Temple Chai in Long Grove. Rabbi Ilana Baden is the guest of Representative Didech. 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."

"Thank you so much, Representative Didech, for Rabbi Baden: inviting me, and thank you to all of you. And thank you for your hospitality. And thank you for welcoming me and having me join you on this Memorial Day as you gather here to deliberate and legislate on behalf of all of us, the citizens and residents of Illinois, one of the great states of the United States of America. I truly appreciate the fact that despite the challenges of this age in which there is so much divisiveness and tribalism, this House of Representatives makes it a point to reach out to clergy of all faiths and denominations to offer an invocation for this auspicious General Assembly. Just as those who sit in this room, and just as those who are represented by those who sit in this room are diverse in faith, practice, interpretation, and belief, so too were those whom we remember, who offered their lives for the sake of the welfare of our nation, varied in race, religion, and ethnicity. As individuals, they were someone's spouse, someone's parent, someone's child, someone's sibling, someone's friend. As a collective, these brave souls were our defenders of liberty and our champions of justice. May their memories inspire and instruct us. And so, it is my honor to offer this prayer in memory of all those who have served and who continue to serve our country. Our

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

God and God of our ancestors, we thank you for the numerous blessings you have bestowed upon our nation. Out of the many nations of the world, our country has been blessed with a singular opportunity to demonstrate how peoples of many faiths and heritages can live side by side and enrich one another's lives through friendship and through the sharing of our unique traditions. We are united this day in a solemn act of gratitude to those who have served in our nation's defense, to those who have risked their personal safety to save the lives of others, and above all, to those that have died serving this country. Their sacrifices are forever remembered by us and by our children for generations to come, we do not forget. Our hearts go out to those serving today in our armed forces and to their families. In all our many faiths, we are united in this. Our prayers are with those who serve our country today. We ask God that they may return speedily and in good health and safety to their loved ones. And may God grant each one of us the wisdom to uphold our nation's virtues, that it may continue to serve as a beacon of liberty and harmony between varied peoples for all the world to see. Amen."

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

Swanson - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Willis."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Willis: "There are no excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Mazzochi and Meier are excused today."

Speaker Turner: "With 116 Members present, a quorum is established. Representative Caulkins, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Caulkins: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Caulkins: "Thank you. On my way here today, I drove through Camp Butler National Cemetery. As I drove there, I had my radio on and heard Memorial Day commercials for sales, and clearances, barbeques, and celebrations. What a stark and surreal contrast that is to the rows of headstones that greet the families and visitors of our heroes that lie and rest on those hallowed grounds. I often struggle with the fact that so many have paid the ultimate price. I'm reminded of my friend and high school classmate, Marine Corporal Johnny Smith. He was the first person I knew who was killed in Vietnam on October 6, 1966, while I was in Officer Candidate School thinking about what my future in the military would hold. I also remember the others who I've had the privilege of knowing and serving with during my 22 years in the military. It's during times like these that I remember this quote from Eleanor Roosevelt. 'Dear Lord,

Lest I continue

My complacent way,

Help me to remember that somewhere,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Somehow out there
A man died for me today.

As long as there be war,

I then must

Ask and answer

Am I worth dying for?'

To all the Gold Star families, thank you. They are not forgotten and I will do my best to ensure that I am worth that sacrifice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Swanson is recognized."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for the honor, again today, to lead this great House in the Pledge of Allegiance. Today is Memorial Day, a day to honor the fallen and not the living. It was first established on 30 May, 1868, and originally known as Decoration Day. On May 5, 1868, General John Logan, leader of an organization for Northern Civil War veterans, called for a nationwide day remembrance. 'The 30th of May, 1868, is designated for the purpose of strewing with flowers, or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country during the late rebellion, and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village and hamlet churchyard in the land', he proclaimed. This is the day we remember our men and women who paid the ultimate sacrifice for you and I. On the first floor of this magnificent Capitol, you can view pictures of some of the over 250 Illinois men and women who gave their lives in the line of duty. Names like Captain Steele, Sergeant B.J. Luxmore, Sergeant First Class Wherli, Sergeant Patch, Sergeant... PFC Lufkin, Sergeant Riney, Senior Airman Miller,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Petty Officer Hull, and Sergeant Lief. It's said if you say a name, their memory lives on. I want to recognize any Gold Star families here with us today. If you could please waive to us down here. Their families made the ultimate sacrifice. I would like to share a couple stories of heroic friends I lost while serving in Iraq from July 2007 to June 2008. Air Force Staff Sergeant Christopher Frost died on 4 March, 2008, while serving with the Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq/Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was assigned to the 377th Air Base Wing, Kirtland, New Mexico. He worked with the base's public affairs office, which he continued to do in Iraq. Staff Sergeant Frost and I had several discussions and we conducted a few interviews during our tours. I'm sure just like any news reporter, Staff Sergeant Frost wanted to get the big scoop. He told me he always enjoyed it when an article he sent over to American papers were picked up and his story told. During his time in Iraq... during this time in Iraq, American Army helicopter pilots trained Iraqi soldiers to fly Soviet Mi-17 Hip helicopters. As with all helicopter training flights, the crew insisted... consisted of a mix of American and Iraqi soldiers in each aircraft, with the American serving as Commander. On 4 March, a pair of Mi-17 Hip helicopters departed on a training flight. At the turn-around or midpoint, the pair made a routine stop. At this point, the Iraqi's wanted to demonstrate to the Americans they were capable of flying an aircraft by themselves. I'm sure Staff Sergeant Frost, seeking the big scoop is why he volunteered to ride with the first all Iraqi crew. While returning to base, the two aircrafts encountered a terrible sandstorm and

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the Iraqi crew aircraft was lost. I recall hearing the news and made my way into the satellite imaginary room as they frantically looked for the down aircraft. Unfortunately, because of the sand storm, they were unable to find the crash scene until daylight the next hour (sic-day). Later the crash site was found and ground troops reported all on board were killed. Staff Sergeant Frost is survived by his wife, Ashley, a daughter, and a son. Colonel Steven Scott and Major Stuart Wolfer were killed on 6 April, 2008. I worked with Colonel Stewart... Colonel Scott on a daily basis, coordinating equipment distribution for the Iraqi Army. Major Wolfer, reservist and lawyer by trade, he worked in the logistics section coordinating transportation for military personnel. Both Officers were killed when a Katyshua rocket hit the fitness center that Sunday morning where they were working out. When we held their memorial service at Phoenix Base, Colonel Scott, a Christian, Major Wolfer of the Jewish faith. So, the memorial service included a Christian Chaplain, a Rabbi, and an Iraqi Imam. A fitness center at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Alabama, is named in Colonel Scott's honor. He is survived by two daughters. Major Wolfer is survived by his wife and three daughters. Together, we honor those we love, we honor those we've lost, we honor those who have served, and we pay tribute to those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice for all of us to enjoy our freedom. Jane Addams, a Great American and an Illinoisan, in a speech called Greatness and Commemoration, was once asked and I quote, 'What is it we admire about the soldier? It is certainly not that he goes into battle. What we admire about the soldier is that

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

he has a power of losing his own life for the life of the larger cause; that he holds his personal suffering of no account; that he flings down in in rage of battle his all and says, I will stand or fall with this cause. That, it seems to me, is the glorious thing we most admire.' In recognition of today's Memorial Day, I would like to request all Resolutions naming a highway, roads, buildings, or structures in honor of a service member sacrificing their life for our great country and state receive appropriate consideration in the appropriate chamber that their name can be mentioned again, and their memories will carry on. So today, remember those who died for us to preserve our freedoms and the way of life. Thank you, Mr. Chair."

- Speaker Turner: "In honor of Memorial Day and those that paid the ultimate sacrifice, the Body will take a moment of silence.

 Thank you, Representatives. Representative Flowers, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In honor of Memorial Day, I, too, would like to have the opportunity to give a speech that was given to me about 25 years ago. And it goes like this. 'I am your flag. Respect me, protect me, and never forget me. I am your flag'. So when a lot of these soldiers went off to war, when they saw that flag standing up, they knew that victory was not far away. So, thank you very much for the opportunity to give me the opportunity to say this again."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 516; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2577, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 2625, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 689, Senate Bill 690, Senate Bill 1257, recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2931, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 527. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 1. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted, is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 26. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2895. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 534, Senate Bill 1407, recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2301 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2301, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2557. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1739. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 210, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2460, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 2837, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2135. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 120. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 90, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1236. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to is House Bill 247, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 1561, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2165, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3302,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3586, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 456. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur to with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 2154, House Resolution 410, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1573. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 94, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 386, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 2708 and #4 to House Bill 2708, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3396, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 416, Floor Amendment #2 and #3 to Senate Bill 1966. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2470, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3263. Representative Cassidy, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2541. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & IT reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #3 to House Bill 3606.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2096. Representative Evans... correction, Representative Anne Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1854."

- Speaker Turner: "Members, on page 21 of the Calendar, under Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 294, offered by Representative Butler. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 294. Be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESNETATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Major General Richard J. Hayes Jr. on his retirement from the United States Army and thank him for his many years of service to the State of Illinois and the United States of America."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Resolution out of the record. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 367, offered by Representative Butler."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 367, offered by Representative Butler.
 - RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with his family and friends, the passing of United States Marine Cpl. Daniel Baker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to offer House Resolution 367. 367 honors the life, not the death, of Marine Corporal Daniel Baker of Tremont in Tazewell County. I often wish we would call these life, not death Resolutions, because it is their life experiences that we honor. We've had a tradition here, since I've been in at least, to honor those in the military, Illinoisans in the military who have passed away in service over the last year, and Daniel is one of those. Daniel Baker packed a lot into his all-too-short life of 21 years. Corporal Baker died in service to our country this past December 6, the eve of Pearl Harbor Day. As you may recall, on December 6, 2018, there was a horrific air refueling accident over the Sea of Japan during which a marine KC-130 refueling tanker and an F-18 collided. All five crew members of the KC-130 and one of the F-18 pilots died. The only survivor was the other pilot of the F-18. The bodies of all the KC-130 crew members, including Corporal Baker, were never recovered. Daniel Baker graduated from Tremont High School in 2015. Daniel's favorite activities in high school were the soccer club and the robotics team. Tremont has a tremendous robotics program and Daniel spent endless hours with the Tremont robotiers. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in the spring of 2016. Corporal Baker achieved that rank in February 2018. He attended Corporal training at MCAS Iwakuni where he graduated top of his class and received an award for academic excellence in August 2018. According to stories I've read about Daniel, he loved serving his country as a marine and appreciated the opportunity afforded him to see the world. He was well liked by all who knew him for being

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

an encouraging, positive, and outgoing guy. Daniel liked adventure. He enjoyed hunting, camping, hiking, time around a bonfire, and traveling with friends. During his high school years, he was active in the church youth group and served on the leadership team for Cabin Youth Ministry. In short, Daniel was the kind of guy we want defending our freedoms. At the celebration of Daniel's life at Northfield Christian Church in Tremont, I witnessed one of the most hearth wrenching moments of my life. As I sat waiting to give my condolences to the family among the hundreds in attendance, I noticed Mary Ann and Dale Nannens, good friends of Representative Sommer, make their way up the aisle to grieve with Daniel's parents, Elizabeth and Dwayne. In... in Hopedale, another Tazewell County community just a few miles from Tremont, the Nannen's son Reid has been honored by this very chamber. Reid died serving this country in Nevada while training to become a top gun pilot. A portion of Interstate 155 is named in Reid's honor. As the Nannen's approached the Bakers and embraced them at this visitation, my eyes filled with tears as I realized they were comforting another set of parents who have lost a son in service to our country as only parents who have lost their own son in service to our country could comfort them. I can't even imagine the pain present in the hug between those four parents. Today is the day we honor our nation's dead who have given their lives to defend the privilege we all enjoy to assemble here today. Representative Swanson said, 151 years ago, General Logan declared this Decoration Day or what is now Memorial Day as a way to honor those who died in the Civil War. In General

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Logan's orders, number 11, he said, 'Let us, then, at the time appointed, gather around their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of spring time; let us raise above them the dear old flag that saved from dishonor; let us in this solemn presence renew our pledges to aide and assist those whom they've left among us a sacred charge upon a nation's gratitude, the soldier's and sailor's widow and orphan'. Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for taking the time to honor Corporal Daniel Baker on this Memorial Day. God bless those who've died defending our country. God bless our Gold Star families."

Speaker Turner: "The Body will take a moment of silence.

Representative Butler moves for the adoption of House
Resolution 367. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the
Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Representative.

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

Bailey: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Bailey: "Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome to Springfield, today, friends from the 107th, 109th, and 110th over here on the right-hand side of the gallery. They're from Effingham Right to Life, here to speak up for those who can't. Thank you very much for being here today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol. Members, on page 11 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1890, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1890, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 2 is offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter on Floor Amendment #2."

 Slaughter: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we need to adopt

 Amendment #2."
- Speaker Turner: "That's right. My apologies, Representative.

 Senate Bill 1890."
- Slaughter: "Amendment 3 encompasses the Bill. I'd be happy to explain the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, I'm being told that you'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."
- Slaughter: "That's correct, Mr. Speaker."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Speaker Madigan and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter on Floor Amendment #3."
- Slaughter: "Again, this Amendment becomes the Bill. I'd be happy to explain it on Third Reading, if that's okay?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1890. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1890."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1890, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Slaughter: Senate Bill 1890 is an initiative to address the many challenges that our state has with human trafficking. Viewed by many as modern day slavery, traffickers physically force, defraud, and coerce women and children into providing some type of labor and/or commercial sex act. Simply put, human trafficking is the business of stealing freedom for profit. Those who have done the research on this topic know that human trafficking is a multibillion dollar criminal industry that denies freedom to an estimated 25 million people around the world. Back in the early 2000's, due to its strategic location and importance, the FBI recognized the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois as national hubs for human trafficking. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a multifaceted issue that disproportionately, negatively impacts minority communities and cultures throughout the State of Illinois, whether they be non-citizens, the Latino community, the African American community. My district, located on the South Side, having recently experienced an uptick in the human trafficking of young African American women. In Illinois, there is an estimated over 30 thousand women and girls that are involved in human trafficking. First getting involved in prostitution by the age of 15, and 62 percent by the age of 18. The Bill that we have before us does four things... actually, it does five things. One, it requires the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board to conduct or approve an inservice training program for all police officers in the detection and investigation of all forms trafficking. Secondly, it extends the Criminal Statute of

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Limitations for adult human trafficking from 3 years to 25 years after the commission of the offense. Thirdly, extends the Civil Statute of Limitations for offenses under the Trafficking Victims Protections Act from 10 to 25 years. And fourthly, provides that any company that commits trafficking in persons, when it normally benefits from human trafficking as a result of participating in ventures involved in involuntary servitude or involuntary sexual servitude of a minor, may be fined up to a hundred thousand dollars. And lastly, it requires hotels and motels to train employees on human trafficking. I know of no opposition. I urge for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "For further discussion, the Chair recognizes Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Representative Slaughter, for bringing this Bill forward. Human trafficking is reported annually in all 50 states and involves our citizens. It happens in a variety of industries including domestic work, agriculture, and the service sector. Regardless of where the trafficking occurs, trafficking victims often face physical, emotional, or sexual abuse at the hands of their exploiters and rarely have access to an education or to healthcare, particularly reproductive healthcare. Even if a child is able, or a victim is able, to leave their exploiter, these traumas, stigma, potential arrest record, and lack of access to services can make recovery an arduous process. To the Bill. Thank you again, Representative, for sponsoring this Bill. Thank you

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

for the many organizations who have worked with us to end human trafficking. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Representative Costa Howard. This a growing epidemic that we must address. I do want to thank Speaker Madigan just for his time, energy, and effort in partnering with me on this initiative. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1890 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1890, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1139, offered by Representative Bristow. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill?"

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1139, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous date. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Bristow."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bristow on Floor Amendment #1."
Bristow: "We want... I'd like Amendment #2, please."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bristow would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #1."

Bristow: "Correct."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Bristow and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bristow on Floor Amendment #2."

Bristow: "Floor #2 is... Floor Amendment #2 is a technical change to Floor Amendment #1. It makes the following technical changes, clarifies the effective date, cleaned up Federal Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act language, and removed reference changing age requirement effecting concealed carry cards."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1139. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1139."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1139, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bristow."

Bristow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1139 makes technical changes and codifies current law surrounding fire arms, concealed carry, and the FOID system. It does the following five things. Improves concealed carry expirations. It will make renewed concealed carry licenses expire five years from the expiration date of the prior license as opposed to five years from the renewal application date. This would encourage current license holders to renew earlier without punishing them by cutting down the days their card is valid. Number two, it exempts Sparta from Gun Dealer Licensing Act. This clarifies the World Shooting Sports

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Complex at Sparta is exempt from the Fire Arm Dealer License Certification Act, that was intended in the original Act when passed. Number three, codifies current law enforcement UUW exemption. Clarifies that qualified current and retired law enforcement members are exempt from unlawful use of weapon restrictions under Federal Law and do not need a concealed carry license to carry. This is already done under Federal Law and has been a concern to law enforcement. Number four, removes law enforcement hunting restrictions. Allows off duty law enforcement to carry a concealed firearm while hunting. Currently, individuals are only allowed to carry a weapon that they would be allowed to hunt with during that hunting season. And number five, lowers the FOID age restriction for military members. Allows military members under the age of 21 to apply for a FOID. Currently, individuals under 21 can only get a FOID card with their parents' permission. individuals would have to submit an annual verification that they are in good standing with the military. These are small and technical changes and I am open to questions and would appreciate your support."

Speaker Turner: "For further discussion, the Chair recognizes Leader Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the Bill. Many people on the other side of the aisle are going to be surprised, but I am going to be in supportive of this Bill. This is a Bill that I think... Yes. Yes, Representative, I am going to be in support of this Bill. This Bill actually is a good common sense Bill. It's one of the things that I've been trying to get people to understand, that there are ways to have lawful owners of guns

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

be respected and that is what this Bill does. It certainly codifies our intent when we put through the gun dealer licensing to exempt Sparta. This codifies that, makes sure that there is no doubt about it. Expanding FOID card applications to those in active military under the age of 21 is truly important. All of the things that this Bill does makes sense when we're talking about law abiding gun owners. And I would strongly urge this entire Body to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bristow to close."

- Bristow: "Thank you. I would also like to remind the Body that the original intent extends the sunset date three years on the law enforcement exemption to the Illinois ban on recording private conversations using an eavesdropping device. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1139 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1139, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, we have Senate Bill 534, offered by Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 534, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1407, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Welter, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Welter: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

"Over here on the Republican side of aisle, I have two Pages for the day. I have Fallon Knodle. She's a fourth grader. She helps care for animals on her family's farm. Fallon has been an active member of Star Shooters' 4-H club in Montgomery County and she was earned a gold award for her community service, leadership, and project records last year. She enjoys dance, basketball, choir, and plans to be on her school's scholastic bowl team next year. She wants to be a chef when she grows up. Also with me is Nora Grig... Grigoroff. I'm sorry, Nora. Nora is the daughter of my LA down here, Shelly. She's also in fourth grade. Next year, she plans to be on her school's scholastic bowl team as well with Fallon. She enjoys spending time at the Illinois State Capitol where she has visited us many times this year and wants to learn more about the political process. She enjoys swimming and dance and she plans to be a State Trooper when she grows up. Could you please welcome her?"

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative, and welcome to your Capitol. Representative Robinson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Robinson: "Thank you, Speaker. I would like to take a moment and have the Body to wish my very, very, very special seatmate, Representative Bob Morgan, a very happy 21st birthday."

Speaker Turner: "Happy Birthday, Representative. Representative Stuart, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Stuart: "Two points of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Stuart: "Thank you. I first want to introduce to the chamber my Page, Skyler, who's with me today. He came on Memorial Day last year and had such a great time he wanted to come back. He is the nephew of my former LA Taryn Durst. He's nine years old. He has three days left in the third grade at Mt. Pulaski Grade School. He loves sports, swimming, basketball, golf, and baseball and he would like to be a professional baseball player when he grows up. So, if we could welcome Skyler."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, and welcome to your Capitol."

Stuart: "And then, I also have three very special guests with me in the gallery. They've come... if they could stand up. They've come all the way from New York City and Jersey City, New Jersey. It's my mom, Carol, my dad, Jim, and my sister, Marcie Kobak."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome. Thank you, Representative.

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

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary Inquiry of the Chair, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Wehrli: "We just moved SB1407 from Second to Third, but I had filed Notes on it and I am just wondering if, procedurally, we are following our rules?"
- Speaker Turner: "Let me get you an answer, Representative.

 Representative, we'll get back to you with an answer for your
 question. Members, on page 13 of the Calendar, under
 Constitutional Amendments on Second Reading, we have Senate
 Joint... Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1,
 offered by Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1 has been read in full a second time on a previous day."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That looks like such an interesting Bill that the House Republicans request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, do you have a time?"

Butler: "One hour."

- Speaker Turner: "House Republican Caucus... House Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118, I believe, for an hour. Leader Willis is recognized."
- Willis: "Democrats will caucus, also immediately, in Room 114."
- Speaker Turner: "Democrats will caucus immediately in Room 114.

 The House is recessed to the call of the Chair. Members, on page 13 of the Calendar, under Constitutional Amendments on Second Reading, we have Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1 was read in full a second time on a previous day."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1. Please read the full Constitutional Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1.

RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL STATE ASSEMBLY OF THE OF ILLINOIS, THEHOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Section 3 of Article IX of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE IX

REVENUE

SECTION 3. LIMITATIONS ON INCOME TAXATION

- (a) The General Assembly shall provide by law for the rate or rates of any tax on or measured by income imposed by the state. In any such tax imposed by corporations the highest rate shall not exceed the highest rate imposed on individuals my more than a ratio of 8 to 5.
- (b) Laws imposing taxes on or measured by income may adopt by reference provisions of the laws and regulations of the United States, as they then exist or thereafter may be changed, for the purpose of arriving at the amount of income upon which the tax is imposed.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Constitutional Amendment Act. This was First Reading in full... correction, Third Reading in full of Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Martwick: House, today, I present for your consideration, Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1. Upon passage, this Resolution will cause a referendum question to appear on the ballot in the November 2020 election. And it will allow the citizens of the State of Illinois, through the course of that election, to weigh in, to decide whether or not Illinois would have the ability to adopt a fair tax. Now, we all run on the ideas of reform. We all come here to make things better. But what is reform if reform is not identifying problems? Finding solutions to those problems, solving them. All of Illinois' problems, every problem that we have in this state, can be traced back to our inability to manage our finances. Over the course of decades, our government has run structural deficits year, after year, after year, leading to a massive accumulation of debts. Debts in our pension system, debts in our backlog of Bills, and deferred maintenance in our infrastructure. About 15 years ago, that service exploded and it started to cause massive pressures on our budgets. And what did we do? We started making cuts. We made massive cuts to education to a point where more than 80 percent of the children that attend schools in Illinois don't have the adequate resources to provide them with a minimally sufficient education. Some districts decided that that wasn't good enough and so they began raising their property taxes

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

and have led to us having one of the highest property taxes in the country. Other districts who couldn't afford to raise their property taxes, basically left their children to be cast aside without the adequate resources to receive a quality education. We cut funding for higher education in half over the course of the last decade, leading to the biggest tuition increases in the country and the largest decline in enrollment of our college students. We led the heartless cuts to our social services, mental health, addiction counseling, homeless prevention programs for children. And how about seniors? We made massive cuts to Meals on Wheels and in-home care, forcing thousands of seniors into nursing homes, and then we cut reimbursement rates causing nursing homes to close. Finally, we made across the board cuts to state agencies year, after year, after year, cutting the budgets of our state agencies to the point that we have the lowest number of state employees per capita in the country. Now, most of our government agencies are so understaffed that they can't even accomplish their core mission. Some of these are just plain stupid, like IDNR. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources has lost 1400 people through cuts over the course of the last decade. Leading to a point where they have cut so many people that they don't have anyone to fill out grant applications and we lose out on millions of dollars a year in federal grants to maintain our state parks and our state properties. Imagine that. How stupid is that? And some of them are just unconscionable. We've made year over year to cuts to budgets like DCFS. And now, you have children dying because you have case workers that are overburdened and

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

underpaid. So, what are the solutions to these problems? The solutions are to eliminate our deficits. Eliminate that structural deficit. When you do that, you start to right the ship. You can fund education. You can pay down debts. How do you do that? Well, there's only two choices. Raise the flat tax or you can adopt a fair tax. Now, COGFA did a study for me, and many of you are aware of this, that said in order to balance our budgets between now and 2045, we'd need a six and a half percent flat tax. Raise the four point nine five to six and a half. But there is an important point that they said. They said every moment that we delay in instituting that flat tax of six and a half percent is going to lead to higher, and higher, and higher taxes, because we will accumulate debt, and more debt, and more debt. And so, without any movement, we're on our way to a seven, seven and a half, eight percent flat tax. But in Illinois, we have a very unfair tax system. According to the Institute on Tax and Economic Policy, we have the eighth most unfair, eighth most regressive tax system in the country. Meaning more than 42 other states. We put too much of the burden of funding our government on the backs of the people who can least afford to pay it. Middle class, working class, and poor. They're overburdened and they need some relief. The fair tax, if approved by the voters, if they choose this tax reform, this path forward for Illinois, we will be in a position where we can eliminate those deficits. And when we eliminate those deficits, we stop accumulating debts, and we begin to pay them down. And when we pay down those debts we relieve the pressure for future tax increases. When we live up to our commitment to fund

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

education and schools start to be funded properly, we provide the education that so many children in this state are not getting and we begin to relieve the burden on high property taxes. This is reform. This is what we all come here to do, identify problems, find solutions. This is the solution for Illinois going forward. Be happy to answer any questions and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Members, there are many people seeking recognition on this very important piece of legislation. Everyone will be recognized and will be allowed to speak for five minutes. We will institute a five minute timer. Please respect the timer, respect the chamber, and respect the other Members over the course of the debate. Everyone seeking recognition will be recognized. First up, we have Representative Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request an immediate verification should the Bill get the required number of votes.

 And will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick, your request for verification is noted. And the Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Batinick: "Representative, I was actually surprised at how much you put in there that I agreed with but there certainly are some important distinctions. I think you're going to have to clarify something for me. So, you said this is a Constitutional Amendment about reforms. My analysis does not say that this is fair maps or term limits. Am I correct in that? You consider this a reform?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Martwick: "Yes, this is a reform. It reforms... it provides an opportunity for Illinois to reform the manner in which it collects taxes."
- Batinick: "Okay. You also said that we have an inability to manage our finances. I certainly agree with that and will address that in a little bit. One of the things that confuses me though, in terms of an inability to manage our finances and continuing to increase taxes, we have one of the overall highest... we've seen study after study, we are not a low-tax state. So, we live in a state that pays overall high taxes, yet you're trying to increase the amount of revenue coming into the Illinois Department of Revenue. And in terms of inability to manage our finances, it sounds like we're squandering our finances. A couple questions for you here. So, we've had a lot of new money, new revenues, things opened up that are in this year's budget that actually, in total, almost match what you're trying to get at with the fair tax and I want to list off some of them. The spending reduction for the MCO assessment, that's about a billion dollars. Correct?"
- Martwick: "I don't know the specifics of it so I cannot confirm that."
- Batinick: "Okay. Eight hundred and forty five in revenue revisions from the strong economy, correct?"
- Martwick: "For the... my understanding is, yes, that for the year 2020 for that budget, there is an additional 845 million, I think is what you said. That number sounds correct to me. And that, of course, was immediately put towards pensions

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

because, as you know, that was the amount that the Governor had attempted to reduce the pension..."

Batinick: "Okay. And we'll get to that too."

Martwick: "...and had proposed in a pension restructuring. And so, that covers that hole so we don't have to do that restructure."

Batinick: All right, 368 million from online sales tax parity, 350 million possibly from Casino BGT, 212 from sports betting, 175 million in delinquent tax plan, 170 million from cannabis, \$94 million from decoupling from the Federal Repatriation, and 65 million in... possible in cigarette taxes. The point is, you want to raise... you came into the Session wanting to raise about 3.2 billion and, essentially, that's what is being opened up and that's not enough."

Martwick: "Well, Representative, forgive me but did you just count revenues from measures that have not been passed. Revenues like... from measures like sports gaming and..."

Batinick: "The bulk... the bulk of what I have in here is passed or is likely to pass. Either way, my guess is you're going to continue on the path you're down whether they pass or not. I'm on a little bit of a timer, I want to go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Body, the Democrats of Illinois have an insatiable appetite for spending. It will never be satisfied. It will never be enough. The five years... I thought I was going to say the one year I've been here. The five years I've been here, I have seen a parade, a parade, of antigrowth Bills. These antigrowth Bills don't just make it more expensive for businesses to do business in this state, it also makes it more expensive to run government. I've said it

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

before on the floor, I'm going to say it again. He had mentioned higher education, we ranked third in the funding of higher education, yet we still charge some of the highest tuitions in the nation. That is because, as the Representative said, we have an inability to manage our finances. There is a lot of people that make a lot of money and are in debt because they have an inability to manage their finances. The issue isn't more taxes. The Democrats plan is to tax more of a shrinking pie. The Republicans want to grow that pie. Yet, we continue to see Bill after Bill that's going to continue to shrink that pie. And to the actual plan, one of our biggest issues is pensions. I did a video on this. I'm happy to share it with everybody. I'm sure some of you have seen it. The Governor's plan under this is to add an extra \$200 million to pensions after shorting it for a long period of time. We have \$135 billion unfunded pension liability. Two hundred million sounds like a lot. When you take off the zeros, that is like adding \$20 to a \$13,500 credit card bill per year or adding an extra \$1.67 a month. If anybody's had \$13 thousand on a credit card bill and thinks that adding a \$1.67 a month towards that bill is going to pay it off, you realize that's not going to happen. It's our appetite for spending. This isn't about fixing our biggest problems, which is pensions. We haven't addressed pensions locally with consolidation. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. We live in the best state in the country. We have the best people, we have the greatest natural resources, and we do have a world class city

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

in Chicago. The problem we have in this state is that we are losing people because of our high level of taxation. When we think about taxation, you need to include not only the high property taxes, the second highest in the country, the high sales taxes, but the high income tax already at 4.95 percent, which obviously will go up dramatically here. And we all know that the real plan of the future is to tax the middle class. There's no doubt about. That's where the money is. That's why we're not voting on a plan for rates first. This plan will be changed multiple times and they will go to the middle class where the money is in this state. We should be talking about pension reform. We should be talking about Medicaid reform. We should be talking about cutting spending. But instead, what this is, is a massive tax hike that starts off at \$3.4 billion in order to sell that to the voters. But we all know that the ultimate number will be 10 to 11 billion dollars, based on the spending promises of this Governor. This is more of the same. Taxes, taxes, and more taxes for people who are leaving this state. We're now behind Pennsylvania population. We're going to lose one to two congressional seats. And the testimony we heard in Revenue Committee the other day of people claiming that people in this state are fine with taxes and are not leaving is absolutely outrageous. We have an opportunity, today, to defeat this Constitutional Amendment if four brave Members of the other side will stand up and vote 'no' and we can do the real business of the people which is focus on reforming this state, reforming pensions, reforming Medicaid, and actually making real changes. This Bill, it will kill jobs, drive more people out of this state.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

And the reason it's going to kill jobs is its going to hit the pass-through entities. Ninety percent of the business are pass-through entities that paid the individual tax rate. They're creating 72 percent of the jobs in this state and they are going to be hit hard. We are going to lose jobs. We are going to lose people. What we need to do is focus on standing up for the taxpayers of this state and we need to defeat this. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Constitutional Amendment. You know, each year in this chamber, we have Legislators who propose a series of Bills that make significant increases in the spending that the state would incur in that year. Every year, there are hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars of proposed legislation that would add to the already challenging fiscal situation that the state finds itself in. And every year, those Bills are given a reality check when we say we're not in a position to add billions, and billions, and billions of dollars in spending because we need to make good on the commitments that we already made before we make new promises. And while we're looking at those Bills, I think it's easy to say, boy, it would be great if there was free money out there. It would be great if we could wave a magic wand and we'd have every dollar that we need to be able to pay for services. But that's not reality. I think that's why this Amendment's been offered. Because people can portray it like its magic money, like it's free, like it comes from some pot of money that's not being used on anything else and we can take it from the state and we can figure out how to spend

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

more and more each year. That's why there aren't any rates in this proposal. This proposal opens the door to say, each year, we can figure out how many of these new spending initiatives we'll pass and then we'll just adjust the rates accordingly to take that money from taxpayers and put it towards any new idea that this General Assembly comes up with. But that's not reality. The reality is that for every dollar this government takes in, it's a dollar that comes out of the pocket of a taxpayer in Illinois. Every dollar that we take to this government has an impact because it's a dollar that can't be spent by a family or a business in Illinois. We're saying, give your money to us and let the state decide how to spend it. Let me ask you though. Has the state earned that right? Have we shown fiscal discipline? Have we been demonstrating a track record of success to taxpayers, that they could have confidence that we would show restraint? That we wouldn't make promises that we can't afford to keep? That we wouldn't push Bills off into future years or let unfunded liabilities rack up for decades? We haven't earned that trust from taxpayers. Before we look at an initiative like this and say, wouldn't it be great if all this extra money came in and spending didn't have any limitations, let's remind ourselves that we live already in a state with the highest tax burden; that we haven't demonstrated fiscal responsibility in this chamber; and that we have no right to go back to taxpayers and ask for a blank check to fund any and all ideas that come before us in future years. Imagine us in 10 years down the line if this Amendment passes. Imagine us 10 years down the line. What's more likely to have happened? That the initial

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

rates offered that in themselves would be a \$3.4 billion tax increase? Is it more likely that those rates stay in effect? Or is it more likely that over those 10 years, people make us change to a rate here, the rate goes up by a tenth of a point here, and the income bracket drops down there and suddenly, more and more Illinois families find themselves on the receiving end of a tax increase? We all know that's a more likely scenario. Don't listen to the TV ads that'll run for the next couple of months saying that, oh, it's... don't worry, somebody else will pay for it. You get all the benefits without any of the costs. We have to bear those costs. Illinois taxpayers have to bear those costs. And for that reason, we should have a lot of 'no's' on the board. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Spain."

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

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

Spain: "Representative Martwick, could you inform me, what is the deadline for passage of Amendments to the State Constitution?"

Martwick: "My understanding, Representative, is that the... in order for a referendum... a constitutional referendum question to be placed on the ballot, it must be passed at least 180 days before the date of that election. So, the election would be November 2020, this would be roughly six months before that."

Spain: "So, we are almost a year in advance, or perhaps, 11 months in advance of the actual deadline for moving this forward, correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Spain: "Now, are you aware of any of the other 48 Constitutional Amendments that have been filed this Legislative Session? Are any of those Amendments yet to move forward? Have any of those Amendments been released from the House Rules Committee or the Senate Committee on Assignments?"

Martwick: "I am not aware of that."

- Spain: "None of the Amendments have been released. Maybe that's because they're premature. Maybe that's because they're ideas that don't meet the support of the Majority Party. Representative, it was mentioned, the issue of rate setting. Is it your intention that rates would be approved by the Legislature and submitted to voters in advance of consideration of this Amendment?"
- Martwick: "So, the... there are rates that have been filed. There was a hearing on them in committee and I believe that the intention is that those rates, that there will potentially be a vote on that before we adjourn."
- Spain: "And if rates are established by the Legislature, if voters approve this Constitutional Amendment, what guarantees will be in place to those voters that the rates established in this Legislative Session would be the effective rates going forward after passage of the Amendment?"
- Martwick: "So, Representative, the... those would be the exact same protections that are there today. Since the passage of our income tax in a... or institution of our income tax in 1970, if memory serves me, there have been roughly four increases in our tax... in our flat tax. There have been two decreases in our flat tax. So, the flat tax has had very little movement over the course of the 40 years that it has been in effect."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Spain: "Is exactly the point of why the unified tax structure is so important, because it acts as a very powerful disincentive to a continued adjustments and manipulation of tax rates to feed the whims of the General Assembly and the appetite for spending, the lack of fiscal discipline that your opening comments emphasized, that have been such a problem for our state. One more question. Will this Amendment allow for the establishment of additional types of income taxes, whether they are supplementary income taxes passed by the Legislature or local income taxes implemented by Home Rule units of government?"

Martwick: "I don't believe so. I think what you're referencing is the fact that when they created the language... and, in fact, I have the minutes of the constitutional convention when this was done... there was a language that was put into the Amendment that limited it to one tax. There shall only be one tax. And this removes that. That language, if you read the actual comments from the convention, was done to prevent a back door graduated rate structure. So, this is literally what needs to be on legally to permit a graduated rate structure. But it is really no different than it is today. By simply declaring other types of income as taxable income, we could bring those in. So, it really wouldn't change anything on that front."

Spain: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This Amendment opens the door to, really, limitless spending here in the State of Illinois. And I'm really thinking about Memorial Day today, as many of our families are traveling outside of the State of Illinois. They're traveling to visit their family members who have left us, because the State of Illinois leads the nation

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

in population loss. And why is that? Is it just our weather? No, every state around us is increasing with jobs and population gains and they're doing well because they have made a decision to invest in economic growth and create a business climate that is favorable for job creation. This is a blank check for poor spending. This is giving more power to the very most powerful in our state. I strongly urge a..."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to go to the Resolution. And I want to talk about Illinois taxpayers and job creators because Illinois taxpayers and job creators should be very nervous about what's happening in the Body here today. I asked in committee about the language of this Amendment and how it maintains the same eight to five ratio between individual corporate rates. And under this new proposal that remains. So, I asked that because I wanted to understand what parameters could be placed on this approach. So, I asked the questions about maybe limiting the number of brackets there could be. How many different rates could we charge Illinois taxpayers? Is there... there should be a cap. There should cap on the highest rate Illinois taxpayers pay on their income. I think that'd be a reasonable thing to ask if we're actually going to do something strange here and actually protect taxpayers. There's not even a cap on the ratio between the highest and lowest rates. That would be an appropriate protection for Illinois taxpayers. In fact, there's not even a requirement that the top income earners pay the highest rate. That's not in here. Under this Constitutional Amendment, this General Assembly

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

actually find out the highest earning Illinois taxpayer is this year, set a bracket for that level of income, and set a specifically, truly confiscatory rate well into in double digits for that one person because we aren't protecting any taxpayers in what's being presented today. And like we've said for years in this Body, how about property tax reform? One of the things that we know drives Illinois taxpayers to other states. Is there a cap in here? Is there any kind of relief? Any reform, whatsoever? Is there even a real approach we could take? We could consider setting a rate like one percent like Indiana does on home values, but that's not here either. There is no taxpayer protection in Constitutional Amendment. Taxpayers should be concerned. What this does do is open the door. It opens the door to rate changes that could occur any time this Body chooses to do that. I know that my friend, the Sponsor, does not want to discuss that part of it. I think that it's real. We've seen it happen before, Ladies and Gentlemen. When there was a flat tax, and that's supposed to be harder to raise taxes, the lame ducks did it in 2011. And it was a heck of a tax increase. It went from three percent to five percent, retroactively. Think that can't happen on a certain set of brackets in the future? Don't kid yourself. When it comes to compliance, understand the wealthy are the most able to move and they're the most able to create tax shelters to hide their income. New Jersey, New York, have all seen this before and had to deal with this in a hard way. We're aiming for the same problems that they already have shown. And I always, always talk about small business when we talk about something this

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

big and this important on the floor. It was mentioned that a stable State Government would be an important thing for taxpayers, also small business owners. I agree, that's a part of it. What's really important to them is stable income tax rates, so they can invest and plan for their business and their future accordingly. We are taking those protections away with this Constitutional Amendment, today. Job creators need to know that there are no protections in this Constitutional Amendment for them. We talk about fair versus unfair. It's been said this is a regressive tax we have right now, it's on the backs of the most vulnerable. That's because our property taxes are taken into account. Again, no measures for protection against property taxes. Nothing. Not a thing in this Bill. I agree with the Sponsor's statement that we have a problem with the ability to manage finances. This Bill also does nothing to address that unless you consider spending more money, like most people can't do in their actual lives, a way to actually manage finances. We are taking the wrong turn. We're taking the wrong turn because it's not fair to Illinois taxpayers to change what they pay until Illinois Government shows they can actually manage the finances that we already have. Our neighboring states are going the opposite directions of what we're doing today. And it's a false choice that there is only two choices here. Flat or graduated. There are lots of reforms we could take. This is going to hurt Illinois business. It's going to hurt Illinois taxpayers. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Willis: "Chair recognizes Representative Bourne."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Changing our Constitution to allow for a graduated income tax system will inevitably bring a tax increase on a majority of Illinoisans. And I say that not because I'm being hypothetical, but because we've seen that happen in other states. In 17 of the 34 states that have a graduated income tax structure, their top bracket is at or below \$60 thousand a year. Illinoisans cannot afford another income tax increase and we cannot afford a system that allows politicians to play with rates and brackets just to fill our annual budget holes. Our current tax structure, which hits everyone in the state equally, is one of the very last competitive advantages we have in our Tax Code. It also has inherent taxpayer protections because when this Body makes a decision to raise the income tax, it has to think about every single Illinoisan, and we are not able to carve out certain groups. In fact, many states are learning that these taxpayer protections are important and they are moving away from their graduated income tax structure, including Mississippi, which is phasing out their brackets, and North Dakota, who's phasing out their brackets. What's been missing from this debate, and we've talked about the overall tax structure a few times in this debate already, is we are not talking about the overall tax burden. A recent study showed that Illinois already has the very highest tax burden in the nation and, as you all know, the second highest property tax burden in the nation. In order to be more competitive, changing our income tax structure to be a graduated one, which will include yet another tax increase, is not the right direction and it will make us less competitive. On top of

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

what the impact of a graduated income tax will be for many families, many small businesses, including agribusinesses and small farms that I represent, file taxes as individuals or pass-through entities. A graduated income tax will raise their taxes even farther. We aren't talking about the most wealthy in our society. We are talking about the mom and pop shops who are the small employers in the rural communities in our state who are already struggling to stay in this state and to stay competitive. This will make this ... our state less competitive. And for agribusiness, it's a lot more difficult for them to up and move out of the state. We know what this will do on the Constitution, but what we don't know is what rates will be implemented. And what rates will be implemented are not at all necessarily the ones that we're going to see in this General Assembly. We've already seen many rate proposals and what we've seen in the trend is rates continue to be adjusted higher just in the last few months and the thresholds continue to be adjusted lower to hit more people. And that will be the trend that continues because there simply aren't enough rich people in this state to pay for the insatiable appetite of spending that we see here Springfield and to pay for these structural spending problems that we have. So, while the other side of the aisle in this General Assembly and the Governor continue to push these policies that increase spending and say that the answer for it is higher taxes and changing our tax system, we know this will eventually hit a majority of Illinoisans. This is nothing more than an attempt to raise income taxes. It will make us

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

less competitive. It will drive out small businesses. This is taking our state in the wrong direction. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Fifty years ago this December, in this very chamber, the Constitutional Convention convened. And what came out of that Constitution was a rewrite of a 100-year-old Constitution that was badly outdated. But one of the things that the Constitutional Convention delegates got right, among many in our current Constitution, is having Illinois set at a flat tax. I would argue that a flat tax is the fairest of all taxes. It impacts everyone equally. You know for quite a long time, since that 1969-1970 convention, the Democrats have controlled either one or both of the chambers of this... of the Legislative Branch of government. Forty four out of the fifty years since our last Constitutional Convention, Democrats have controlled one or both chambers. I believe for the past 16 years, Democrats have controlled both chambers. And what we have seen is what we continue to see in the State of Illinois, driving people out of this state for economic opportunity in other states of this nation. We should be a powerhouse. We're centrally located in the United States. We should take economic advantage of our infrastructure that we have here in the State of Illinois, the great people that we have from across this entire state, from Chicago to Cairo. But no, what we do is institute time, and time, and time, and time again, policies that drive people from this state. This is yet another one of them. This is not the answer to create an economic climate in this state to bring jobs back to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Illinois, to bring more citizens back to my district who are losing jobs when factories close. If we spent as much time creating an economic climate in this state and being attractive to business as we do on spending money and putting up barriers and creating more bureaucracy for people, if we spent as much time doing the good things economically that we should, things would turn around in the State of Illinois. But we have seen it, as I said, 44 out of the last 50 years, Democrats have controlled one or both of these chambers. And what have we seen? People continuing to go from out of the State of Illinois. If we want to change the Constitution... if we want to change the Constitution, Mr. Martwick, let's change the Constitution. Let's have a Constitutional Convention. I've got a Resolution from the last General Assembly that did that. Because we have a lot of things, not just we, the citizens of Illinois, have a lot of things that they would like to see change in our Constitution. Members of the General Assembly who represent a cross section of Illinois geography and Illinois politics have sought to amend the Illinois Constitution to address challenges including taxes and revenue, term limits and recall of elected officials, voting in elections, Home Rule governance, unfunded mandates, education funding, public pension reform, consolidation of constitutional officers, and legislative redistricting among other things. That's what I included in my Resolution last year. We've got a whole laundry list of things. Representative Spain talked about all the Constitutional Amendments that have been bottled up without a hearing. If we want to have a serious conversation about where we're going to go in this

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

state, let's have this discussion. But let's not have this one off Amendment that's going to change the Tax Code and continue to drive people out of Illinois. This is not the right way and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Miller."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. One of the things that... when I was listening to Representative Martwick's comments, so eloquent comments, to begin, I thought I normally wear a pair of cowboy boots to work every day but I thought I got the wrong equipment. I need a pair of gunboots for this talk. One thing that I do, that I've done the past 40 years, I'm a farmer. And what farmers do is they grow things. They solve problems and they fix things that are broken. And a lot of the problems get solved around the kitchen table. And I know one of the things that I think about when I think about this Bill, I think about what would this look like if we're having this conversation around my kitchen table. And I know that probably one of the first things that would happen would one of my family members would look at me and say, dad have you been drinking this early in the morning? And I know one of the things that we think about how, continually, we put lipstick on a pig, and in this case, we call this a fair tax. And there couldn't be anything more unfair that's ever been brought before this Assembly as this. I know one of the things that I observed over the past 65 years of my life, any time Democrats talk about making something fair, it's code language for meaning that everybody is getting ready to get the BOHICA and this is just another case of that. This is going to end up being eventually being just another tax on

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the middle class. There's several reasons why I oppose this Bill and the first thing is it penalizes achievement. I know ever since that I was young and I was encouraged to work hard, to keep my nose to the grind stone, to get a good job, to build a big house, to work hard to make as much money as I can. And every time we turn around, an oppressive government sits like vultures on a highline ready to take more money out of your pocket. The American Dream has become the American nightmare. Number two, it takes approximately \$3.4 billion from responsible citizen's hands and puts it into the hands of irresponsible bureaucrats. As Representative Butler noted, you've all been in charge for a long time and look at the results of that. The states without an income tax have a greater GDP. They have a greater wage and salary growth per worker. They have a shorter duration of unemployment. You know, when you think about this from the last stats that I looked at, we have the eighteenth largest economy in the world and we have done everything possible to destroy business here in the State of Illinois. The third reason is it will increase the exodus. Hard working Illinois families have either left and they're thinking about leaving. Current businesses have either left or they're thinking about leaving. I've especially had this experience since I live along the Wabash Valley, where it's so easy to move across the river to Indiana and have a better life. And the third thing in the increase of the exodus is there is no new businesses in their right mind that are coming. And number four, none of these things fix the problem. The blue model of tax, borrow, and spend hasn't worked, it isn't working, and it will never work. It

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

has left a trail of destruction every place it has been tried from Connecticut to California. And not only would I encourage you to vote 'no', but I would encourage you to vote 'hell no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Speaker yield?"

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

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. We... you talked about spending and I want to talk about what we did in the General Services Committee. And I'm very, very proud of the work that we did on the bipartisan way to cut spending, to hold spending down. There is an opportunity, I saw it firsthand. We can control our spending if we put our minds to it. I don't... and it was, you know, a very uplifting experience for me. So, to say that we've cut everything to the bone and we can't cut anymore, doesn't ring true. At least not in the General Services Committee. Secondly, Sir, you said that if we didn't do something with this progressive tax, that our tax rate would have to be 6.25 percent."

Martwick: "According to COGFA... So, I asked COGFA to run a study. I mentioned this in the Revenue Committee. I asked them to basically do a projection between now and 2045, which is the extent of our pension ramp. And I asked them to assume that we made all the payments on our pensions as we should, and we lived up to our commitment to fund education, and that the growth and all other spending stayed at its 20-year historical average, which I point is quite low in Illinois because of the financial pressures we had."

Caulkins: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Martwick: "They said that in order to balance our budgets, we need a 6.5 percent flat tax."

Caulkins: "Six point five. And if we didn't do something sooner, every year we delayed, that 6.5 would go up."

Martwick: "Yes, every... because you're running a deficit..."

Caulkins: "Right..."

Martwick: "...you cause more debts and you put upward pressure on taxes."

Caulkins: "And when will we see the income if this Progressive Tax Amendment were to pass?"

Martwick: "2021."

Caulkins: "So, what happens between now and 2021?"

Martwick: "Well, I think that's why you're going through the exercises that you're going through in your committees, is where we're trying to scrape our way through until we get there. But there is not enough to eliminate the structural deficit, but we can patchwork something that gets us through until that time."

Caulkins: "So, we're able, for the next couple of years, to make our budget work without this tax increase?"

Martwick: "It does not... Representative, respectfully, it does not eliminate our deficits. We are not able to cut our way out of this. We saw it over the course of the last four years. We had a Governor who couldn't propose a budget that got us within \$3 billion of a balance budget. It didn't happen. And Members were not willing to vote for those cuts. It's the reality of the situation that we're in."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Caulkins: "In fact, it's sad that we're willing... not willing to vote for the cuts but we are willing to vote to increase our taxes."
- Martwick: "But we have voted for those cuts, year after year. And in fact, when we voted to override the Governor in order to pass an increase in the flat tax, that budget included a billion dollars of cuts above and beyond what the Governor himself proposed."
- Caulkins: "I understand. And... but it also concerns me greatly that you talk about structural deficits and spending money and yet, we look at this proposed tax, and 200 million out of 3-some billion only, goes towards additional pension funds. And that's very concerning. As I told you in the committee, if every dime of this proposed tax increase went to pay our bills and to pay our pensions, this might very well be a different discussion."
- Martwick: "And while I appreciate that sentiment, then what I would ask you in converse was if every dollar went to pay back our pensions, would you then be okay not living up to our commitment to fund education? We're supposed to be putting \$350 million a year so that we fund education properly, we provide a quality education, and provide property tax relief. So, it's great to pick out one thing in a silo, but we have to address all of our problems."
- Caulkins: "I understand. To the Bill, please. My fellow Members, please make no mistake about this. This is a jobs tax. We've heard from Illinois manufactures, we've heard from business leaders, we've heard from small business owners about the devastating effect this tax increase will have on our economy.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

You know, we continue to push tax cuts that will drive even more jobs and more people out of our state. I strongly oppose this attempt to replace the Illinois flat tax with this graduated tax because I know, and I believe you know, that eventually this tax will get to the middle class and will do exactly the opposite of what you are intending and proposing to do today. We didn't come here..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your five minutes has expired.

Can you please make your final comment?"

Caulkins: "We didn't come here to draw people or drive people and businesses out. We were elected, we came here, we ran to make this state more competitive, more job friendly, and to help stabilize our economy. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

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

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

Skillicorn: "Hello, Rob. How are you?"

Martwick: "I'm well. Thank you, Representative."

Skillicorn: "Very good. So, you talked about reforms, and you called this reform. Are you open to discussing other reforms, maybe something like a Constitutional Amendment for term limits?"

Martwick: "Well, I believe that those sorts of measures should be handled separately and if you're... you know, I think if that's an interest of yours, then by all means file it and we can have that discussion."

Skillicorn: "So, you'd be open to having a discussion on that?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Martwick: "Well, it's not a measure that I support,

 Representative, just I suspect this is not a measure that you support."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. What about a discussion on a Constitutional Amendment for fair maps?"
- Martwick: "Again, it's not my issue. My issue is this that we have before us. It's the fair tax. This is what I campaigned on seven years ago. It's what I filed Bills on, it's what I've had town hall meetings on, it's what I believe in. This is my issue. This is what I'm putting forward."
- Skillicorn: "And what about a discussion on a property tax hard cap?"
- Martwick: "I have worked tirelessly towards property tax relief.

 In fact, I passed a Bill in the last General Assembly that increased home owner's exemptions, saved taxpayers in Cook County between 300 and 1000 dollars a year in property taxes.

 So, I'm always happy to have that discussion."
- Skillicorn: "And I would zealously advocate for a property tax hard cap. But to the Amendment. Here we are debating a Constitutional Amendment to hike taxes when WalletHub says Illinois' tax burden is the highest in the nation. Revenue and tax receipts are off the charts at record highs right now because of President Donald J. Trump's economy and tax cuts. Is the struggle about spending or is the struggle about revenue? Hear me say this. Illinois has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. It's about the liberal trifecta of higher spending, higher taxes, and even more waste. In 2011, this Body passed a temporary tax hike with no reforms. In 2017, this Body again passed a tax hike, a permanent one I

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

might add, with no reforms. And now, this Body wants to jam through a constitutional tax hike with still no reforms. People of Illinois, people in the gallery, people watching online right now, Chicago politicians want more of your money. More money to feed their legislative pay lucrative pensions. More money to stay in patronage workers. More money that benefits Chicago Public Schools over our own suburban school districts. Hear me say this. Illinois has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. We haven't had a meaningful discussion about an Amendment for fair legislative redistricting. We haven't had a meaningful discussion about an Amendment to reform pensions. We haven't heard a meaningful discussion about an Amendment for term limits. Three items that poll off the charts. Three items that are very, very popular with all of our constituents, from all 118 districts. Hear me say this. Illinois has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. The supporters of this tax hike are politicians, lobbyists, and other political parasites, not the hard working people of Illinois. I've been calling this a jobs tax because that's exactly what it is, a tax on jobs. Ladies and gentlemen of Illinois, our issues are about spending, and not revenue. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "To the Amendment. I really struggle with how we live in some alternate universe here in Illinois, like the universal laws of economics don't apply to us. But yet they do. We're doubling down on failed policies. We're doubling down on taxing our job creators. We're doubling down on taxing our middle class families. We're doubling down on ignoring

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

any attempt whatsoever to address spending. And somehow, we think that we're going to have a different outcome. That we're going to be able to address our structural deficit and we're going to be able to grow our economy and create jobs for all the people in all the schools that we talk about all the time here. But yet, none of those things will happen because, the fact of the matter is, when you increase taxes on the job creators and on the middle class, which this Bill will do, they have no choice but to take their businesses and their children to a place where they can prosper because they're not going to be able to get ahead here. I just don't understand why we think that if we keep doing the same thing over and over again, we're going to have a different outcome. The Sponsor talked earlier about how our debt service 'exploded' like this was something like lightening that came from somewhere that had nothing to do with anything we did. Our debt service exploded because we created unsustainable pensions. Pensions that cannot be sustained at any tax level, people. And so, if we're not going to address one of the largest drivers of our costs here, something that's driving out our ability to support our children and our most fragile citizens, then why are we doing this? It's just a futile exercise and we know that we'll be back in the pockets of taxpayers very quickly. We know, because I heard in revenue less than a week ago, that Members of the Democrat Party feel that these rates are not high enough. So, people listening at home, I'm going to ask you just like my colleague did, to listen to this. Because if you think that this doesn't hit you, you're wrong. None of the drivers that have created the

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

structural deficit have been addressed in any way, shape, or form by this Body. And furthermore, even the rates that are listed there are not 'enough' in the eyes of people that are sitting here today. So, the rates that you may see between now and when you vote on this Amendment, are teaser rates. They're fake rates. They're lying rates. And the only way that we'll be able to address our structural deficit in the future is to lower the brackets and to increase the rates, because nothing has been done about our spending. In fact, we're adding new programs yet this year. So, even in a year, where we're talking about having to ask our taxpayers to sacrifice, we're adding more programs instead of using our deficit to pay down Bills or past due commitments to our pensions. So, just get ready because we're going to continue in this horrible, horrible, heartbreaking downward spiral where we continue to tax families and business creators out of the state. Please vote 'no'. Please think about how repeating the same foolish tax and spend policies will not change anything about our future. We need to address the underlying drivers, and we need to get our financial house in order, and this Amendment does none of those things."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Amendment. This Amendment is going to allow Illinois politicians to take away protections to facilitate future increases. This proposal is going to allow the door to open on multiple taxes and different incomes. This proposal is not going to help the poor and the middle class as the Sponsor says. If that was truly the case, the bracket that is being proposed from income

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

from 0 to 10 thousand dollars, would not be 4.7 percent. It would be zero. Last year, alone, the Sponsor put forth HB3522 that suggested a rate on incomes from 15 thousand to 225 thousand dollars, which I would guess is probably most of us in the room, at 6.27 percent. We have four legislative days left in this Session. We should be drafting a budget together, not amending our Tax Code, the only Illinois tax that is not regressive. We have the ability here to be growing Illinois and this is not the answer. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Kalish."

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

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

Kalish: "Mr. Sponsor, a couple questions. First of all, if we
pass this Joint Resolution today, what happens?"

Martwick: "If we pass this Joint Resolution, then the question of the Constitutional Amendment will appear on a referendum on the November 2020 election ballot. And if approved by 60 percent of the people voting, then the restriction on a flat tax will be eliminated and we can then choose to adopt a fair tax."

Kalish: "So, it sounds like we're asking the people?"

Martwick: "Yes, there's nothing that this Body can do to adopt a fair tax. The only thing that we can do is give the citizens of Illinois an opportunity to decide for themselves."

Kalish: "Can you tell me why someone would oppose the will of the people?"

Martwick: "I can only assume that the reason that they would oppose allowing people to choose is that it doesn't align with their ideological beliefs, even though the vast majority

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

of people would benefit. Under the rates that have been filed in this chamber, over 97 percent of people in Illinois would receive a tax cut. And I assume that that figure holds true in Republican districts as well as Democratic districts."

Kalish: "Thank you. Further, the proposed Amendment deletes the sentence in the 1970 Constitution that prevents the Legislature from imposing more than one tax. Can you explain why is that sentence being deleted?"

Martwick: "As you know, the current Constitution expressly prohibits graduated income taxes. It is very clear from the 1970 constitutional debates that the purpose of the one tax sentence was to prevent an end run around the flat tax by creating multiple taxes. Because we are now authorizing graduated rates to allow higher rates on higher incomes, that sentence no longer serves the purpose for which it was written. Leaving it in the Constitution will cause confusion and could undermine the core purpose of the Amendment."

Kalish: "Thank you. Given the amount of negative responses that I have received since the hearing the other day, I can only imagine the barrage that you are taking. So, I commend you for this effort. And I urge a 'yea' vote. Thank you."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, this Constitutional Amendment really does nothing to invest and grow our businesses in Illinois, large and small businesses in Illinois. The most recent noose around businesses' neck is the minimum wage which was passed by the Majority Party. And now, you're asking the electorate

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

to believe that only 3 percent of taxpayers are going to be hit to raise 3.4 billion, and that a big chunk of that middle class will not be effected, eventually. Remember, if you will, the lottery was going to be the answer to all of educations problems in Illinois. How's that worked out for us? I don't think very well. When history has shown us that the General Assembly cannot manage its finances, which has been eluded to here in our debate this afternoon, why would you throw more tax dollars at the problem without any reforms? Without any structural changes? Without anything that's going to help business and show business, not only do we want you to stay in Illinois, but we want you to grow in Illinois. To me, that's like tasting sour milk in your refrigerator and putting it in again and hoping it's going to taste better the next day you take it out. It won't. I'll be voting 'no' on the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, it's been discussed that this is something that is the... people should decide, we want to hear the will of the people. But, you know, proponents of this measure, I ask, and it has been asked earlier, why don't we allow the same opportunity for fair maps? Why don't we allow the same discussion for term limits? Why don't we allow the same discussion for the Constitutional Protection Clause? None of which proponents on that side of the aisle will allow the voters to decide, so why is this item more important for the voters to decide? I would also argue that the voters have voted, they have made a decision. And we've seen tens of

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

thousands of voters leave the State of Illinois because of measures like this which are a penalty on our working families. Those will not ... those statistics will not change. This is not going to be a job creator. This is not going to incentivize people to stay in Illinois. Many on that side of the aisle, proponents of this legislation, also discuss how this is a tax on the rich. The rich should pay their fair share. The Governor, who has done quite well, goes out of his way to say the rich need to pay more. But at the same time, billions upon billions of taxes are being proposed by Members on that side of the aisle and by the Governor in a regressive fashion which will hit all taxpayers. So, is he really trying to protect lower income workers, those on minimum wage, when he proposes taxes on everybody? True, this one small tax, or this one big tax, I should say, will be a tax on the rich right now, but all the other taxes he's proposing will hit everybody. And when I say right now, as was mentioned earlier, more than half of the states that have a progressive tax at this very moment are hitting people at 70 or 80 thousand dollars or less. Some states, the highest rate is on less than \$10 thousand of income. I think all of you realize that. The danger that this sets... the precedent that this sets, it'll be very easy to drive up these rate structures to charge more and more taxes and include everybody in the very highest rate. This is a dangerous proposal and one that will not help Illinois thrive. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Frese."

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

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

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Frese: "Representative, did I hear you correctly a while ago, you said that was it about seven years ago you actually ran for this job on a graduated income tax platform?"

Martwick: "Yes, Sir, that is correct. I knocked on doors and talked about how we could create a fair tax structure...

Frese: "Okay."

Martwick: "...providing relief to the middle class, working class, and poor."

Frese: "It's interesting you say it that way. Did you call it a fair tax at that time?"

Martwick: "I did."

Frese: "You did? You've always called it a fair tax?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Frese: "Okay. And could you explain to me why you think that it's a fair tax? More fair than the flat income tax?"

Martwick: "Certainly. Well, what it does is it creates... so it's fair for a number of reasons. By virtue of the fact... and I'm sorry, I know you don't have unlimited time. I'll try and be quick here. By virtue of the fact that it allows people who make less to pay a smaller share, it balances out our system. We... as I mentioned before, we are the eighth most regressive, most unfair tax system in this state. So, adding a system that allows for graduated rate structure, allows some relief on those that are most overburdened."

Frese: "Well, the people that would argue that the flat tax is fair tax because the more you earn, the more you pay. The less you earn, the less you pay. And everybody would then participate. Is that not fair in your mind?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Martwick: "I'm not saying... what I'm saying is that this is a fair tax because it allows... it is the same structure of the 32 other states, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government already use and it's based on the ability to pay. When people make more money, they have more disposable income and they have a greater ability to absorb a different rate structure than just a flat structure. So, it is fair based on their ability to pay."
- Frese: "Well, I'm going to disagree with you, Representative. I don't call this a fair tax. As a matter of fact, I don't think we would be talking about a graduated income tax if not for one reason and that is it will bring in to the state more money. If this... if your fair tax, if a graduated tax did not bring in more money, I'm not thinking we're even having this discussion today. It's all about bringing in more money to the state coffers. Am I on the right track there, Representative?"
- Martwick: "So, Representative... and I get where you're going but I'm going to disagree with you. When I filed a Bill three years ago that was about fair tax, the discussion was always around solving our structural problems so we could properly fund education, relieve the burden on high property taxes, pay down our debts. That's what this does. It's an acknowledgement of the mathematical realities of our fiscal problems and it creates a solution that puts us on a path to fiscal prosperity."
- Frese: "I'm sure you've looked at the numbers. As you eluded to earlier, there is a separate Bill that does set certain rates for certain levels of income that would attach to this Bill.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

And I'm sure you've looked at it, and a number of different people have looked at it, and said it might raise about 3.4 billion more dollars. Is that about what you're seeing?"

Martwick: "Roughly. I understand that with this Amendment, it's three point five."

Frese: "Right. And we just did raise and take more money out of the private sector by going from the 3.5 to 4.95 just in this last General Assembly, just last year. Now, we're going to propose to take another \$3.4 billion out of the private sector and put it in to the state coffers for us to spend at our whim. The people from my district would say that until the State Legislature can spend effectively the tax dollars they're sent, they're not deserving of any more dollars. How do you respond to that?"

Martwick: "Well, I would respond to that very simply. You'll remember, I think it was about two years ago, that as an illustration I delivered to the Members of your Caucus, calculators and a letter asking you to solve our problems with math. And it was met with some people... they enjoyed the moment, it was a little bit of fun. Some people took offense to it. But there was a reason behind it. So, 17 Members... 16 Members of your Caucus sided with us to stop a ridiculous bleeding, an accumulation of \$12 billion of additional debt. And yet, how did we determine the tax rate? Did we sit down with those calculators and figure out what we needed to balance our budget? No, we went to 4.95 percent because it was less than 5. We have never used math to solve our problems. This uses math to solve our problems. It's the right thing to do. It's done mathematically."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Frese: "And I can see I'm running out of time, if I just may finish my thoughts."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final comment."

Frese: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative. I appreciate the engagement. For almost two decades, we've had deficit spending. They say... I've been told that the last actual budget that balanced goes back to the George Ryan administration. We don't run our households that way. We don't expect anyone in the State of Illinois to run their households that way. And yet, year after year, we continue to do that in the State Legislature. I'm telling you the people in my district and around the State of Illinois are saying enough is enough. Until you want to make the tough decisions on how you're going to spend that money effectively and hold down costs, you're not deserving of more of our capital. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I believe this Constitutional Amendment will hurt not only our small business community, but also our middle class. The future unknown of these rates will leave many Illinoisans regretting this day if this Constitutional Amendment would pass. Many Illinoisans are leaving this state. I was born here like many of you. I've never seen and never heard in all my years in politics, going over four decades, people saying I've had enough, I'm going to go. Think of the higher institutional learning facilities that we have, especially up in the Chicago area and in Chicago. I'm thinking about that future student that maybe is going to Northwestern. And maybe their spouse will be going to DePaul. They may meet at a summer festival

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

in Chicago. They may meet at Wrigley field. And then after upon graduation, maybe they'll choose Illinois as their state. I believe that if this Constitutional Amendment is passed and they see the higher tax rates, that they will leave this state, maybe go back to the state they came from instead of settling here in Illinois. Never seen so many people say enough is enough, I am leaving Illinois. But that's what the people are saying and they will continue to leave if this Amendment passes. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Weber."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, what we hear today is we're talking about changing the Constitution. We're not talking about, you know, putting on the ballot fair maps. We're not talking about pension reforms. We're not talking about anything for job growth. Nothing to attract business. We're talking about changing the Constitution. So, I try to always keep my little pocket Constitution handy for when I need to pull it out. In case anyone ever wants to read it, it will be with me in committee. So, the Constitution was written, basically, to restrain government, not to restrain the people. And I think for the people in Illinois, our predecessors had the foresight enough to put in the flat tax protection. With the flat tax protection, it means we all get to pay the same on the flat tax. When we look out at how government is ran and what government has done, I've always believed that as an elected official, the number one charge that we have is to make sure that everyone is treated equally and fairly. I have people come to my office here Springfield on a daily basis, and what they want is to be

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

treated equally. And that's exactly what the flat tax does. It treats us all equally. When we have brackets that we can change, that we can adopt different numbers every year with a different... with a majority vote, what we end up having is economic class warfare. Saying that, don't worry, vote for me, we're going to pass this and someone else will pay for it. We hear it all the time. We hear it how the millionaires don't pay their fair share. We hear about the loopholes, but no one wants to address the loopholes. Why is that? So, well if it is, then good. So, what we have is wanting to create different tax brackets. And like I said, having someone that ... creating economic class warfare in my opinion is wrong. Instead of addressing the issue of spending, we'll be addressing how to pay for Bills. We see Bill after Bill passed out of each house that's more money than we take in in revenue. And the only thing that's kept that spending under control is the fact that we have a flat tax and the State Representatives and Senators are afraid to raise taxes on everyone. That's the only thing that's been able to keep it. So, I ask everyone for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just a few comments to make. You know, I've heard some of the other comments and I certainly appreciate them from our aisle here, representing their folks back home. When we talk about the will of the people, something that I'm reminded quite often from the independent business people, the farmers, the families, and those members back in my district, is I did not give you a blank check. And that rings very loud and clear here today

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

that this is a, potentially what we are giving, is as a blank check. Usually, that doesn't work out too well for our constituents when that happens. So, I'm very solid in my belief that this is a blank check. And you know, I also think about the words that have been used before that we cannot tax ourselves into prosperity. You know, eventually, the well goes dry. And as the comments have been used here today is, enough is enough. The many emails I've received from members throughout my district, the phone calls we've been receiving in the office, is pretty much that message of enough is enough. So, I certainly will be voting 'no' on this Resolution and would certainly encourage more Members to do that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sommer."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your indulgence. To my colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle, we share thoughts and opinions quite often and sometimes we don't. But we're all sincere about how we approach government. I jotted a few notes down here, just would like to give you some of my thoughts. My constituents, and I believe yours, need jobs. My daughters, perhaps your sons and daughters, grandchildren, or members of your family, are looking for jobs. Not just jobs, but good jobs. Sustainable, good paying jobs and careers. Yet the General Assembly, to me, spends so much time and energy trying to grow taxes instead of growing job opportunities. All those individuals who get a job will pay taxes. That's the true revenue growth that this state can have. Revenue growth through job growth across the state and in each of our communities. Let's work together to make

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Illinois and each of our communities... make Illinois a destination state. Make our communities and our neighborhoods places where people want to live and people can live and work. Higher taxes on our small businesses, and our job providers, and our entrepreneurs take away incentives and drive jobs and investments, and yes, our college grads away. You know, we can go to the airport, we look at the boards that say destinations and departures. Unfortunately, I think Illinois would be found under departures. I don't have all the answers. I just encourage all of you to continue to work together on these issues to provide a better economy for the State of Illinois. All the other social issues we work on together, we can make progress. Let's work together to grow jobs and not grow taxes. I'm confident that by working together, we can make Illinois the state where people want to come. Those who aren't here now, who want to come. And it can encourage our high school graduates, our college graduates, our families to stay here. Please work together. We must find a solution."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Fair tax, graduated tax, progressive tax, we hear all the different words for this. But since the Governor has released the details of his income tax that he proposed in March, even the Senate Democrats have already changed the tax rates. With these changes, the number of taxpayers who would have received a tax cut has gone down and the number of taxpayers that will pay more has gone up. Nationally, we have seen the trends going away from a graduated, a progressive tax. And, once again, Illinois has it backwards. Ladies and Gentlemen, what

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

we are discussing on this House Floor, today, is extremely important to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, to the businesses in the State of Illinois. It's not an exercise in Facebook Live. It is serious business, Ladies and Gentlemen. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Meier."

Meier: "To the Amendment. A graduated income tax is bad policy for Illinois. It will have a significant impact on farmers and their small businesses throughout my district and hurt economic development in rural Illinois. Because I am a farmer, I understand that farms and other small businesses often run in cycles. There are years when farmers don't make much money because of bad weather, such as the flooding this year, prices were low or both. And those factors farmers can't control. To get through the bad years farmers may not invest as much in their equipment or inputs or they may not have money to take on more debt. They have to add more debt. But when the good years come, because prices improved and the weather was perfect, farmers used their increased income to invest in their farms, they buy new equipment, invest in new grain bins, or pay down their debt, increasing the local economic activity in their community and their tax base. Creating a graduated income tax will punish farmers when the good years come. It may require them to pay higher tax rates and more in income taxes, keeping them from investing in their business and increasing economic activity in rural Illinois. The graduated income tax may take more of their money when they need it most to improve their business and decrease their debt load. Many small businesses operate the same way. Increased income

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

in good years is important to grow and improve the business and pay down your debt and grow economic activity in your community. Punishing farmers and business owners for good years is a terrible tax policy. It will hurt economic activity in rural Illinois. A graduated income tax will only make it easier to increase taxes in the future. I keep hearing comments that only a small percentage of Illinois will see a tax increase from this proposal. We will hear that comment over, and over, and over again in the future if the General Assembly decides to change the tax packets and increase taxes for those with lower incomes. Increasing tax rates for one bracket or creating more brackets to increase rates for more people will only impact a small portion of Illinois just like the supporters of the graduated income tax rate are proposing now. We need to quit creating new programs, use the current revenue to pay down debt. A graduated income tax is bad policy for Illinois. It will hurt our farmers and our small businesses. It will hurt economic activity in Illinois and it will make it easier to increase taxes in the future. There is nothing good about this proposal. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Parkhurst."

Parkhurst: "Thank you. To the Amendment. We need reform. You want math? Here's a simple equation. We need to spend less than we take in as a state. If we've done that, we wouldn't be in the situation that we are now. All we want to do is to continue to spend and then we keep on raising taxes to say that we need that to cover what we've spent. Well, we need to spend less than we bring in. The Illinois Constitution requires a flat tax on income. The flat tax provides important protection

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

for Illinois taxpayers by forcing politicians in Springfield to face the economic and spending realities. When the state raises income taxes, every taxpayer receives the same increase. The graduated tax will give Springfield the ability to raise taxes on whoever they want by manipulating rates and brackets. The result will be an increase on the middle class. We cannot trust Springfield with anymore of our money without real structural reform to our State Government and our political system. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. This Amendment will be a job killer. I recently read an article by the Tax Foundation that states, if this Amendment passes, we will have the third highest corporate rate and the fourth highest rate on pass-through businesses. These are our job creators. Our pass-through businesses alone, the smallest of all businesses, create 46 percent of our jobs. We must find ways to encourage job growth, not stymie it. That same article, they mentioned our neighboring states Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri have all recently cut income taxes while Illinois will be going in the opposite direction. With the passage of this Amendment, our businesses and jobs will be going in the opposite direction of Illinois as well. So far in the 101st General Assembly, we have had no serious discussions how to create jobs, and as Representative Sommer just recently said, good jobs. We're not taking advantage of the fact of everything we have going for us, being in the middle of the state, our transportation system, our education system. We need to work on that and we need to work on it

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

right now. We need good jobs in Illinois. Passing this Amendment will do nothing in regards for that. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker. My voice is still pretty much gone but there is no way I would miss being in Session today for such a historic moment and a historic record vote. So, I am rising in support of the fair tax. I actually want to speak to something I heard just a few moments ago from this side of the aisle. And I don't know if we have done the work, the definition, but equality and equity are not the same thing. When we talk about a flat tax, there is no equity in a fair tax... in a flat tax. There is no equity in a flat tax. Ninety seven percent of the people of Illinois make less than \$250 thousand a year. Therefore, it means that they are not starting at the same rate as people who make \$250 thousand or more. Therefore, there is no equity in a flat tax. I want to repeat that. Equality and equity are not the same thing. If you and I started in the same place, I had access to go to the same schools that you went to, I had a trust fund, and I had all the money in the world and everyone started in the same place, equality and equity would go hand and hand. That is not where we are, certainly not in Illinois. So, what I want to be able to reiterate today, that when we say 97 percent of Illinoisans will see no increase in their income tax or will see a decrease, 97 percent, folks, is majority. Ninety seven percent is me and my district. I don't know about you, but I make \$67,836 a year. That's what I make. Because when I decided to run and be a public servant, I decided to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

be a fulltime Legislator. I'm not sure how many of you make \$250 thousand or more, because if you make \$250 thousand or more, I could understand why you're concerned. You're going to pay a little bit more taxes, I am not. And 97 percent of us are not going to be paying more taxes. So, when we talk about a fair tax, folks, I wish we would have been taxing at a higher rate. I wish we would have been able to go to the million and looked at 10 percent. We're not there, we're at 7.95 percent. This is the best that we can get on rates right now and still be pretty comparable to everyone in our surrounding area that has a gradual income tax. And it is because of that reason, because I understand the difference between equality and equity, that I could tell you that this is the fairest of the taxes we could get so that the people that live in Illinois, the 97 percent, I'll say it over and over until my voice is completely gone, is able to see no tax increase, or stay the same, or pay less as opposed to others here, maybe some of you who make \$250 thousand or more. I stand with the majority of Illinoisans in saying that it is about darn time that we go from a flat tax that charges everyone the same when people make nothing or paying as much as someone that pays \$300 thousand and say, it is time for us to have an equitable tax. That is what the fair tax is and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. We all are supposed to represent our districts to the best of our ability. Very few people back at home have the ability to see the information that we see, to see the depth and breadth of

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Bills that we debate here in Springfield in committee and here on the floor. And I think what our side is trying to stress, here on this Memorial Day when so many are enjoying time with their families or in remembering those who paid the ultimate sacrifice, our concern is that the residents aren't going to see a fair debate on this. You want to talk about fairness? They're not going to see a fair debate because of numbers cited by the other side. It's indisputable that people are leaving the State of Illinois. It's indisputable that we're losing residents by the thousands and cumulatively by the hundreds of thousands. That's tax revenue that Illinois loses. That's also sales tax revenue that Illinois loses as those individuals go and buy goods and services in other states. And so, what that necessitates is that the state will have to make up that revenue from everyone else who is left behind, from every other business that is left behind. That's the concern. And I've done the best job that I can in talking to people from all over my district. Former Senator Daniel Biss held a town hall meeting in my district a couple of weeks ago. I attended because these are my residents, I want to hear what they have to say. It was a meeting that was organized by our local Democratic Party, and so I assume that most the people in the audience there were from one side of the aisle in terms of their voting record. But even among that audience there was concern that there would not be a vote on pension reform, that there would not be a vote on the pension clause. And so, some of the residents, during the Q&A, they raised their hand and said why can't this be tied to some kind of pension reform? Because otherwise, the sky's

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the limit on where taxes will go. This Legislature, with help from the Governor, and maybe not even this Governor, maybe in the future, it will absolutely be easier to raise income taxes on middle income families, on dual income families, on those who work hard and work overtime to better themselves, to improve their lot in life, to improve their families, and that's just wrong. It's wrong to force those individuals and those families, those business owners, to have to look elsewhere because this Legislature, this State Government, does not have the fiscal discipline to stop spending, to stop creating new programs, to stop over promising on the spending side. So, I will be voting 'no' today. I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote 'no'. And again, I cannot stress enough that when it comes to taxes, it's not just income taxes that afflict Illinois residents. Our property taxes are among the highest in the nation. We're not going to see any kind of relief on property taxes. And even if you're renting in the State of Illinois, who do you think pays the property tax? It's the owner of that building. Your rent is going to go up because we, as a General Assembly, fail to enact reforms on property taxes. I would plead the Body to vote 'no' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Once again, my colleagues from the northeast corner of the state continue to kick the rest of the people of Illinois in the head.

Earlier this spring, the minimum wage was raised on all our employers and all of our farmers throughout Illinois. These folks are already squeezed to the point of no return, along

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

with our manufacturers who are choosing not to expand and not to locate in Illinois. Where are the reforms on our property owners? Where are the reforms on our businesses and local units of government? Where is the property tax reform that's much needed? Where is the compensation worker's reform? Our rates are two to three times higher than our neighbors. What are we doing to address the backlog of unpaid bills that will get our vendors paid on a more timely manner? The Federal Government and many other states are reducing taxes and they are thriving. People are fleeing to these states in droves. Thankfully, due to recent federal tax cuts, our treasury received an extra \$1.5 billion this past month. It's time to decide, do we embrace the new federal tax policy or do we continue to go down a road, a bad road, that loses more jobs and more families to our neighboring states and beyond? It's more spending, it's more borrowing, and it's more taxing and no talk of reforms. This is failed policy. This is the third time in nine years we've asked the taxpayers of the State of Illinois to send in more of their hard earned money. The tax policy that we are debating today has long term implications that we are not likely to recover from. Why don't we talk about changing the Constitution to affect our spending like pension reform and other important reforms like term limits and fair maps? Reforms that the people are calling for. Over 600 thousand people have signed petitions to get these measures on the ballot. Let's let the people decide. Again, we need to be talking about these important changes and reforms. In closing, the people of Illinois have been voting. They've been voting with their feet. We are losing one person

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

every four and a half minutes. Losing population every year equal to a town the size of Peoria. If there was ever an example of people not being properly represented or equally represented, this is it. I will be voting 'no' on this Amendment, and I ask every one of my colleagues in this chamber to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I'm a firm believer in the old adage that they who fail to learn the lessons of the past are condemned to repeat them. So, I'd like to take a little trip down memory lane, if you would. Back in 2008, at the height of the economic crash, Illinois' tax revenues in 2009, when our tax rate was 3 percent, dropped \$1.6 billion in one year. \$1.6 billion. If this Bill... if this Amendment passes and we get the rates that are indicated in the Senate's rate structure or whatever comes out of it... according to our analysis, there are 24 thousand people in this state who will pay the maximum rate on income of 7.95 percent, amounting to \$2.4 billion of income. When the crash happened, our tax rates were low and they were flat. If we lose ... if we have another downturn in the economy, the loss of revenue across that small number of people whose income is derived from the very things that will be the most... will suffer the most from the crash will be devastating. The response from most of the states that suffered the most in the 2008 crash was to raise income tax rates, and we were no different. In 2011, we raised our rate to five percent. It was supposed to be temporary and as it turned out, it was. But in 2014, Speaker Madigan proposed what he called the

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

millionaires' tax. And if you look at it, it's not that much different from what's being proposed now. It was a 3 percent surcharge on our 3 percent tax rate. So, we're not talking a great deal of difference in terms of structure here. One of your colleagues, if you were here in 2014, said as follows, 'The real issue here is that this would help enable the Governor to continue business as usual and continue tax policies that have choked off Illinois' recovery, and I will not allow that to happen.' The speaker was my predecessor in office, Jack Franks. Jack was right. The millionaire tax was wrong then, this tax is wrong now. The Governor has said that this will raise \$3.25 billion in the first year. But based upon the Bills we've passed this year, that money has already been spent. The big issue hanging over us is our debt. The Governor ... looking at our backlogs of Bills is huge but the pension debt is worse. The Governor has said he's going to take \$200 million out of his tax increase and put it toward the pensions. But you know something? When you're taking 25 percent of general revenue and putting it towards pensions now, and by 2045, the amount of money that we need to put into the pension plan to achieve 90 percent under the Edgar Ramp is going to be \$20 billion. That's a rounding error, folks. This plan will not work. Do we need tax reform? You bet we do. This isn't the way to do it. We need a global review of our entire tax system, with an eye toward creating a system that tracks our economy, that doesn't create class envy and class warfare and take money from those who are the most productive in our society. We need a tax system that tracks our economy. We need to talk about income taxes, sales

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

taxes, property taxes, user fees, all of it. There's also a moral hazard here, because people are going to look at this and they're going to think that by passing this Amendment, we will have solved our state's problems and we know that that is not the case. We can start down the path of true tax reform, but it takes an acknowledgement on everybody's part that this is not going to work. If there is a principle Democrat on that side of the aisle who will listen to what Jack Franks said four years ago and vote 'no', we can do something good..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final remark."

Reick: "...for this state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Grant."

Grant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Swapping our flat tax income... excuse me. Swapping our flat income tax for a graduated income tax won't make our economy better. It'll just make it easier for this Body to raise our taxes. Springfield has proven incapable of spending tax dollars wisely. So, giving them more of what we work hard to earn, will only give them more incentive to spend. This Body should keep... this Body should reject the graduated income tax. Someone will have to make up that money and that will more than likely be the middle class. The high income tax rates will gradually creep downward and no longer will only be the rich paying, it'll be the middle class. The middle class generates the most tax revenue for our state. And removing the flat tax will directly hurt the middle class over time. Governor Pritzker, himself, says no guarantee that the tax rate table won't change. Instead of pushing the flat (sic

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

fair) tax hike plan in hopes of boosting revenue, we should push for structural reforms that allow the state to stop squandering revenue. Let us have new hires move into a 401K savings program and decrease property taxes immediately. That's just for a start. Oh, I... vote."

Speaker Turner: "Are you finished, Representative? Chair recognizes Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've listened today as I've heard this described as a reform as a way to solve our state's problems and to... told that we should listen to our constituents, and I couldn't agree more. I've heard from my constituents. I heard from my constituents while I've been meeting with them in the community, and I've heard from my constituents that have called in solely on this. And while I do not live in a district that has a majority of wealthy people who will be affected by the proposed rates that have been floated so far, the vast majority, the overwhelming majority, almost everybody who has contacted my office, has asked me to vote against this. And that's because we have a problem in this state. We have a trust problem. We have a trust problem that we won't do with the money what we tell voters we're going to do, and there's good reason for this. There's the 2011 tax increase that didn't go to what it was supposed to. There's the 2017 tax increase that hasn't done what it was supposed to. And now, we're asking for yet more income taxes. This is causing a problem and it's causing my constituents, when I'm with them in the district and talking to them, telling me they're leaving. They're leaving already because taxes are too high. They're leaving because we have

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

problems in this state we refuse to address. If we want reform, Representative Spain and Representative Halbrook talked about reforms we could actually start putting in place to start growing and expanding our economy, to lessen the tax burden on our residents, so that it's spread out over more people and we'd have more revenue coming in. That's the way to address this situation. These are antigrowth measures. This is an anti-growth measure. It's not going to work. We cannot tax our way out of the situation we are in. We are already one of the highest taxed states in this country. And passing this Amendment is just going to drive businesses and business owners out of the state, which will in turn cause the middle class to lose jobs and end up leaving the state as well. We're already driving these people out of the state. Numbers don't lie, folks. They're coming in to us from all over. The Census Bureau is telling us we are losing population. population. We are We are losing businesses. And our youth, our youth are leaving. And I'm sure our youth are leaving for a number of reasons, but I also know that, again, in talking in my district with my constituents and my community, they're leaving because they don't see opportunity here. And the saddest part is their parents, who have been here their entire lives, are telling these youth, go to school out of state and find an opportunity elsewhere because a future does not exist for you in Illinois the way it once did for me. I'm not looking to create the past. I'm looking to create a better future, a better future for our youth. I still have kids here. I still have grandkids here. I want them to stay. I want a better future for them.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

But trying to tax people further, to drive more people and more businesses, is not the way to do it. If we pass this Amendment, we are going to face a double loss before it even gets to the voters. We are going to lose high income earners and the potential revenue, whatever this tax increase seeks to capture from them, as well as the taxes they're already paying to our state. We're also going to lose the jobs that they provide to our workers here, and we're going to lose that tax revenue. And eventually then, this tax is going to have to fall on somebody. The flat tax is the last great protector from future General Assembly's doing the wrong thing. If you have a graduated tax, this Body, no matter who's in it, can take and increase taxes on small percentages of the population without facing any major repercussion at any time. It can hit the middle class, the lowest earning income members of our society, it can hit anybody at any time. If you have a flat tax though, and you raise it on the people of the entire state, you better have a very good reason for doing it because now you've just upset every single one of your constituents. Don't change that protection. We are sending a message... if we vote for this today, we are sending a message to both people inside and outside the State of Illinois. Its saying don't come to Illinois if you want to succeed. Because even if everything goes as being proposed currently, if you succeed, we're going to take more of your money from you. Business, you're not welcome. If you want to help this state, if you want to save this state, please do not vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bailey."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Bailey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill and to the Sponsor. I carry a very consistent message from Southeast Illinois and that message is very simple. We don't trust you with our money. This has been proven time and time again. As a matter of fact, it was proven recently. July 4, 2017, we went through... it had a 32 percent tax increase that, I believe, was supposed to answer everything. And now, we are deeper in debt, we have more problems, and guess what? We need more money. What a dishonor it is to sit here, Memorial Day, 2019, and discuss a series of pathetic Bills that burden our citizens, that strip our citizens of their freedoms and of their moral convictions. But yet, here we are and this what we do in Illinois. When are we going to change this? This can be changed. I sit in Appropriations with the Human Services and Education. We made cuts, that looked good at first, and then we came back and all of a sudden more money pops up out of nowhere. We even met the Governor's budget and we still had money left over. And I just had a Representative from the other side of the aisle come over here and talk to me and tell that maybe I should give up money out of my district because I'm against this tax raise. This is a medieval attitude that exists in Illinois to suggest that you want to bilk my district for their taxes, yet we should have nothing in return for it. I am willing... I've invited many of you to come to my district to see the difference that exists between true Southern Illinois and the rest of the state. We don't have the opportunities that you do. We cannot afford any further taxes. We simply can't. I want to show you that. But then, I also want to come and see what you have so I can gain

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

a better understanding of why you have this attitude, because I don't get it and neither do the residents of the 109th District. We need stuff. We need stuff bad. I've got eight grandkids all under the age of six and I am very concerned. I want them to live by me. I want them to function and flourish in Illinois. But you know, as well as I do, that those opportunities aren't going to be here in 10 or 15 years. They're simply not going to be here. When are we going to be responsible to the taxpayers of Illinois? I farm for a living. I have good years, I have bad years. When I have bad years, we have to make cuts, we have to get by. I don't get everything that I think that I need. We sacrifice, we do without. That's what we do. Many of you have grown up that way, many of you have lived that way. Let's work together, let's go through some lean years, and let's get the foundation of our state solid. Thank you very much. We must vote 'no' on this to protect the future of this state."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Davis."

Davis: "I'll say to the Bill, but probably more importantly to the previous speaker. I wish he had characterized our conversation with a little bit more accuracy than he just indicated, as if to say that his district needs to give something up so that mine can flourish. That wouldn't be correct. So, he and I both are in the K-12 Appropriations Committee. And as we were dealing with our budgetary challenges, and after we had initially put a budget of cutting spending across the board, it was indicated to us that there may be some additional revenue to come, therefore here are some dollars that you can spend. And the only thing that I

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

may say relative to his comments is that when it came time to of transportation, the proration transportation, for his district based on the additional revenue, he didn't say no. He didn't say stop. He didn't say I didn't want that. He supported that spending. And my simply saying is that if you want the money in his district like he indicated in committee that he did, that these are the kind of votes that are necessary in order to try to make that happen. That's what we need to do, Ladies and Gentlemen. So again, whether you philosophically agree or not, I can assure you that the increases that this side of the aisle, that we're putting in the budget, that we're trying to increase program, we're trying to increase K-12 funding. He wasn't even sure that even if the new school funding formula impacted his district. It does. It does impact his district just like it impacts mine. Now he's smiling, but I asked you that question, and you said I don't know. Now, if I'm not telling the truth, I encourage you to stand up and tell me that I'm not telling the truth because you did say I don't know, and I said it does. I sponsored it. I know for a fact that it increases spending in your district. I know that for a fact. But again, when it came time to say I'd like to have more money for that particular line, didn't say no, didn't say no we shouldn't do that. And just like he just said, why would I give up money for my district. And I agree with you, why would you give up money from your district? But the only reason you get it is because we're willing to take a vote just like this to make sure that those resources exist. And that's across the board. That is absolutely across the board. That's the quiet

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

conversation that many on your side of the aisle say, well, we don't want to take the vote for it, but we'd like to see where that money is going. We'd like to make sure that our organizations get resources. We'd like to make sure that our communities get resources, but we're not willing to take that vote. You and I had a conversation about capital, I said what about capital? Do your mayors want capital? You said, well, my mayors support my position. But I can assure you that if we take that vote, your mayors are going to be asking where's my road project? Where is it? Where am I getting money for my buildings? How do you think that that happens? Because we have to take tough votes like this. Now, it'd be nice to have you all take that vote with us. You've all indicated that it's not something that you're willing to do. Now, in a perfect world, at least in my perfect world, if you're not willing to take the vote, why should I share the money? In a perfect world. But this is not that perfect world. We're going to have to figure out, based on those kinds of efforts, where these resources are going. And just like I like to see resources in my district, I understand that communities like yours need resources. Therefore, you're going to benefit from my hard work. Now, you said something to me that I took a little offense with. I'm not going to drop it into this conversation, you and I can continue to have that discussion as well, but the idea that a district like mine is all Chicago or a part of Chicago is absolutely wrong. I'm in a suburban district and suburban districts have the same types of challenges that your district has as well. But again, these are the things that I'm willing to do to try to help make

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

sure that my district has those resources. It's unfortunate that you... and you indicated that you haven't been here that long and I understand that, but I understand... I wish that someone like you would be willing to take this vote with me to make sure that the entire state gets and benefits from this kind of effort. Because again, this is the tough part of what we do and it's easy to say 'no'. It's more difficult, actually, to say 'yes'. You think 'no' is the tough part? Trust me, 'no' is the easy part. Say 'yes'. Say 'yes'. Are you willing to put it on the line to say 'yes' to make sure that my communities receive what they need to have, that my transportation my school transportation, gets what it needs? Are you willing to do that? Clearly, you're not. And that's too bad that you're not willing to do that. But for any of us in this chamber, these are..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, please make your final remark."

Davis: "Yes. These are those tough decisions that we have to make.

And while I understand none of you want to vote for it,

hopefully afterwards, and it passes and we pass a budget

that's going to make those increases and put those resources

back in your districts, it would be nice if you would just

say thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes... Chair recognizes Representative Severin."

Severin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I sure hope you're wearing good shoes today. I'm sure your feet are feeling great. To the Amendment, please. I'll be brief. That's tough for a preacher's son, but I'll do it because I know time is short and there's a lot of expansion of the State Government left

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

to get to. Let me begin by saying I have not risen on this floor very often in my three years. Lou Lang knows I was always nervous. Here to offer broad, philosophical statements instead. I've used my time to introduce people from my district, to pass Bills important to my constituents, and to listen intently and make informed decisions when I vote on legislation. Today's a different story. Today, the free market is under attack in Illinois. Small business owners, like myself, are under attack. Job creators are under attack. Southern Illinois is under attack. During the Governor's first speech before this chamber, I took special note of one of his promises. I believe the words he used were something along these lines, he wanted to work with us to create a downstate revitalization plan. And I was really excited about that. I thought, hey, maybe this is a new day. Maybe this Governor gets it. Southern Illinois needs help. We need more jobs. We need investment and infrastructure improvements. We need to be more competitive with states like Indiana, Missouri, and Kentucky. We need relief from the over burdensome environmental regulations and the crushing mandates from the state. Sadly, folks, there has not been much words of encouragement coming to Southern Illinois and downstate. As I'd like to call it, the revitalization plan is yet to come. Instead the Super Majority of Democrats in this chamber and in this Senate rammed through a massive spike in the minimum wage during the first weeks of this Session. This action will mean our minimum wage will be aimed almost double the wages in our neighboring states. And when news broke out that Illinois took in more money than we were expecting,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

instead of steering toward fiscally sanity, we see radical expansions of access to taxpayer funded abortions, putting us on the eleventh hour, a government fingerprint registration data base that flies in the face of the Second Amendment of the Constitution, and now a progressive tax hike. None of the items I've just mentioned are going to revitalize Southern Illinois' economy. Let's for once, for once, stand for the citizens of the United States that are living in Illinois and paying the highest combined state, local, sales taxes in the nation already. I strongly urge a 'no' vote on this legislation and any of the legislation that raises taxes. We need more taxpayers, not more taxes. Let's get back to work to balance the budget using existing revenues, pay down our Bills, let's restore fiscal sanity. Thank you. I urge... I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Chesney: "Representative, are you of the opinion that the middle class need relief?"

Martwick: "I am."

Chesney: "Thank you. To the Amendment. So, I live in a rural area that represents six counties. Takes me about an hour and half to get from one end of the district to the other. Generations of families have been there quite a long time. And the people in my district and the people throughout the State of Illinois are certainly tired of being tired. But I think we do share a lot of common interests. And we've all knocked a lot of doors, we've all gone to spaghetti dinners and pancake

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

breakfast, and they asked us to do a few things, 'Will you please invest in public safety?' That's reasonably simple. Fix our roads, fund our schools, lower some property taxes. But most importantly, we want our kids and grandkids to want to come back here. That's very important. Now, this Body is going to take up a vote and my side of the aisle represents 4.8 million people and the Majority Party can't convince one person to say 'yes'. Not one in the House or the Senate will vote for this Constitutional Amendment. But in 1982, we did have an income tax of 2.5 percent, and surely we had roads, schools, and we invested in public safety. But we have a population loss and people are no longer saying 'yes' to Illinois. They are just simply leaving. We are now using the taxpayer as an ATM machine. Time and time again, more and more money, little, little results. But we decide the 'what' in this Assembly and the Governor decides the 'how'. We decide what our priorities are. Ninety seven percent get a tax break. So, to my progressive colleagues on the other side of the aisle, for somebody making \$10 thousand, you are going to give them a tax break of \$6.67. Cannot even buy a Jimmy Johns' sandwich, congratulations. Way to fight for the working poor. For somebody making 100 thousand or less, \$37.75 cannot even fill up a tank of gas. Way to work for the middle class. So, how are you going to explain to your district, when you raise taxes on everybody, for the most part, in the State of Illinois, eventually, to the tune of 3.522 billion? And you're going to go back to your district and say somebody that makes \$10 thousand or less, you gave \$6.67 tax break. However, somebody making \$100 thousand or less will receive \$37.75. To

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

my progressive Members on the other side of aisle, why are we not fighting for the middle class? Where's their voice? Is their voice not being heard? Six dollars and sixty-seven cents for the working poor. That's a heck of a negotiation. But the \$37.75 will be erased when the Democratic Majority passes the gas tax. So, let me ask you this. Speaker Pelosi once famously said, a thousand dollars is crumbs. What is \$37.75? To the working poor, \$6.67, again, cannot even buy a Jimmy Johns' sandwich. But I know somebody in this chamber has been a Speaker for a very long time. And like many of you on the other side of the aisle, our first inauguration is something we never forget. And I heard it time and time again, we're just people helping people. Folks, this Amendment is people hurting people, and I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll go to the Constitutional Amendment. But I want to really, just briefly, address previous comments from the others side of the aisle directed at a colleague from Southern Illinois. And I would just say it is offensive to say that our communities and our education system shouldn't receive money from tax increases just because we don't vote for them. I've got a newsflash for you. People in our districts, they pay taxes as well. Yeah, people in Southern Illinois, they pay taxes. We're just as entitled to the spending as what you are. To this Bill. This state has major issues, nobody denies that. But low taxes is certainly not one of them. This Body has done nothing. It's done nothing to address the major issues that's holding our economy at ransom. We've done nothing to relieve the pressure of middle

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

class homeowners. All we ever do in this Body is asks for taxpayers to put up more money, to prop up an unsustainable government system that's led by politicians who have shown over and over they've proven themselves untrustworthy with that money. Illinois politicians need to grow a backbone. Dealing with these big issues requires political courage. That's what's called for at a time like this. Fiscal responsibility, fiscal restraint, proper prioritization. These are the principals that should be directed in our policy in this chamber. We can't address out of control property taxes, we can't properly fund our education system without addressing the major cost drivers. Pensions, Medicaid, the sheer volume of government, burdensome regulations on our industries. If we're going to open up the Constitution, let's talk about an Amendment that gives us the flexibility to make pension systems fair and sustainable for future generations without crowding out the core services that we see right now. This Body needs to deal with the issues, the real issues. Taxpayers in my districts, in your districts, they deserve accountability and they're not getting it from this government. Here's an idea. Let's put some policies in place that would spur economic growth. Let's stop stifling our economy with job killing regulations like we do over and over in this chamber. And listen up, this is important. A growing economy that creates jobs and opportunities is the only sustainable revenue pathway that'll sustain the future of this state. Until this Body gets their fiscal act together, not another dime should be asked from hard working taxpayers, period. This legislation does nothing to address the

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

structural issues. It does not promote economic growth. It increases the power of the permanent political class under this dome. I was sent here by hard working taxpayers in Southern Illinois to fight for real reform, promote sound fiscal policies, and limit our exposure to the career political class here in Springfield. This legislation completely flies in the face of every one of those principles. So, I'd urge all my colleagues to vote 'no' to the status quo. And for once, for once, I would ask this Body to stand up for the overtaxed, overburdened Illinois taxpayers. Vote 'no' on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Stava-Murray: "My fellow Members, I'm alarmed. I'm alarmed not by this Constitutional Amendment, but by the lack of originality and borderline plagiarism happening in the commentary of some of my colleagues across the aisle. Am I in the Illinois House or am I listening to an Illinois Policy Institute podcast, is a question I had to ask myself several times. Many reference irresponsibility. This is irresponsible rhetoric bought and paid for by dark money. Let me repeat, this is irresponsible rhetoric bought and paid for by dark money. Irresponsible rhetoric that relies on popularizing buzz words like blank check and insatiable appetite for spending. Blank check doesn't even make any damn sense. The last time... the first time I heard this was from the actual Illinois Policy Institute and it didn't make any sense then because we already can raise taxes and we did raise taxes. This is just something

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

that's thrown out there to make people feel scared. And the only insatiable appetite I see for money is the campaign accounts of many, many across the aisle from the money they get from the millionaires who don't want to pay their fair share. So, when we're talking about irresponsible rhetoric, irresponsible rhetoric purports a flat tax impacts everyone equally. That's just untrue. It doesn't impact everyone equally. When people are making a very low amount, a flat tax is taking out that money that they need to pay for toilet paper or their other toiletries or food. Irresponsible rhetoric has asked, why there aren't any rates or caps in this proposal? This is a Constitutional Amendment, it would be financially irresponsible and bad legislation to put rates or caps in this Amendment. So, asking that question as though it should be there is simply a misleading device meant to, I don't know, show something to your people back home. I'm not sure what it is. This irresponsible rhetoric is designed to ignite fears of the middle class who actually benefit from this Amendment. What I didn't hear anyone, anyone, from across this aisle speak about is how our current policies make it harder for the middle class to actually stay in the middle class year over year. What I didn't hear anyone speak about is how our current policies make it harder for those of least means to 'pull themselves up by their boot straps' because the flat tax is actually taking away the boot strap they could pull themselves up with. Finally, I heard a lot of consternation about killing jobs and losing people. Data actually suggests that the wealthy don't bother to leave when their taxes rise. So, let's be clear about one thing, the

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

only votes on this Amendment that will kill jobs are the 'no' votes for the soon to be out of work Representatives. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill, but I know this has gone on for a really long time. And before I kind of speak to the Amendment, Representative, just in good fun, earlier I think you... I would say you kind of championed yourself as a constitutional champion of the people and just want to remind you that my seatmate here does t-shirts, and should you need a cape later, we might be able to get one for you. But in fun, I'm just saying that in fun because I know you're carrying this Bill, but in reality, this is really the Governor's plan. And so, today, I'm rising in opposition, specifically, of the Governor's plan, even though there are no... you know, we know that his tax plan is different than even what we are seeing from the Senate with whether you call it a graduated income tax or the progressive income tax. So, my opposition to this legislation really started back in January when I signed onto a House Resolution that stated that this side of aisle was 100 percent in opposition of the graduated tax system. So, I, like my colleagues over here, believe that the real reason behind the push for the legislation is the desire for unending government expansion and the expansion at the expense of the middle class and high earning small businesses and individual taxpayers. So, that being said, as offensive as the proposed rate increases are to farmers and small businesses, the increases to individuals are just as punitive. We're being told this is

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

a financially responsible plan. This is coming from the same Majority Party that introduced, already this year, billion in new spending in just this Session. To me, those actions and this attempt to change the Constitution from a system where everyone pays the same to one that punishes success, represents an insatiable appetite to grow the size, scope, and cost of government. What exactly will this \$3.3 billion tax hike on the people of Illinois pay for? Let me just talk about a couple of them. How about taxpayer funding of elective abortions for any reason, at any time, during a pregnancy. How about a massive new bureaucracy that targets law abiding qun owners. How about a huge expansion of government because, according to some of my friends who are Chicago politicians which control every level of power in Illinois, that government knows best, not individuals. We're often told that this plan is the only fiscally responsible path forward. Well, House Republicans, for weeks, have argued that if the working groups would continue their efforts, that we could have a surplus using existing revenue streams. The working groups didn't even consider the Governor's 8 to 10 additional proposed sales tax hikes when they were putting the budget together and we still had enough money to meet our obligations and pass a responsible budget. House Republicans have also pointed out for weeks that the fiscal outlook for the State of Illinois is looking better for maybe as far out as the next five years. So, what's the rush to put a Constitutional Amendment on the ballot to forever enshrine a graduated tax system. Our state is losing businesses to neighboring states that border my district, Representative

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Windhorst's district, Representative Reitz's district, Representative Greenwood's district, Representative Stuart's district, Representative Bristow's district, all of us. In we're saying with this Constitutional Illinois, what Amendment and the accompanying Bill that sets the rates is this, the higher you climb, the more successful you are, the more jobs you create, the more the State of Illinois is going to tax you, regulate you, and increase fees on you. There's another way, folks. We can pay our bills, pass a balanced responsible budget, and eliminate this policy from consideration by simply using existing revenues. I'm asking those who represent deep Southern Illinois, the region that we all love and work together on, to join me today in voting 'no' on this jobs killing, tax hiking, progressive income tax. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I'm very disappointed, today, in the process that has gone on with this Amendment and how we're proceeding. You know, I think that we were, before this year, on a relatively good path of working together, of working in bipartisan fashion, and of showing what we can get done when we do work together. Many of you know in this Body that I thought it was unconscionable, immoral, unacceptable when we slipped into a third fiscal year without a budget. And there was many people that worked together in getting the 2018 budget. And because of that, because of that working together, we were able to continue working together and passed very good education reform funding... education funding reforms that some in this Body had

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

fought for, for three decades. And we were able to do that by working together... because we worked together in 2018. Then we continued on to the 2019 budget and because of the success that we showed and the 2018 budget, we were able to get a balanced 2019 budget by working together. Now, fast forward to this year, we've seen that bipartisanship disappear. We've seen the minimum wage that is going to be so bad for jobs in our area. And now, we've seen this process continue to go forward. There is nothing bipartisan about this process. Make no mistake, there is no reason, right now, that any Illinoisan should see a tax increase. There is no reason for any Illinoisan to see a tax increase. We have proven what we can do when we work together in bipartisan fashion. We've seen the education reform pass when many people thought it was unacceptable, when many people thought there was no way, no possible way that it could get done. We got it done. Why don't we continue to go down the path of working together in bipartisan fashion? Why don't we continue to work together for real meaningful workers compensation reform, for pension reforms, for other reforms to bring jobs and confidence back to the State of Illinois? We've started that path. We've proven that we can do it. We should not eliminate that path right now. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm going to use a quote that was stolen from somebody, but it wasn't IPI, who I've disagreed with in the past. I'm going to steal a quote from the Sponsor of the Bill. He mentioned earlier our inability to manage our finances. For years, the Majority

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Party has proven the inability to manage our finances. For decades, the Majority Party has proven their inability to manage our finances. He spoke of reform. It's interesting that his version of reform is to continue to watch taxes or push taxes up on Illinoisans in our great state, while being unwilling to make reforms on the other side of the balance sheet that affect the spending. A colleague earlier mentioned that just this year, \$12 billion in new spending has been proposed. Twelve billion dollars in new spending. Just a couple years ago, taxes were raised and brought in \$5 billion of new funds. Every year, annual, \$5 billion. This proposes to increase taxes another three and a half billion dollars. And then, other various proposals that will directly affect the middle class, propose to bring in an additional \$3.4 billion, for a total of \$11.9 billion of new revenue. That does not even cover the proposed new spending just from this year. If a business saw their sales go down, what do they do? Do they raise prices if their sales are going down? No, they don't. That's what we're proposing. We are losing customers. Those are Illinoisans that are moving to other states. There is a reason why Apple is investing in new cell phones and not in the rotary phone. We have to invest in a new process, a new State of Illinois. We have to reform the efficiencies to allow us to earn the dollars that the State of Illinois brings in. If we provide a better product for the people of the State of Illinois, people will move here. They will want to be Illinoisans instead of wanting to move out of the State of Illinois. This Bill relies on the fairytale that somebody else is going to pay the Bill. We all know there is no such

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

thing as a free lunch, somebody has to pay for it. But as overburdened taxpayers, the taxpayers that are paying the most taxes, as they leave, who is going to be left to continue to cover all of this additional spending? It's going to be the middle class, and most of them are going to be looking for jobs because the businesses have left with them. The Majority Party has not only proven their inability to manage our finances, they have shown a complete unwillingness to do so. Raising taxes on the people of Illinois is not the answer. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would say one thing I agree with some of the speakers on the other side of the aisle is that we need to talk about the overall tax burden here in Illinois. And in Illinois, the bottom 20 percent of the people, with an average income of a little over \$12 thousand a year, pay an effective tax rate of 14.4 percent. What about the top one percent in the State of Illinois? They pay an effective state and local tax rate of 7.4 percent. For the tax rate of the millionaires and billionaires of this state are paying an effective tax rate that is half of what the poorest Illinoisans pay. And so, even if you believe that a flat tax is the fairest tax, as my colleague from Springfield and a couple others have said, we do not actually have a flat state and local tax system in Illinois. We have a graduated state and local tax system in Illinois, except it's one where the poorest pay the highest rate while the wealthiest among us pay the least. And this leads, as it has for years, to the working class and the poor falling further and further behind.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

In the past 35 years, the average income of the top one percent in Illinois nearly tripled. Tripled. And at the same time, the income for the rest of us, the other 99 percent of Illinoisans, has barely budged. Where the top one percent used to make only, only 10 times as much as the rest of us, they now make 30 times as much over that same time period. And so, when we look at the overall tax burden, so important to my friends across the aisle, it's dramatically lower for the wealthy. And what's worse is that as the rest of us fall behind, as the working class and the poor fall behind year after year, the State of Illinois has cut services, terrible cuts. I had to stand in this chamber and cut higher education by 10 percent to try to balance our budget back in 2017. We cut Department of Natural Resources to the point where we can't maintain things like the Hennepin Canal in my district and others and our other natural gifts. We should, we can, and we must fix this. This Constitutional Amendment is the first step in fixing it. It's the first step for fixing it for the working people of the State of Illinois. I'm in strong support of this Amendment and would ask my colleagues to please join me and vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Long afternoon. Thank you very much for your patience, Sir. To the Resolution, if I may. Nine states have no income tax, nine have a flat tax, meaning about a third of the states have either a flat state income tax or none at all. Illinois has forfeited the title of the fifth most populous state to the Common Wealth of Pennsylvania. And the five most populous states to have no

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

income tax, that being Florida and Texas, and Pennsylvania has a flat tax. The trend across the nation has been a shift away from the progressive taxation that we're talking about today. In 2011, Utah switched to a flat tax. In 2014, North Carolina followed suit. Just last year, our neighbor Kentucky did the same. Twice in the last five years, Colorado voters have rejected ballot initiatives to adopt a graduated income tax there. Twice. In fact, the last state to implement a graduated income tax, my friends, was Connecticut 30 years ago. Thirty, with disastrous results. Before the change, they had higher than average employment and lower than average poverty. Their tax was sold to be, believe it or not, middle class relief. Ah, heard that before. And would reduce property tax. And it said more taxes, more middle class was hit, jobs were lost, and as you can imagine, the labor force shrank. We're talking about raising our taxes at a time when the states around us, some of our competitors, are headed in the opposite direction. Every year, the Tax Foundation publishes a new addition of the State Business Tax Climate Index. It's a measure of state structure. And Illinois currently ranks, I'm very sorry to say, number 36 overall. However, if the state were to adopt the graduated rate structure we're talking about today that is proposed, the state's overall rank would drop even lower, perhaps even as low as 48. Not much farther to go, guys. It reminds me of an old saying that we've heard before but is very relevant today. When you are digging a hole, and yes we are, the first thing you do is to stop digging. Friends, we received \$1.2 billion more than we expected this year. We're planning for 800 million, perhaps

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

more next year, to keep in our budget for next time. Instead of talking about how we want to spend this on new programs or expand programs in our work groups, we need to take a look at how this money can be used to help pay down the debt, spend down the \$130 billion pension that is growing every day. If we just added \$250 million to the pension payment every year for 25 years, just 25 million... or 250 million, excuse me, we would have over \$15 billion to help pay down the debt. And as Senator Dirksen once said, that is real money. My friends, I know this is important priority for our Governor but I would encourage this Body and this administration to change our focus toward improving this economy and encouraging job growth and encouraging new businesses to come here in Illinois, and this doesn't do that. And also, help find ways to reward the businesses that we have here today. Businesses, my friends, are watching what we are doing today and they are watching what we are going to do very, very soon. This income tax, or income Resolution that we're talking about, is not the way to do it. And along with the minimum wage Bill we passed a little while back it will stifle growth again. Stop digging. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, I know we've had a long debate. Some Members are having trouble hearing the debate in the chamber. So, can we please bring the side discussions to a minimum or take them to the rear of the chamber? The Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Illinois managed for the first 150 years of its existence without an income tax and the other states that have avoided it like

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Texas, Tennessee, and Florida have skyrocketing economies. The notion we need this type of Amendment and tax scheme going forward is a lie. It's a lie that this is a fair tax. The top income earners in this state already pay in the largest percentage of overall taxes. This tax system you propose is going to be a tax system where the politically privileged win and the ordinary people lose. It's a lie that this tax scheme is going to solve our budget problems. Billion dollar windfall in tax revenue this year, and did you put it towards paying down our debt, paying down our Bill backlog? No, you proposed more new spending. And by the way, if you want to help spending on education, quit imposing politically correct mandates on our schools and free them up for reading, math, and science. It's a lie that the unfixed rates are going to provide 97 percent of citizens with a tax cut. Everyone will pay more than they did in 2014. Fifty years ago, it was a lie that instituting the income tax in the first place would allow Illinois to pay down all its outstanding pension debt. That 2.5 percent income tax rate, the money came in and the Legislature refused to control spending and failed to keep that pension promise. That temporary three percent increase in the 1980's was also promised to pay down the pension debt, and that was a lie. The pension liability never went away. Same was true in the 1990s. And then we even had the pension ramp. So, what a shocker the idea that restructuring debt by adding more debt, that didn't work either. Legislators promised that in 2011 that an increase of five percent would solve the state's debt problems and unfunded liabilities. Some of you were here. You promised it was temporary and you

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

were wrong. That was a lie. And again, our debt is now at a point one step above junk status. Never in my generation's history have Illinois tax increases ever been a long term solution to balancing our budget. And if history is any indication, it's not going to work this time either. From the time the income tax went into effect until today, the funding ratio for our pension programs was 41.8 percent, today it's 41.2 percent. But our promises have skyrocketed from 2.5 billion to over 130 billion or more today. I put forth a Constitutional Amendment to fix that problem and you wouldn't even give that a public hearing, Representative Martwick. My district tells me that Illinois is already number one when it comes to overall tax burden whether you are rich, poor, or middle class. We are taxed out. And as I think about the very sad events of the countdown to the end of this Session, all I see are more unseemly schemes. We're here today on a holiday weekend when we should be honoring those who gave all for our nation. And instead, our colleagues in the Super Majority have determined that Constitutional Amendments and mandates that are meant to be treated carefully and tread on with the utmost caution, we can toss all that aside in less than a day of debate. I know some people on the other side of the aisle love the notion of soaking the rich for more money. Forget for the time being that most of these so called evil income earners that your side of the aisle hates, despises, and frequently denigrates are actually our state's job creators. And unlike our Governor, they didn't inherit their wealth, they actually earned it. If you want to talk about equity, they've contributed more than anyone else to the Illinois

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Treasury and they take out little. They don't get the billions spent on food stamps, Medicaid, social services, financial aid. They pay for that for everyone else. And if you want to talk about equity, it's going to take one year of 2021 revenue to figure out that you're soaking the rich plan only provides so much extra revenue and we're still deficit spending. It won't ever be enough when this Body's desire to spend is so insatiable. So, to the middle class, you'll go next. To the working poor, you'll go next. And you'll be pulling copper wire out of the last pennies of hard working families and workers in Illinois and it still is not going to satiate your spending. Who does this Amendment really benefit? It's a windfall for all the political players who have made a mess our finances, who stand to profit from political insiderism, and it will be a disaster for the State of Illinois because the best and brightest will leave. I was at an event a few weeks ago in Chicago with people who have long invested in the city. And a question was asked of the room, how many of you have started to hedge your investment into other states with a..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your five minute time clock has expired, please make your final remark."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. They all raised their hands. That's your districts Democrats. Your own voters are planning on getting out. That money won't come back. That talent won't come back. The jobs won't come back. Short term thinking, long term paying, no structural reform. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you." Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Yingling."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Illinois has an abusive and dysfunctional Tax Code that disproportionately places the burden on working and middle class families. We see this dysfunction in every aspect of our Tax Code and, specifically, our Property Tax Code. Residents are being taxed out of their homes and out of the state. Our property tax system creates a level of instability and insecurity in our communities as homeowners see their mortgage payments eclipsed by rising property taxes. Overhauling that system must be a priority of this Body and this government. Since the time I arrived in the General Assembly, I have been focused on reforming our poverty tax system and streamlining government through consolidation. Over the past several weeks and months, I've had numerous discussions with my colleagues and the Governor about what I believe is the pathway forward for property tax relief. For the first time in my tenure, I know we finally have the momentum needed to provide property tax relief to our communities. Our current system does not work and we all know that. The process of property tax restructuring will not be easy, but I submit that that process begins today. We must restructure our entire Tax Code from the top down. And by placing this question on the ballot, we will let our constituents determine for themselves what type of future they want. I will be voting 'aye' and I strongly encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Marron."

Marron: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I am blessed to represent some truly great communities in the 104th District. Those communities are home to some of just the most

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

outstanding people. Wonderful people that are hardworking, they're tough, and they're resilient. And they needed to be resilient because the two largest communities in my district, over the last 25 years, lost their two biggest economic engines. The City of Danville lost a General Motors foundry that employed over a thousand jobs, high paying UAW jobs. And the City of Rantoul lost Chanute Air Force Base. Now, the resilience has been important because we have worked hard and struggled to redefine ourselves economically. But every time there is a glimmer of hope, we get our legs cut out from underneath of us by the State of Illinois. On the face of it, we have a lot going for us. We're centrally located between major metropolitan areas. We have a good transportation infrastructure network. We have access to interstate highways and to rails. And we have strong local leadership that does what it can to incentivize job growth and encourages business to locate in our communities. But we are increasingly challenged by the policies of the State of Illinois. A few years ago, one of the major employers in Danville told me that he could relocate his business just a few miles to the east across the state line in Indiana and pay for a brand new facility in one year with the difference in worker's comp rates. In a few short years, those competitors in Indiana will be paying half the minimum wage that we do here. And now this. We are already over taxed and this is going to exacerbate the problem. My home town of Fithian, a little over a decade ago, lost out to Greensburg, Indiana as a location of a Honda plant. And time and time again, we have lost major manufacturing projects to states like Tennessee

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

and Texas. These policies are hurtful to communities like Danville. They're hurtful to communities like Rantoul. They're hurtful to the State of Illinois and I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First and foremost, I want to thank my colleague for taking up this important initiative for the State of Illinois. My first term here in the General Assembly, I had a proposal for what we called the progressive income tax at the time. What is clear to me is people don't want to reform the fair tax system that we're trying to do today. What I've heard today's debate is the wealthy people of the State of Illinois have not come to me and say, Representative, we don't support this fair tax plan. Because they know that they have full representation in this Body already. They don't have to come and speak for themselves and say how this is going to hurt them. They don't have to come and say how it's going to hurt their businesses because they have so much representation in this Body already. I have looked at this proposal for the last several months. And places like Champaign-Urbana who will only have about, maybe, 200 people that will have to pay more in their taxes, out of thousands of people who will pay the same or less. When I looked at Danville, they may have 20 people who have to pay more in their taxes than a majority of people in City of Danville. Rantoul, the Village of Rantoul, most people in Rantoul won't pay anymore at all because the majority of the people in the Village of Rantoul don't make even a \$100 thousand a year. So, who are we speaking for when we suggest

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

that to do this is going to harm the middle class and the lower income realm in the State of Illinois? We are speaking for the ultimate wealthy people in the State of Illinois when we say the fair tax plan is a bad plan. Let me just remind people that just a few weeks ago, our Chairman of the Appropriations Committees had to face a very difficult decision to potentially cut in places like higher education, and human services, and public safety because we feared that there would not be enough revenue to cover those critical services in our state. And when we turned to our Republican colleagues and said, if you want to cut your universities, if you want to cut your line items, you just tell us what you want to cut and we will oblige you. None of them wanted to cut their line items. None of them spoke up and said that they want to make sure that we keep it at zero for some of those very important and critical programs like those for teachers and human service workers and child care workers. They didn't take that position. So, you can't have it both ways. You can't say that you want to make sure that we keep a flat tax which will never keep up with the cost of doing business in the State of Illinois but yet, we want to cut everything and there be no proposal from the Republican Caucus as to what exactly they want to cut. Let me say that again. Over the last four years, even under Governor Rauner, we didn't want to see the cuts that came down under that Governor. Yet, today, the Republicans are asking you not to vote in support of a fair tax plan that will not increase the taxes on the middle class or on the poor. And yet, they have not put forward a budget that shows where they want to cut.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

You cannot have it both ways. So, either you want people to pay their fair share or you don't. And those who believe that the rich hiding their income is the proper response or moving to where Alabama or something is a real thing, they're not going to do it. They are here in the State of Illinois because of our infrastructure, because of our transportation network, and because of the resources that we spend to keep the roads and infrastructure together. So, we stand today for the people of Illinois. We stand for the middle class and the poor. We stand for the teachers and the human service workers. We stand for the childcare providers. We stand for the nurses. We stand for all of those who are working in our industries and want to provide relief to them. We urge you to relieve those workers and to vote 'yes' on this fair tax plan. And I thank my colleague for being willing to stand up at this time for us to do the ... "

Speaker Turner: "Would you like to make your final comment, Representative?"

Ammons: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Chair recognizes Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, I hear all the time people taking about their districts, so I want to tell you a little bit about the one that I'm honored enough to represent. Every weekend when we've been going home, I've been going to the grocery store and to other places and I keep getting stopped from the people saying, don't raise my taxes. Don't raise my taxes. Do whatever you need to do, but please do not raise my taxes.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

That is what is being said over, and over, and over. So I ask, how do you think we can get ourselves out of this mess? And I don't point fingers as to how we got there because it doesn't really matter. What matters is how are we going to move forward. Well, we're not going to move forward by doing things in a partisan way. Because when we do things in a partisan way, it's horrible. And when we work in a bipartisan way, we do great things. So, as I'm telling these folks what I see and hear, they say, well, why don't you talk about some cuts? And I say, well, we try. And they say, well, what do you mean? And I say, well, we had a working group for public safety appropriations in Chicago where we actually were talking about cuts. We were talking about a six percent cut across the board. And I was actually good with that. Let's do a six percent cut across the board. And they liked that idea. Then we come back here and we are now talking about a six percent increase across the board. So, a 12 point swing. They are not happy with that. They don't want to see that. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have to understand that when we do things of this nature, we are pushing more people out. Which means the people that stay have to make up for the people that left. So, why are we not trying to find ways of bringing people back in so that we can all pay less? It's not hard to understand. We have a \$1.5 billion increase, thanks to President Trump's economy. I'm very happy for that. But we shouldn't be spending it now. Let's do it to ... let's use that money to do all of the things that we've already done. We have \$15 billion in unpaid bills, yet we want a 6 percent increase. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to urge a 'no' vote

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

to this piece of legislation. And I shouldn't call it a piece of legislation because it's a piece of something, but it's not legislation."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes... can both sides hold all their applause 'til then end when we take the vote? Thank you. Chair recognizes Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. After four years of an epic struggle with a Republican Governor who could care less about this state, Illinois voters sent a message. And that message they sent was it's a new day in Illinois. We have campaigned for years in changing Illinois' regressive tax structure. This isn't new rhetoric. Today, we finally have a chance to take a real step toward change. We're going to take a step, and make no mistake about it, the voters will make the rich finally pay their fair share. Most of our neighbors already have a progressive tax. Ask Minnesota what it's done for them. Look at Wisconsin, look at Iowa, look at Missouri. Why do they have a progressive tax? Because it's fair. Everyone agrees Illinois must right its fiscal ship and stabilize its long term revenue and spending commitments. That's exactly what the fair tax does. The Gentlemen from Rockford stands up in opposition to the fair tax. Basically, he says do nothing. We can cut our way out of this mess. We've heard that year after year. We heard that for four years during the epic struggle. We know that's not realistic. No Representative in this chamber would vote in good conscience to make the cuts to schools, to hospitals, nursing homes, and other vital state funded services that this requires. Other opponents of the fair tax say, well, don't

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

tax the rich, tax someone else. And who does the Gentlemen from Palatine propose to tax? No surprise, its seniors and middle class workers. Because trust me, when you talk about cutting pension benefits to people who have worked them, that's who you're talking about, Gentlemen from Palatine, seniors and workers in the middle class. You want to cut the pensions of policemen, firefighters, hardworking teachers, people who are making a difference in people's lives each and every day. They work for those pensions. Those pensions are a promise and we need to keep that promise and pay those pensions. That's what the fair tax is going to help us do. And it's not only retired public servants that you want to hurt, it's all senior citizens. Groups like the Civic Federation and the Civic Committee of the Commercial Club. Made up of who? The wealthy and city's business elite. They say the solution is to tax retirement income. Come on. Tax retirement income? For decades, the state has said it is unfair to tax those retirees that live on fixed incomes and struggle to pay their property taxes, to pay their soaring prescription drug costs. They're struggling to make their everyday needs. But the watchdogs for the wealthy elites want to stick it to them. You want to stick it to them. We want to do what's fair. We have a choice here today. Who will pay to right our state? Those who have benefited the most and can afford the easiest or those who struggle to survive after having worked all their lives and can afford it the least. To those who much is given, much is required. To the Lady from Carbondale, absolutely. To those who are successful, they can help us do the right thing. They can pay their fair share.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

So, I know what side I'm going to choose here today. And I urge all of my colleagues to do the same..."

Speaker Turner: "Please make your final remark, Representative."
Welch: "I urge all of my colleagues to vote to support the fair tax, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a 'yes' vote today. Thank you so much."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Chair recognizes Representative Welter."

Welter: "Mr. Speaker, does the Sponsor yield?"

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

Welter: "Mr. Martwick..."

Martwick: "Representative."

Welter: "Do you believe the people of Illinois trust this Body to spend this new tax revenue appropriately?"

Martwick: "Well, Representative, it's a good question and I appreciate it. I really do. You know, I think that there's different levels of trust that we have to ask about. I would suggest that there are students who have been denied opportunities for college education that don't trust us to run the government because we've cut funding for higher education in half and we've increased their tuition rates and we cut their MAP grants and they can't go get a college degree. I think there are senior citizens that have been forced into nursing homes that don't think we can run our government properly and that is because we have been fiscally irresponsible. And fiscally responsible is not a one way street, Representative, it's a two way street, and it's time for us to acknowledge that."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Welter: "So, to the Amendment. I can tell you, overwhelmingly, the people of the 75th District don't trust us to do much. They don't trust us to protect children in our care because too often we have failed them. They don't trust that we're actually spending lottery revenue on education because that was all just a shell game as well. They don't trust us to fully fund pensions because for far too often we took holidays and shorted the funds. And we were about to do that again this year under the Governor's proposed budget. They don't trust us because of the corruption we've allowed to flourish in Illinois. Teach for a day and receive a pension for life. Four Governors elected since 1960 have gone to prison. No other state can match that. We have a trust issue. The facts are clear. Illinois residents don't trust us and why should they? What are we offering them? Any real reforms that would provide true relief to the people across our state? No, we're not. Based on official numbers from the Department of Revenue, we have the money to pass a balanced budget with no tax increase and no cuts to essential services. Programs that we all care about. Illinois does not need, and our taxpayers can't afford, a graduated income tax. Passing this Amendment sends the wrong message to working families and job creators throughout Illinois. Make no mistake, Governor Pritzker's candid admission that we can't give any guarantees that there won't be more changes to the state's rates, meaning higher taxes on the middle class earners. I choose to stand with the taxpayers of Grundy, Kendall, LaSalle, and Will Counties and I'm voting 'no' today."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Windhorst."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Our state is losing people by the tens of thousands every year. Many people are leaving because we have the highest overall tax burden of any state in the union. Raising taxes is not the answer. It will only make our situation worse. We will continue to lose population and the burden will be worse on the rest of us. We have to grow our way out of this problem by adding taxpayers. With fiscal sanity, we have the ability to balance our budget and bring down our debt without a tax increase. This Amendment will remove protections for the middle class, will result in higher taxes for our job creators, and will cause more people to flee our state. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Keicher."

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

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

Keicher: "All right, Representative Martwick, a couple yes or no questions for you 'cause we got a clock running. Trying to get everybody out of here in a reasonable time. Could be 1 a.m., that's all right. Can you tell me, the average Illinois family makes approximately a 162 or sorry, \$62 thousand a year?"

Martwick: "That's... yes."

Keicher: "Okay. And can you tell me we are moving from a 4.95 to

a 4.9 percent income tax rate at that \$62 thousand a year?"

Martwick: "Well, actually, the first 10 thousand will be taxed at 4.7."

Keicher: "4.9... Okay."

Martwick: "And then 10 to..."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Keicher: "4.9, right?"

Martwick: "Yeah, 4.9."

Keicher: "Okay. And can you tell me is the approximate savings on that \$62 thousand household approximately \$43 a year?"

Martwick: "No, if you give me just one second... and I know you're trying to do this quickly."

Keicher: "A non-homeowner?"

Martwick: "I have the number right in front of me. So, a family of four making \$61 thousand a year would save, compared to the flat tax of 4.95..."

Keicher: "Non homeowner?"

Martwick: "Pardon me."

Keicher: "Non homeowner?"

Martwick: "I have a household with two children here as an example. So, they would save \$271."

Keicher: "Okay."

Martwick: "If we were doing equal flat tax they would save 800 over that."

Keicher: "Moving forward. Can you share with me whether this sounds right, that the Minnesota rate right now at \$85 thousand is 7.85 percent?"

Martwick: "That makes sense to me. Okay. I don't have it right in front of me."

Keicher: "The Iowa rate at \$71,910 is approximately 8.98 percent?

Does that sound about right?"

Martwick: "That sounds about right."

Keicher: "Missouri rate, that we just heard mentioned, for a household earning in excess of \$9,253 is being charged 5.9 percent. Does that sound right?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Martwick: "It does, yes."

Keicher: "Okay. In Wisconsin, a family earning in excess of \$22,470 is paying 6.27 percent. Does that sound about right?"

Martwick: "Only on that income that exceeds that level."

Keicher: "Okay. And so, it sounds like all these other states
 have a heck of a deal going on that we're able to make here
 in our state. To the Amendment."

Martwick: "What?"

Keicher: "We live in a state... yeah, I kind of get that. I get it. We live in a state where we found accountability a difficult concept to implement time and again. I've been here a short time and have been amazed at the number of consequential spending plans that we've passed. We're in a state where we call taxes resources and we don't refer to it as other people's money. I have so many constituents that have voiced their concern on this, it easily leads to issues where folks tell me they can't wait to leave. When I share with my taxpayers the amount of money that they will save under this plan where the 97 percent will allegedly not save, they tell me just take the money and pay down the pensions and that's still not part. We look at the farmers and the job creators in this state and the income taxes that they already pay on incomes in excess of \$77 thousand. Depending on the range, the first tier at the federal income tax level is somewhere between 22 and 35 percent federal income tax. If you're a self-employed individual, you pay an additional 15.3 percent in social security, Medicare, and what we like to call selfemployment tax. And then currently, here in Illinois, we pay an additional 4.95 percent today. Before we get to any new

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

rates, they are already paying 42 to 55 percent on every dollar they earn above \$77 thousand. That's before they pay our high sales taxes. That's before they pay our high realestate taxes and that's before the job creators pay payroll. This Bill offers no rates, no certainty to the constituents in my district that we will act judiciously. Further, earlier, I had one of our peers from Skokie a short time ago say, why would someone oppose the will of the people. I'm glad he asked. Because on May 5, 2014, 298,399 voters asked for a fair maps Amendment to be presented. It was challenged by the Majority Party in Cook County court case and defeated. Again, two years later, May 6, 2016, after making modifications, the underlying court decision advised, an effort again was undertaken where we had 550 thousand voters again ask for a Constitutional Amendment for independent legislative maps. Again, a Cook County judge struck down the voters following a challenge by the Majority Party. The will of the people has been denied time and again. The hypocrisy is obvious to any of the voters in Sycamore, Grayslake, or Northbrook that are watching us here today. We're talking about the biggest opening for potential abuse in spending with no boundaries. Please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution... or the Amendment, rather. Our national economy brings us great news. There's good data out there. Businesses are flourishing. Production is increasing. Entrepreneurship is on the rise. Why? Because we've taken burdens off of American free enterprise and we've encouraged entrepreneurship. And that,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

in all honesty, has helped many states around our great nation. California received a windfall of \$10 billion due to that economic growth. Illinois, \$1.6 billion in new revenues due to economic growth. It has other benefits that impact everyone. Unemployment across all categories is at historic and record lows. More people are working. That grows the economy which puts money in to government's pockets. That is how we get out of this situation, we grow our economy. But there's also cautionary tale in those numbers. When we talk of states receiving higher incomes due to our growing economy, the caution comes from New York who passed a similar bit of legislation to tax the wealthy. What did Mayor Bloomberg say in February when New York's budget was hit by a decline of \$2.3 billion? Well, we taxed the rich and they left. We heard from the other side of the aisle that this is a hard and difficult vote. I argue it's the easiest vote you are all ever going to take. Why? Because the hard work, the hard votes, are on the reform side. The things that people want to see when we want to provide them with economic stability and an optimistic future and a place where they can tell their kids to stay here, go to school here, instead of fleeing the state for prosperity elsewhere. Those votes along the lines of anyone that's had to deal with the services we deliver. If you're a parent of special needs, you know exactly what I'm talking about. When you go to the state agency, and you sit there for hours, and you get the run around, and you still don't have an answer. We are extremely inefficient in how we deliver our state services and yet, we're not talking about reforming that. When we are talking about state universities

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

and how they're so expensive and what can we do to make them more affordable for Illinois residents to stay here, we're not talking about the Procurement Code. We're not putting that hard vote on the board. Instead, you're going to take the easy way out and you're going to dig deeper into people's pockets and they're going to leave. Right now, our economy, nationally, is doing quite well. But quess what, it won't always be that way. Illinois is ill prepared for the next recession. And I hope it doesn't come for quite some time, but when it does, under this tax strategy, under this tax plan, under this proposal with no reforms, I'm not sure Illinois can survive. So, your rates that right now you say are only on the wealthy and those that can afford it, when that recession comes, I quarantee you you're going to have to lower those rates and hit the middle class that you so desperately want to protect. But all you're doing is kicking the can down the road until the time when they can least afford it, you're going to hit them even harder. We also heard that there is dark money driving this. The only dark money I know that's being spent right now is the man that sits down in 200. Think Big Illinois is spending millions of dollars saying this is a fair tax. That's the dark money. You know what else you should do for the Governor, is you should listen to him when he answered a question about fair maps. And this was his answer when he said, and I quote, to the fair maps question, 'Yes, I will pledge to veto. We should amend the Constitution to create an independent commission to draw legislative maps.' That would be a really easy vote for most of us but yet the hard work remains. Instead of the reforms

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

we desperately need to save our great state, we're just going to drive it more and more and deeper and deeper into the ditch. Our brain drain will continue. Our brightest students will continue to flee the state. More in corporal will leave. Congressionally, we will lose two seats and yet we will have nothing to show on any reforms. This is a bad policy that will have devastating impacts for years. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. My folks and colleagues who are sitting next to me here on this side know I didn't have my light on originally, but I heard enough from the other side of the aisle that I figured I had to say a couple things. First of all, I keep... I just can't help myself but laugh when I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle deride Illinois politicians in Springfield and all the terrible things they're doing as if you aren't also Illinois politicians in Springfield. The Gentlemen from East Dundee said the only people who support this plan are parasites. I take umbrage to that. I think the overwhelming majority of folks in my district and, frankly, probably the majority of folks in your district who support this plan, might take umbrage to that idea as well. We heard these described as fake rates, as lying rates. If you think these are fake or lying, you might as well call every Bill that we pass in this General Assembly fake or lying because it can be amended by a future Bill. The only reason you guys have for calling these rates fake is that you say that some future legislation might change them. Some future legislation might change everything we do in here. So, if that's the case, every

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Bill we've ever passed is fake. Now, one point I just can't let stand is this idea that people are leaving Illinois because of our high tax rates. It's certainly true that people are leaving Illinois. You guys know what the state with the highest in-migration is? The highest net in-migration in the country? Drumroll, please. Is the State of Oregon. The State of Oregon with a top tax rate of 9.9 percent. In fact, the lowest tax rate in Oregon is 7 percent which is higher than the tax rates here in Illinois. But the last thing, and maybe the most important point that I want to bring up, is this idea that we've heard over and over again that taxpayers should be worried about this plan. As if the parents who send their kids to public schools aren't taxpayers. As if the families who rely on state funded services for breast cancer screening or autism aren't taxpayers. And you know as if those people who don't make enough money to pay taxes and yet still rely on us for Medicaid and for social services as if they're not human beings worthy of our attention. It has been said over and over again that we have a spending problem in this state. People have described it as insatiable. And you know what, I am willing and, in fact, proud to stand here and say that I believe in government spending. I believe in government spending on food for the hungry, on shelter for the homeless, on healthcare for the sick, on education for our children. I believe in spending. I don't think that's a spending problem. I think that is our job. That is the job of government and that is our job as basically decent human beings treating our neighbors with morality and compassion. This Resolution will finally give us the tools to provide for our neighbors

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

in those ways. I could not more strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "For our final speaker on this measure, we have Leader Durkin... is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. It's really Durkin: unfortunate that we are here today to take up this issue. However, we are here for a reason and Illinoisans need to know the truth of why we are doing this today. Now, at the beginning of this debate a few hours ago, I listened to the woes of the State of Illinois by the Sponsor. Cruel cuts, underfunding of vital services, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And if you listened to the Sponsor's statements, it would lead one to believe that the Republicans may have led this chamber for these decades or for a great number of them. Here is the truth. The Illinois House of Representatives has been run by the Democrat Party of Illinois and Speaker Madigan for 34 years. Those woes, those troubles, those painful cuts. Those were decisions made by the Majority Party. That's the truth. So, here's my advice to the House Democrats today, take responsibility for this mess before you ask more of its citizens. Let's make no mistake, today's vote is the end result of the Illinois Democrats historical reckless, irresponsible budgeting and spending. However, it is also clear today that today's vote is a fate to complete. It's a forgone conclusion. Now, I will tell you this, I am secure with my vote today. But I honestly believe that many of you on the other side of the aisle can't say the same. You know why? I know how this Bill went down. I know how this Amendment went down. And please, don't think there wasn't any horse

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

trading to get these votes. I know better, you know better, we know better. Now, I have one last statement to make and it is not meant for anyone in this chamber. It's meant for the Illinois citizens. And this should be the constitutional question that should be on the ballot before this one is posed. It's very simple. Based on their past practices, can you trust the Illinois House Democrats and Democrat Party of Illinois with spending more of your money to solve its budget problems?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thank you for a very robust debate. I appreciate the remarks. I certainly appreciate those of you who did take the time to actually debate with me. I appreciate your statements and I appreciate those in support. There were a couple things that were said that really just is amazing they kept coming back to these focuses of out-migration, killing jobs, and this fluctuation of the rates. All of which, I'm sorry, are just not true. The vast majority of people leaving this state are the middle class, working class, and poor, and under the proposal they will see tax relief. You talk about this being a jobs' tax and yet 95 percent of the small businesses in this state will see tax relief under this plan from numbers from the Illinois Department of Revenue. This is reform. This is an opportunity to fix the problems of Illinois and begin reestablishing the essential services that government is supposed to deliver. Quality education for our children, social services for those most in need, paying down our debts, beginning to relieve property taxes. Now, before we proceed

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

to the vote, I want to thank some people that have been working on this Bill. There have been people, activists who have worked on this Bill for over a decade, trying to create a system that puts us in fiscal responsibility while allowing us to live up to our responsibilities. Many people, and you heard from them today, have been advocating for this issue for years and I thank you for your comments. But I want to thank Governor Pritzker for his advocacy. He started his campaign with a commitment to this and he never once wavered that this was something that he was going to push as a cornerstone of his administration. And he won an election by astounding numbers and he never wavered. He pushed for this Amendment and it's been his support that has been able to help us get this to the point where we can now turn this over to the voters and let them decide if this is the reform that Illinois should have. I believe it is. I believe the time is now to adopt a fair tax, fair for all of Illinois. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification. All Members will be in the chairs and vote their own switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 73 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Representative Ammons; Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Bristow; Representative Buckner; Representative Burke; Representative Carroll; Representative Cassidy; Representative Connor; Representative Conroy; Representative Costa Representative Crespo; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Didech; Representative Edly-Allen; Representative Evans; Feigenholtz; Representative Representative Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gong-Gershowitz; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greenwood; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Halpin; Representative Harper; Representative Harris; Representative Barbra Hernandez; Representative Liza Hernandez; Hoffman; Representative Representative Representative Jones; Representative Kalish; Representative Kifowit; Representative Lilly; Representative Representative Representative Manley; Martwick; Representative Mason; Representative Mayfield; Representative Meyers-Martin; Representative Moeller; Representative Morgan; Representative Moylan; Representative Representative Ortiz; Representative Mussman; Pappas; Representative Ramirez; Representative Reitz; Representative Rita; Representative Robinson; Representative Scherer; Slaughter; Representative Representative Smith; Representative Stava-Murray; Representative Stuart; Representative Tarver; Representative Turner; Representative Villa; Representative Villanueva; Representative

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative West; Representative Anne Williams; Representative Jawaharlial Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yednock; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you. With the indulgence, there's a lot of people standing and everybody moved since last Session so I'm having a hard time here. Representative Cassidy?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy is here."

Batinick: "Okay. Yup, see someone is blocking me there.

Representative Reitz? Did I pronounce that correctly?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reitz is here."

Batinick: "All right. Representative Gabel?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel is here."

Batinick: "Okay. Representative Edly-Allen?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Edly-Allen is here."

Batinick: "Okay. Representative Lilly?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly is here."

Batinick: "Representative Pappas?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pappas is here."

Batinick: "Representative Stava-Murray?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stava-Murray is here."

Batinick: "Representative Mussman? Representative Costa Howard?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costa Howard is here."

Batinick: "We fold."

Speaker Turner: "On this question, there are 73 voting in 'favor',
44 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. And the Senate
Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1, having received

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, on page 3 of the Calendar, under House Bills on Second Reading, we have House Bill 2668. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2668, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Robinson, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Robinson on Floor Amendment #1."
Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2668 amends the School Code, requires that the State Board of Education to develop child opportunity zones as a means to deliver comprehensive and coordinated social services at or near schools in the state that are related to specific community needs that will ultimately, excuse me, increase student performance which is much needed in our state. And the community defines community zones, provides that a child opportunity zone must provide a means to integrate education, health, and social services into schools and link families to much needed community resources. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "So, Representative, we're going to adopt Floor Amendment #1. Would you like to adopt Floor Amendment #1?"

Robinson: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Okay. The Gentlemen moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2668. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2668, offered by Representative Robinson. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2668, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, did you describe the Bill on the Amendment? All right. Okay. Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2668 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting in 'favor', 11 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2668 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1637 offered by Representative Villanueva. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1637, a Bill for an act concerning immigration. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 2 offered by Representative Villanueva has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Villanueva on Floor Amendment #2."
- Villanueva: "I'd like to adopt House Floor Amendment 2. It significantly narrows down the focus of the Bill by removing all of the language from the original Bill except for the public safety section."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick, do you have a comment on the Amendment or can we adopt the Amendment? Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1637.

 All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1637,

offered by Representative Villanueva. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1637, a Bill for an Act concerning immigration. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Villanueva in the Chair... excuse me, on House Bill 1637."

Villanueva: "Thank you. Thank you for the promotion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley in the Chair."

Villanueva: "Thank you for the promotion, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1637 would prohibit state and local law enforcement agencies from entering into 287(g) agreements with ICE that turn their officers into ICE agents. The Federal Government is now encouraging local law enforcement agencies to enter into agreements with Immigration and Customs Enforcement to deputize their officers to engage in immigration enforcement work. These type of programs have been well documented and have been recorded as injecting bias and ethnic stereotyping into policing practices. Because of this, and despite of many protective policies in place in our state, families continue to be afraid to seek police protection. This is a huge public safety issue. When victims of crime are afraid to report those incidences for fear of police actively acting immigration agents, we have a problem. When people are living in fear of taking their kids to school or simply going to work to earn a living, we have a problem. This Bill seeks to ensure that law enforcement remain focus on public safety,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

rather than diverting resources to a program that undermines trust of law enforcement. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "For discussion, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. This Bill was voted 8-5 by committee. Sheriffs oppose, Chicago FOP and ISP are reviewing. My guess is because they haven't had enough time to review this Floor Amendment. This isn't the way we should be acting. I strongly urge my side to vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler for a question."

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

Wheeler: "Representative, we talked about this Bill in committee and I just want to make sure that we're on the same page here. This is effectively an extension of things that were originally negotiated out of the Trust Act a couple years ago, maybe three years ago, that are now kind of being put back in. Is that accurate?"

Villanueva: "Yes, this was one of those items. I'd also like to point out that the FOP is neutral on this Bill."

Wheeler: "Okay. But however, our friends at the Illinois Sheriffs remain opposed. I asked a question about that and the impression I got was, and you can add your comment here, that if we don't follow through on these 287(g) agreements that already exist in many cases, that instead ICE will just send more agents to Illinois. Is that a possibility?"

Villanueva: "So, again, the purpose of this Bill is to ensure that law enforcement, local law enforcement, is doing their

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

job which is focusing on public safety. ICE, Immigration and Custom Enforcement has their own job. This is to ensure that law enforcement, local law enforcement, and law enforcement agencies in the State of Illinois are focused on public safety."

Wheeler: "Okay, then... the ultimate... I think the result of the Bill may not be your intended affect and that's why I bring this up. Again, if there were an agreement on this Bill, that would be a different story, and unfortunately there isn't. At this time, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

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

Skillicorn: "Here's what I'm curious about. I represent McHenry County which has an ICE detention center, and I believe of three other ICE detention centers in the State of Illinois. Will this interfere with the Kane... I'm sorry, McHenry County government interacting and forming a contract with ICE for this detention center?"

Villanueva: "So, again, I go to the language of the Bill. This Bill specifically states that the..."

Skillicorn: "If you don't know, you can pull the Bill from the record."

Villanueva: "Again... I'm trying to answer your question, Representative, so I would appreciate the same respect with which I'm trying to answer your question. This particular section of the Bill, of which we narrowed down the original Bill from, prohibits law enforcement agencies or officials from entering into or remaining in an agreement with U.S.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Custom Enforcement under any Federal Law that permits state or local governments to enforce federal immigration laws. This particular Bill and the language, the Amendment clarifies that nothing of this section shall prevent a law enforcement official from executing his or her official duties in ensuring public safety."

Skillicorn: "So, is that a 'yes' that the McHenry County Sheriff cannot enter into a contract with ICE?"

Villanueva: "This is under the 287(g) program."

Skillicorn: "So, that sounds like a 'yes'. What do you expect to do with people that are illegal immigrants that have a federal INS detainer, what do you expect these sheriff's departments and other law enforcement agencies to do with them?"

Villanueva: "I expect for ICE, Immigration and Custom Enforcement, to do their job. That's what I expect. What I expect for local law enforcement is to do their job to ensure public safety, because like many other places... I think it's actually written on a lot of their cars. That's what I expect."

Skillicorn: "To the Bill. I heard the insinuation of protect and serve. I go back to a few people that get these INS detainers. They're not nice people. First off, they broke Federal Law by coming in here illegally. Second off, they're already in the system. Some of these people are domestic robbers... domestic abusers. These are not nice people and, effectively, we're letting some just go off in the streets. This is wrong and, frankly, I represent McHenry County, this will be a massive property tax hike for the people of McHenry County because the Federal Government pays millions of dollars to house these people in the McHenry County Jail. And there's three other

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

counties like that in the State of Illinois. This is significant. This is full on sanctuary and this is something that we have to vote down. This is a bad Bill, vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler. Thank you for your patience. I'm sorry, Wehrli."

Wehrli: "I'm patient, too, by the way. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "I just like him better than you."

Wehrli: "That is on the record. Thank you. Thank you. There goes your Christmas card. To the Bill. This Bill, under the United States Constitution, has separation and preemptive concerns. States cannot dictate to federal entities and federal law enforcement what they can and cannot do. I have a strong suspicion that this Bill will be brought up in a court case rather quickly and therefore, would just urge a 'no' vote just so we follow the law around here."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Villanueva to close."

Villanueva: "I am the daughter of Mexican immigrants... and I'm going to be emotional and you know what, I'm not going to apologize for that... who came to this country over 40 years ago. I am an Immigrant Rights Organizer who saw and has witnessed the atrocities of what's happening in this nation. Not just to immigrants who have been in this country for years and decades, but to asylum seekers that are coming to this country seeking refuge. So, when I have people across the aisle making claims very similar to the President about rapists and murders and not understanding the situation that in a lot of instances when ICE is going out seeking someone that has a warrant, who they end up picking up, are parents and normal day everyday human beings who are just trying to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

live their lives. When we talk about these issues, when you talk about all of this rhetoric, you forget that they're people like me. They're people like my grandparents. They're people, like my parents, came to this country looking for the same American Dream that all the immigrants before them, which all of you, most of you across the aisle, unless you're African American or Native American, are immigrants to this country. Because let's be real about the history of this nation. Don't forget where you came from, and how you entered this country, and how your ancestors entered this country. What we're talking about is people being able to call the police when they're victims of a crime. That's what we're talking about. So, again, I find it very offensive that we use this rhetoric to describe immigrants in this country as rapists, and murders, and bad guys, and whatever you want to call them. Because I am the daughter, the very proud daughter, of Mexican immigrant parents. And I'm in this chamber with you day in and day out. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1637 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. This question, there are 67 voting in 'favor', 50 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we're moving to the Order of Resolutions on page 21. Beginning with House Joint Resolution 35, Leader Hoffman. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 47, Representative Marron. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 66,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Representative Reick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On March 7 of this year, McHenry County Sheriff's Deputy Jacob Keltner was killed in the line of duty while serving on a federal task force, attempting to serve a warrant on a fugitive in Rockford. He left behind a wife, two sons, a grieving community, but a grateful community. We previously honored Deputy Keltner with our Resolution #186, and my House Joint Resolution 66 seeks to further honor him by designating the new overpass that's being constructed at Routes 23 and 90 in McHenry County as the 'Deputy Jacob Keltner Memorial Overpass'. I hope that what it will do is remind us always of the sacrifice of this fine man and the sacrifice and dedication of all of our first responders. And I would ask that all Members of this Body be added as cosponsors of this Resolution. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Reick moves for the adoption of House Resolution 66 and has requested that all Members be added to the Resolution. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 117 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting present. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. House Joint Resolution 69, Leader Hammond.

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Chair... Madam Speaker. House Resolution 69 declares May 29 as '529 College Savings Day' in the State of Illinois, and urges all Illinoisans to explore the benefits

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

that 529 plans offer for families. I'd appreciate your support and, unbelievably, we are doing a Resolution that is naming a day that hasn't happened yet. Kudos to us. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "You're clairvoyant. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 70, Representative Swanson. Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Chair. What an honor to present this Joint Resolution on Memorial Day and to be joined by the Director of the Illinois Department of VA, you might recognize as Director Chapa-LaVia, here with me. What House Joint Resolution 70 does, it memorializes two great Americans. Although I was Army, these are great Americans who served in the Navy. Petty Officer Second Class Holloway and Petty Officer Third Class Crose. Both gentlemen were born in the small town of Keithsburg, Illinois. Petty Officer Holloway was 24 years old when he died in the South China Sea. He served from 1961 to 1966. It's amazing enough to know that people still post birthday wishes on his memorial wall that can be found on the internet. His name is listed on panel 13E, line 48, at the Vietnam Wall. Petty Officer Third Class Crose, Gunner's Mate Third Class. He entered service 21, November 64, and was killed November 24, 1967. He was killed when a small boat he was operating was hit by a land mine or water mine planted by a Vietcong. You can find his name on panel 30E, row 75, on the Vietnam Memorial. What this Resolution does, it names what was commonly referred to as a

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Keithsburg spur near Keithsburg, Illinois, as a Holloway Crosse Highway. I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Swanson moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 70. All those 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? Clerk, please take the record. With 117 'ayes', 0 'nays', and 0 voting present, this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. House Joint Resolution 71, Representative Halbrook."
- Halbrook: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber. House Joint Resolution 71 designates a section of Interstate 57 from I-74 South to exit 233 as the Congressman Tim Johnson Highway. Congressman Johnson came to this chamber in 1976 until 2000, when he was elected to Congress, and served there for many more years. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Halbrook moves for the adoption of House Resolution 71. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay' and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 116 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present', the Resolution has received a Constitutional Majority, and is hereby adopted. House Joint Resolution 74, Representative Mah."
- Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General... of the House. House Joint Resolution 74 designates May as Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month. Recognizing the contributions of a group of people who have been essential to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the growth and economy of our state and nation. The Asian American population represents more than six percent of the Illinois population and is one of the fastest growing in both the state and the country. And as I have spoken about several times this month, Asian Americans were involved in literally building this country through their involvement with the construction of the Transcontinental Railroad. I ask for your support in adopting this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mah moves for the adoption of House Resolution 74. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 75, Representative Sosnowski. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 76, Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Madam Chair. On this Memorial Day, as we celebrate this day and remember those who gave their... gave the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our nation, it's highly appropriate that we pay tribute to another who unfortunately met an early demise in the service of others. It's highly fitting that the Illinois General Assembly pay honor and respect to these individuals. This particular individual, Trooper April C. Styburski, on Friday, January 5, 1990, her watch ended. She was responding to an accident near Pingree Grove on U.S. 20 when she was killed. Trooper Styburski was a four year veteran of the Illinois Police. And at the time of her untimely demise, Trooper Styburski was survived by her husband and a son. Therefore, it is appropriate to remember and pay tribute to this Trooper and that we designate the section of Illinois Route 20 between Plank Road and Switzer

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Road as Trooper April C. Styburski Memorial Highway. I ask for your support in this Resolution."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ugaste moves for the adoption of House Resolution 76. All those 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 question, 117 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. On House Joint Resolution 77, Representative Bennett."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is important, of course, to remember and honor those who gave the ultimate sacrifice and service to the State of Illinois. I rise today for House Joint Resolution 77, as it gives recognition and honors Illinois State Trooper Marvin C. Archer for standing in harm's way and dying in the line of duty. Trooper Archer served in World War II as a combat engineer in the Pacific. After the war, he returned to his Illinois State Police duties, on June 18, 1946. Six months after he had returned home from World War II, he and his partner Vernon Harper spotted a stolen vehicle and initiated a traffic stop. Two suspects opened fire and both officers took cover and returned fire. The Trooper was shot and killed at the scene. Trooper Archer is an example of the dedication and sacrifice of the Illinois State Police and it is truly fitting that we remember his sacrifice today. Madam Speaker, I ask for an 'aye' vote. I ask for a moment of silence and that we may add everyone to this Resolution, please."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Manley: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Representative Bennett moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 77. All those 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 question, 117 voting 'aye', 0 'nay', 0 'present'. This Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Next, we have House Joint Resolution 78, offered by Leader Durkin."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Joint Resolution 78 Durkin: honors a young girl from Indian Head Park who was brutally murdered some eight years ago, who made the mistake of coming home from school in the afternoon on a nice pleasant day. Her name is Kelli O'Laughlin. Tore up our community, tore up a good portion of Chicago. This is a beautiful young girl who many of us knew the family, know her. And as I said earlier, made the mistake of coming home after school where she walked into a vicious home invader who proceeded to kill her in a very violent, violent manner. It is something that has touched our community, as every community gets touched by the loss of a young child. Since then, the family... they've had multiple runs, they've been raising money on her behalf. But the occurrence occurred right off at her home, Plainfield Road, where 294... there is a Plainfield Road Bridge at 294, just off... just north of I-55. The family and also the friends have asked if we could name that bridge in her honor. Every day since then, there have been solo cups that have been placed in the bridge, in the fencing area, expressing their love and also loss for Kelli. And I would ask that we would remember

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

her for the joy that she gave to so many people, including her family and friends, by designating that Plainfield Bridge in her honor."

Speaker Manley: "The Body will take a moment of silence in memory of Kell Joy O'Laughlin. Leader Durkin moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 78. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', and this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Members, we're moving back to Bills on Senate... I'm sorry, Senate Bills on Third Reading, page 5. First order of business is Senate Bill 1828, Representative Conroy. Take your time. Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1828, the Overdose Prevention and Harm Reduction Act, is a bipartisan Bill that builds upon the past state and federal efforts to combat the opioid epidemic and save the lives of thousands of Illinoisans struggling with opioid addiction. It contains three common sense provisions to improve how Illinois is addressing the opioid epidemic. One, it directs DHS to provide training and support to overdose prevention programs. Two, it requests additional reporting on our state wide opioid treatment capacity, including medication assisted treatment. And three,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

it creates the syringe access program under IDPH to allow local health departments and community-based organizations to provide syringe access services if they meet certain requirements. Syringe access, or needle exchange programs, are evidence based public health interventions that reduce overdose death, prevent the spread of HIV and hepatitis, and increase the likelihood a participant will enter treatment and recovery. There is no opposition, and I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I see that this was unanimous in committee and almost there in the Senate. I had one line, I think most of the people on my side will be supporting this Bill, but it said it amends the Hypodermic Syringes and Needles Act, provides that the Act shall not prohibit the sale, possession, or use of hypodermic syringes or hypodermic needles by staff person, volunteer, or participant in a needle or hypodermic syringe access program. Can you talk about that a little bit?"

Conroy: "Representative, this is just adding those people to this already existing list."

Batinick: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. Could you repeat that?"

Conroy: "So, Representative, this is just adding staff persons and volunteers or participants in the Needle Hypodermic Syringe Access Program to the already existing statute."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for the answer."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Conroy to close."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1828 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting in 'favor', 11 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2050, Representative Edly-Allen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2120, Representative Moylan. Out of the record. Moving on to Senate Bills on Second Reading, on page 6. Senate Bill 9, Representative Ammons. Representative Ammons. Out of the record. Senate Bill 62, Representative Costa Howard. Representative Costa Howard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 138, Representative Tarver. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 138, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like the Body to welcome back our former Majority Leader, Barbara Currie."
- Speaker Manley: "Welcome back. It's nice to see you. Returning to Senate Bill 138, Representative Tarver. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 138, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Good afternoon, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that allows for... it allows for individuals in short sale situations to avoid the necessity of the arms-length transaction... excuse me, an arms-length affidavit. So, there's an organization, nonprofits specifically, that will essentially buy a person's home and sell it back to them at a lower rate that they can afford. This allows individuals to be able to do that. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "I yield my time to Representative Keith Wheeler."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, you had this in the Executive Committee the other day. I just want to run through a couple things we talked about that day, I believe. Originally, this Bill had some opponents in its original draft, I believe those were taken away in some Amendments. Can you walk me through that?"

Tarver: "Sure, give me just one second here. So, the banking industry was opposed initially. They're neutral now due to an Amendment that the… the purchaser in the transaction has to be a CDFI and a nonprofit, and I think that eliminated most of their concern."

Wheeler: "Right, because this is a unique situation with short sales and how we can help allow some of these non-for-profits

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

to be a part of that process, even those more useable, I guess, into the situation for people who need housing. Is that a fair account?"

Tarver: "That's correct. My understanding is that title agencies and other individuals have some concern when there's armslength affidavit saying I don't know who the... I don't know the purchaser or the seller, you know, but you actually do because they're the nonprofit purchasing the house and essentially agreeing to sell it back to you. That created some concern. And so, yes, this is a very limited situation."

Wheeler: "Right, and it's agreed to now. So, I appreciate you answering the questions. Thank you, Representative."

Tarver: "You're welcome."

Speaker Manley: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Tarver to close."

Tarver: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 138 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 111 voting in 'favor', 5 'opposed', 0 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 147, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 147, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

offered by Representative Mussman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mussman on the Amendment."

Mussman: "So, the Amendment is the final clean up language requested by the Department of Labor with the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity and the Motion Picture Association. It clarifies the department may, rather than shall, adopt rules to further implement the Bill. It limits the required set aside in the trust account to be at 15 percent and it authorizes a temporary employment certificate to be initiated so the child can start working while the trust fund is being set up."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mussman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 147. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 147, a Bill for an Act concerning

employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. So, I'm here on Senate Bill 147, which has actually been under construction for a couple of years now, as many people may know. And what this does is it creates a Coogan's Law for the State of Illinois, which is a set aside trust fund account for child actors and child models. This idea was actually brought to me by one of my constituents working in the field

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

who had been aware that this is actually a practice in many other states including California, New York, Louisiana, and New Mexico. And as we see that there are more child models and child actors working in the State of Illinois, especially in the Chicago area, we want to make sure that part of the proceeds that they're working so hard for are set aside for their personal use when they turn to the age of 18. There is no opposition that I'm aware of and it passed the Senate unanimously. I would also appreciate an 'aye' vote and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Representative, my understanding is, is that if we don't pass this Bill, it may not match some of the requirements that the unions have and we may lose out on some of the production work that would be done in the state. Is that correct? And this is to help with that."

Mussman: "That is not something that I have been aware of, no."

Batinick: "Okay. That's... All right, that's where we are with our analysis, but that was just a plug for a thumbs up. So, thank you for kind of not agreeing with me but we're going to vote for this. Thank you."

Mussman: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

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

Mussman: "She indicates that she will."

58th Legislative Day

- Flowers: "I was reading the analysis and it says that the department may, rather than shall, adopt rules to implement the Bill."
- Mussman: "They honestly believe that the Bill is self-explanatory. Really, all it needs is that a parent has to prove that they have set up a trust fund in order to retain a portion of the proceeds from their paychecks to go in there. It gives them the ability to make changes going forward if they find it necessary, but right now they do not find it necessary to articulate anything further."
- Flowers: "So basically, is there rules already in place for the implementation of the Bill? Because we're talking about the implementation."
- Mussman: "So, the Bill articulates that the parameters of the trust fund that must be set aside and it explains that the parents need to put 15 percent of the funding into the trust fund. There aren't really other details that I think that need to be laid out at the moment, or is there something you feel is lacking?"
- Flowers: "I don't think you're answering my question, again. And it says that the department may, rather than shall, adopt rules to implement the Bill."
- Mussman: "So again, we had thought that was going to be necessary and the department is articulating that that is not necessary. They will create a form that is available online for the families to fill out that indicates that the trust fund is ready."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

- Flowers: "So, what would be the guidelines for the implementation?

 How would people know that the rules or the guidelines for the implementation of the Bill?"
- Mussman: "So, in order for the child to get a work permit if they're under the age of 16, the parent will have to show this information. The parent will have to be able to prove to the employer that a trust fund has been set up. Those are the rules."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

- Skillicorn: "Thank you, Representative, for putting this forward.

 I don't think... I think sometimes these child actors and stuff
 get ignored, and it's unfortunate. So, the gist of this Bill
 is that there's going to be a trust fund established. Who
 manages and runs that trust fund?"
- Mussman: "So, the trust fund... it's already under the Illinois
 Uniform Transfers of Minors Act. Those requirements are
 already laid out. So, it simply... it will be held by a bank,
 a corporate fiduciary, or a trust company. And that's laid
 out directly in the Bill."
- Skillicorn: "And are there any other industries that do this? I mean, let's think of when children work, so child labor specifically. They don't work in that many fields, but I can think of like farming and stuff. Is there... are there any other fields like farming that has a similar trust fund created?"
- Mussman: "Not that I'm aware of. I think the larger concern has been... you know, historically there have been very famous cases

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

where a child actor very possibly could make a significant amount of money from their work, and then it would be a possibility that, perhaps, the parents had not been very responsible with those funds and had basically used all of them so there was nothing left available for the child to use for their own purposes as an adult. I think if you worked other jobs, perhaps, as a younger person, the likelihood of your income being of that magnitude would not be comparable and so certainly that's the thrust of why this Bill is initiated."

Skillicorn: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think it's admirable that we'd want to protect some of these child actors. I think that they're probably abused... they're not abused, but taken advantage of by the system. I still don't know if it really should be the role of the state to do this. We haven't set our own example of being very responsible, so I wonder if there's an outside organization, even the actual, you know, organized labor in this case could do something similar. So, even though I like the idea of protecting these children that are probably taken advantage of, I still don't think it's going to be role of the government, so I'm not going to support your Bill. But thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Andrade."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Andrade: "Representative Mussman, I just have a question. Is there a floor on this Bill?"

Mussman: "No, it's 15 percent of whatever the pay is per the activity. So, if you have a one day modeling fee, it's 15

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

percent of that set aside. If you have an employment contract for a TV show that maybe you show up for a couple of times throughout the year, it's 15 percent of whatever your salary is for that performance."

Andrade: "So, who sets up the trust if it's just one time?"

Mussman: "The parents... I'm sorry, the parents set up the trust fund. And once it is set up, then they continue to put money into it as the child has employment contracts."

Andrade: "So... I mean, how does... most of these people sometimes have no idea how to set up a trust fund. They would have to hire a lawyer and pay a thousand dollars for a lawyer for a job that only pays \$50."

Mussman: "So, you can set up a trust fund through a bank. There are ways to set up a trust fund. And I'm going to imagine if you're a parent navigating a child through the wildness of, you know, having a modeling contract or having a television contract that you have the capacity to do this. And they will help you do this. This is actually very common practice for some of the larger facilities and employers."

Andrade: "But there is no floor. Even one job or whatever, anything, just..."

Mussman: "Right."

Andrade: "There's no exceptions based on income or anything?"

Mussman: "No."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Mussman: "We didn't set any limits. Generally, their goal is to get repeat jobs and the trust fund just remains open for them."

Andrade: "Okay. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Representative Mussman to close."
- Mussman: "So, I really appreciate all the effort that has gone into this Bill as it's crossed over between the House and Senate with Senator Harmon's appreciation and also some of the assistance from the Republicans like Grant Wehrli. You know, we really do think this is a good opportunity to protect, you know, the child actors that we're seeing more and more of in their state all the time, especially with the impressive, you know, rebates that we've been giving to the movie houses to participate here."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 147 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yingling. Morrison. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 107 voting in 'favor', 10 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Lisa Hernandez."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."
- Hernandez, L.: "I will ask if all Members can join me in welcoming one of our former colleagues, Linda Chapa LaVia, acting Director of Veterans' Affairs. Let's say hello to Linda."
- Speaker Manley: "Welcome back, Leader Chapa LaVia. Nice to see you. Senate Bill 158, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 158, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Walsh, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh on Amendment 2."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment 2 is a technical change that further defines the definition of what can be told concerning with the underlying Bill. I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Flowers, can we let Representative Walsh adopt the Amendment and discuss it on Third Reading? You have your light on. Can Representative Walsh... you don't want... okay. Thank you. Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 158. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 158, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 158 is a Bill that provides the legal framework for the Houbolt Road Extension. This bridge extension is a privately financed one and a half million long extension of Houbolt Road in Joliet, Illinois with a new toll bridge over the Des Plaines River to serve as a new access

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

route for trucks entering the CenterPoint Intermodal Center. It's a result of a public-private agreement between the City of Joliet and Houbolt Road Extension along with the state internet... Illinois Department of Transportation. CenterPoint is a real-estate investment firm that developed the largest inland port in North America. And they're partnering with United Bridge Partners who does this type of private tolling across the United States. What the Bill does, specifically, is there's a property tax exemption for the road extension bridge in the same manner that the Chicago Skyway is exempt from property taxes. It sets that the county board must fix the toll rates, which is current law, by establishing a toll rate schedule and setting a maximum toll rate that may be adjusted from time to time. Thirdly, a clarification that the Illinois Toll Authority may enter into a governmental agreement with that private bridge operator for I-PASS implementation and then works also... the private tolling would work with the tollway authority to deal with toll violations with the Secretary of State. I am happy to answer any questions, and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill being on Short Debate, the Chair recognizes Representative Sosnowski. For what reason do you rise?"

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. This came up in Revenue Committee and I expressed some concerns with this at the time and the truckers... one of the truckers associations also raised some concerns, more with the process and not so much with the project. I believe... and I don't know a lot about the project itself that may be good. But they certainly raised

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

some valid concerns about how the process went down, their involvement in these discussions. And as we know, truckers will pay the vast majority of these tolls in these types of agreements. And some of the concern that was raised in committee is that there's, other than a local municipal or county board review, there's not really a public hearing process that's set up to review these tolls. There was also concerns raised about the overall discussion of the project and truckers not being brought into these conversations. You know, I raise some of these concerns because I think, as a process, we definitely want to have these organizations involved. And again, they were on the record saying the project itself may be an okay project but they weren't brought in and not a part of it. There's also some concerns raised on access points. There used to be three access points in this particular area. One was closed recently, leaving this project and one other access point. So of course, they also have a concern, will that other access point still be available. So, I'm prepared to vote 'no' on this. I think this Bill needed a little bit more discussion. It would have been nice to have the stakeholders that raised some concern brought to the table, and I think many of their concerns could have been worked through and addressed. Certainly, you know, there will be tolls at this location but I think some of the other concerns that they raised in committee are certainly valid. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Bennett, for what reason do you seek recognition? This is on Short Debate. We've already had somebody in opposition."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Bennett: "I'm on the fence, ma'am, if I may."

Speaker Manley: "We've already had somebody in opposition speak

on it. It's on Short Debate."

Bennett: "So, how many do you have then? How many..."

Speaker Manley: "One."

Bennett: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "But I just like you and I wanted to say hello.

Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Thank you. And just to make sure everybody knows, the trucking association had been in negotiations. This project has been talked about for over, oh let's say about six years of the eight that I've been in this General Assembly. There has been wide discussion over what's going on. As far as the tolling and having public access to public information on that decision making process, that would be done through the county's governmental process so there would be postings of what the agendas are. And if that were to come up on a transportation committee agenda, it would be provided to the public. Also the dates of the county board meetings are made public for, and opportunity for public comment. So, there is ample opportunity and transparency if anything were to change with the toll rates. And thirdly, is this part of access points, there used to be two... three access points. One was closed because the railroad track was right along one of the access points and the ICC actually closed it down for safety reasons from very many near misses. So, what we're doing is adding a tolled access point into the north end of the intermodal facility. There is still two free accesses, one off of I-55 and Arsenal Road and then one off of Laraway Road.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

So basically, this is encompassing in the Bill. And I've given my commitment, as this continues to go forward, that I'll work with the trucking association, hand in hand, to make sure anymore issues are addressed. With that, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 158 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Wes. Spain. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting in 'favor', 29 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 171, Representative Williams. Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 171, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Williams, would you like to present the Bill on Third? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 171, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. One moment."

Speaker Manley: "Take your time."

Williams, A.: "I'm ready. So, this Bill is similar to a Bill that was passed in the 100th General Assembly. It was amended in the House with similar language and it dissolves the Dry

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Cleaner Environmental Response Trust Fund Council and transfers all administrative responsibilities of the fund to the EPA. So, as some of you may be aware, clean up regarding dry cleaning fluids and other by-products have traditionally been addressed by a freestanding fund and a board, etcetera, of governance. We are proposing, now, to update the procedure for addressing these to make it more in line with the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Procedure and move everything to the EPA. I will note that we are still having discussions with some of the opponents and we believe we may have to do a trailer Bill just to make sure that all the parties involved are comfortable with the direction this change is going. But at this point, we're ready to move forward with this legislation."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes

Representative Butler. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Butler: "I rise in support and urge an 'aye' vote on my Republican colleagues."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams, A.: "Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 171 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Harris. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the
record. On this question, there are 103 voting in 'favor', 12
voting 'against', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having
received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

passed. Senate Bill 9, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 9, a Bill for an Act concerning coal ash. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Ammons, Senate Bill 9. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 9, a Bill for an Act concerning coal ash. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 9 is a Coal Ash Pollution Prevention Act. Coal ash is a by-product that is produced when burning coal. It contains toxic metals that cause serious health problems, including cancer. For over seven years, we've been working to try to address the issue of coal ash. For over 55 years, power plant operators at the Vermilion Power Station dumped over 3.3 million cubic yards of toxic ash in the floodplains of the Middle Fork. This is enough to fill Chicago's Willis or Sears Tower nearly two times. Protecting our communities and our environment is our number one option. This Bill will set the parameters of how coal ash will be handled in the State of Illinois. It is a good piece of legislation negotiated with many, many partners. And we look forward to passing coal ash this evening for the taxpayers of Illinois but, specifically for those who are impacted by the coal ash that is in their backward. We highly urge a 'yes' vote for this Bill, Senate Bill 9. And I'll take any questions."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Manley: "This matter is on Short Debate. Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. While I like Short Debate,
I'm going to request that this particular Bill be put on
Standard Debate."

Speaker Manley: "I had a feeling."

Batinick: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Would you like to proceed with any questions, Representative Batinick?"

Batinick: "I do have a question or two, Madam Speaker. Will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I appreciate some of the work that you did on this and I know that there was an amendment that was going to take off a whole bunch of the opponents. Can you speak to that Amendment?"

Ammons: "The final Amendment that we ultimately did not pass in the Environmental Committee, that Amendment had various opposing views in one Amendment that we could not work out. What we hope to do is, Senator Bennett has committed to a trailer Bill to address some of the remaining issues that were not addressed in this Bill, and we've made a commitment to come back to those issues at a later date."

Batinick: "I'm hearing that there's a problem with the constitutionality and rulemaking because this would require clean up within 18 months. Has that been one of the issues that's been brought forth by some of the opponents? Rulemaking is going to take up to 18 months, but they're required to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

clean up immediately. How do they start cleaning up immediately if it takes time for the rule making?"

Ammons: "So, there... first of all, the portion that covers Vermilion County is in the AG's Office and that is being moved by lawsuit, unfortunately. The other provisions will be implemented as we get the rulemaking in place. They already have some provisions to start clean up. The Amendment would have caused some other constitutional challenges, which is why we did not move that Amendment, and moving Senate Bill 9 as it is."

Batinick: "Okay. So, you have ... I mean, you have a Vista Energy, you have the AFLCIO opposed, along with the IMA opposed, Illinois Energy Association, Chamber of Commerce is opposed, IBEW, Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group, Illinois Coal Association, although I believe they may be neutral now, Municipal Utilities Illinois Association, Engineers. So, you have a mix of business groups and unions that are opposed to this and you have some environmental groups that are for it. I'm going to actually try and do something here, and let's just try and simplify down what happened in Vermilion County so everybody can understand it 'cause it's really a mish mosh of proponents and opponents. So, you have the coal ash from what, about 70 years, correct? That's built up on the banks of the river?"

Ammons: "That's right."

Batinick: "Okay, and what does your Bill do to propose that it immediately starts the clean up?"

Ammons: "So, this Bill would allow U.S. EPA rules given... Illinois power companies until October 31, 2020 to close any of those

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

coal ash disposable areas that fail ground water protection requirements. The companies have known about this for years and they haven't done anything about it. So, this Bill gives the rulemaking process for Illinois so that they can clean these up. And any of those who are not cleaned up, they have an opportunity to set aside some rules to do so."

- Batinick: "So, how do they start immediate clean up if the rules aren't going to be set for 18 months?"
- Ammons: "Well, there is a process already that they can work with the EPA to clean up these. These coal ash... we don't prevent them from cleaning it up now. This Bill does not stop them from cleaning any of this up tomorrow. They can do it if they want to. But this Bill just set parameters in place for going forward."
- Batinick: "Right. Now, there was an issue with... the Amendment wanted to allow bonding so you could get an insurance bond so that you don't bankrupt some of these companies. So, some of the concerns that I've heard from Members of our Caucus is that if you enact this Bill as is, without some of the ideas that were in the Amendment, you're going to have companies go bankrupt and then the state or, you know, the local... I don't know would then be in charge of the clean-up. Can you speak to that? Because that sounds important. If you're asking them to clean it up immediately, there's a high cost, right?"
- Ammons: "Well, unfortunately, the high cost is to the people who have been exposed to the toxic waste. That's actually the high cost."
- Batinick: "I don't disagree with you, but I don't want them to go bankrupt. So, we're on the same page on that. I want to be

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

clear. I want these cleaned up as much as you do. What I want to understand is that if we pass up legislation that bankrupts the companies that will be responsible for the clean-up, it's not going to be cleaned up on their dime."

Ammons: "Unfortunately, the insurance that was being proposed in the Amendment we did not move, it was too much of a risk to taxpayers. Because, unfortunately, there is evidence already that the insurance provisions for other coal plants, they literally just close up shop and left and insurance companies found a way not to pay, left the taxpayers having to pay the Bill. We don't want that to happen in this case, which is why we did not move that Amendment."

Batinick: "So, how many coal plants in Illinois does this effect?

My understanding is there might be one bad actor, there are seven or eight other coal plants. Is that correct?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Okay. And one bad actor that we know of. So, what will happen to those other seven or eight? Will they be in financial duress with the passage of this Bill?"

Ammons: "I don't think so."

Batinick: "Okay. That's where my concern lies. I'm going to go ahead and speak to the Bill. I think we've fared this out enough to kind of explain what it does. These are difficult situations where we're trying to make decisions to protect the citizens from bad ground water. But the issue is, is we're trying to force these companies to pay for the clean-up. But if we force it in too much of an onerous way, they may just go belly up, go bankrupt, and leave the state and we're going to be on the hook. So, I'm going to sit back and listen to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the rest of the debate. I very much thank you for your answers. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Marron is recognized. I'm assuming you're in favor?"

"Yes, Madam Speaker. Thank you. To the Bill. I'd like to thank Representative Ammons for bringing this Bill forward and for her hard work on this very important issue. I want to thank her for her willingness, along with Senator Bennett, to address a few more issues in a trailer Bill. And this is a very, very important issue to my district. It is so critically important to Vermillion County. We are home to the only National Scenic River in the State of Illinois. And on the banks of that river are 3.3 million cubic yards of coal ash. So, not only do you have the short-term environmental liability of ground water contamination from the toxins and the coal ash, you also have a chance for a catastrophic spill into the only National Scenic River in this state, as the bank of that river erodes over the years. Not only do you have an environmental liability there, you have an economic liability because the river has become a very, very strong destination for people around the Midwest coming to Vermilion County. It's become and economic engine for the City of Danville and surrounding communities as people come to enjoy the river and the natural amenities that it provides the area. And finally the last thing, the taxpayers of Vermillion County and the taxpayers of the State of Illinois should not be on the hook for cleaning up this liability. And although this actual issue is tied up in litigation right now, it is very important to the residents of Vermilion County that no other

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

areas have to go through the same problem that we see with our beautiful river. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote. And thank you, Representative Ammons."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Wheeler, for what reason do you rise? Do you rise in support or against?"

Wheeler: "I voted 'no' in the committee and I have questions for the Sponsor."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative... Representative, we did... you had a great discussion in committee. I appreciate that all of those questions got asked. I want to clarify a few things that were brought up in that committee meeting regarding the insurance element. That was an important aspect to me and I wanted to go back to what was said in committee from the representatives of the Illinois EPA who were asked to come and speak. Do you remember that part of the committee?"

Ammons: "Vaquely."

Wheeler: "Vaguely. Well, I'll try and refresh your memory then. The representatives of the Illinois EPA got up and they said that they use insurance in other situations like landfills which have a similarity to this situation. And they were willing to accept that approach. Is that why the Amendment that was drafted had that element in it? Is that something you were willing to accept as an approach on this?"

Ammons: "That was part of what we were trying to do, but the full provision was problematic, ultimately leading to questions of constitutionality."

58th Legislative Day

- Wheeler: "Regarding the insurance?"
- Ammons: "Regarding the way the insurance provision was written for that Amendment."
- Wheeler: "Okay. Because my impression is that insurance companies, if they write the policy, as long as the insurance company is solvent, even if the company who had, you know, wrote... actually bought the policy goes out of business, that insurance is still in effect. Is that your understanding as well?"
- Ammons: "Well, it just really depends. What we've seen from other similar kind of issues like this, and I can share with you specifically. Issues facing the insurance as self-bonding, it's the same for all of them. We've seen many, many plants go bankrupt and the insurance companies not pay out the cleanup. And that is the problem that we had with the insurance provision in the first place."
- Wheeler: "Didn't some of the business community folks, who were testifying, tell us in that hearing that they were willing to let the IEPA actually pretty much pick the insurance policy that they would accept to clarify that problem, to clear it up so that could not happen?"
- Ammons: "They did say that in a committee. Unfortunately, when we looked at the provisions, this was still one of those that could not be cleared up at this time for us to pass on this Bill."
- Wheeler: "So then, my question becomes the trailer Bill. You mentioned it, I think, in your earlier statement. Is that something that would be a component of that trailer Bill, Representative?"

58th Legislative Day

- Ammons: "I can't answer that because that would be up to the Senate Sponsor of this Bill. I lean towards him on that question, on an insurance question."
- Wheeler: "I ask 'cause it's very important to all of us that this measure... that something happened here to take a positive effect. We all want this to be cleaned up, but I understand also that the company who owns that now purchased this site after much of this had already taken place. The people who are now responsible for it are not the ones who actually put the coal ash in the current situation. I think it would be appropriate for us to give them some flexibility to move forward with this. We don't want the Floor Leader had mentioned earlier, a company not owning up to this and somehow the taxpayers of Illinois being on the hook. We all want to prevent that from happening, but I think some measured flexibility would be in order for this. Would you agree with that?"
- Ammons: "I have a different view on what we would consider measured flexibility here. We have many examples of insurance companies not paying out for the clean-up. That was our concern in committee, that's still our concern now. My Senate Sponsor of this Bill can continue to work on this with industry, as well as with labor over the summer, as he has made a commitment that he will look back at this issue. But we have too many examples already to lean towards, even in this case, where we're talking about Dynegy and Vistra, they are in legal action because they failed to clean this up."
- Wheeler: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an issue where we are, I think, really close to getting

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

something done that meets everyone's standards here. I know that there's questions about promulgation of rules. As a member of JCAR, I'm always paying attention to those situations closely. I wish that we got a little further on this part of it. I really wanted to vote 'yes' on this Bill. I'm not there yet. Representative, if there's more we can do to get this done right, please reach out. I'd love to work with you on it. But this is something I'm not ready to vote 'yes' on yet, but I'm so darn close. I wish we could. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wehrli, who is in favor." Wehrli: "That is correct. Thank you. To the Bill. Illinois is a national leader, I believe, in the amount or the quantity of coal ash pits that we have in our state. And some of them that are still currently being used, or are in need of being cleaned up, date back to the 1950's. Now, when this practice started, technology was different, and now here we find ourselves down the road with the problems still remaining. And this is not something that is just Illinois centric, but we are seeing this issue all across the nation. And when we take no action, we see this leach into rivers where it has a serious environmental impact on those bodies of water. I am glad to hear that there is mention of a trailer Bill, because I do believe the concerns of the business community are real and they're worthy of us addressing. So, when I hear a trailer Bill, that to me is good. And I look forward to working collaboratively on those solutions as well. But here we are today with this Bill in front of us, and it's a time for action in the sense that we don't know when this environmental

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

disaster could potentially happen. But to do nothing in hopes of coming up with the perfect solution, you know, I'm not going to let perfect be the enemy of good. This is a healthy first step. I remain open to the business communities concerns. I want to address those, but we have to stop this now, because once it gets into our water, into our environment, it takes years and decades to clean up. With that, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Representative Ammons to close."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you to all of those who have taken this issue very seriously. Protecting our communities and natural resources, like our state's only National Scenic River, is nonpartisan. We all benefit from this. We need Senate Bill 9 to give us consistent and enforceable regulations that ensure timely and safe closure of Illinois' unlined leaking coal ash impounds. We need to put this in place to protect the people of our state and we want to give them some real assurances that we are taking this very seriously. This is a significant step forward. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to work on environmental protections that are in the best interest of the people of Illinois. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 9. And thank everyone so much for helping us to get this done. Thank you to Representative Marron, for Vermilion County standing strong, and certainly thank you to Leader Wehrli who has helped us to get this far. And we urge an 'aye' vote."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 9 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Walsh. Halbrook. Butler. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Speaker... excuse me, Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the question, there are 77 voting in 'favor', 35 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving onto Senate Bill 653, Representative Jones. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 653, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Jones, Senate Bill 653. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 653, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 653 is an initiative of the Physical Therapist Association. This Bill comes after some disagreement with the insurance companies that attempted to reduce the reimbursement on a time-based system that all insurance companies go through. I know that we have some opposition to this Bill. And I would like to state for the record, I haven't spoken to Illinois Chamber of Commerce or the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. This dispute involves Blue Cross Blue Shield, did an audit two years ago and it changed the way that CPT codes were done. It allowed the reimbursement rate which Blue Cross Blue Shield

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

implemented. They didn't notify all of the physical therapists that this Bill would apply to. They cut the reimbursement rates to physical therapists by approximately 13 percent, or \$68 million. So, I'm available for any questions. But this Bill is a check and balance, not only on the insurance company, but it allows us to protect our residents who are going in for physical therapy, and also the 4000 thousand physical therapists around the State of Illinois. I'm available for any questions."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "A couple of... just before we get into the meat of this, curiosity thing. Landscape architecture sunset, Representative, and I don't see an Amendment on this. How did this start as a landscape? This is anything but a landscape architecture sunset Bill. Do you have any explanation for that?"

Jones: "For the record, Representative, there was House Floor Amendment #1 which become the Bill."

Batinick: "Okay."

Jones: "Although it says landscape architect, this Amendment applied the language to the Bill."

Batinick: "Okay. So... and I believe I want to simplify what you just went through in your introduction. Basically, somebody changed... was it Blue Cross Blue Shield, changed the way that they calculate billable hours. So, depending on quarter hours, half hours, however they calculate billable hours,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

their system was changed, correct? It's a little bit different than what some of the other insurers used. Is that correct?"

Jones: "Yes, that's correct."

Batinick: "However, my understanding was that it does exactly what the contract allows, right? So, this is something where the contract is... we're legislating away something that was already allowed by contract. Isn't this a dispute that could be solved by the two parties the next time they renew their contract?"

Jones: "This is not... well, to answer your question, no, because Blue Cross Blue Shield decided to make this change through an audit without notifying any of the physical therapists around the state. And Blue Cross Blue Shield, they chose this fight and it's up to us to provide a check and balance on Blue Cross Blue Shield. We do this all the time. We did it with locomotive engineers. So, we do this all the time. Our goal is to protect our residents."

Batinick: "I certainly didn't vote for the locomotive engineers Bill."

Jones: "I'm sure you didn't."

Batinick: "But my understanding is, is what they're doing is, is allowed in current practice and it's within the agreement.

Madam Speaker, if you would indulge me to move this to Standard Debate, that would be swell."

Speaker Manley: "We will move it to Standard Debate."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Jones: "And, Representative, I disagree with you that it's not standard practice for an insurance company to go through this process, bring in an outside auditor, audit a company, change

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

the course of the contract, the agreement that they agreed to, and then not notify any of the physical therapists. Now, this costs, when they do that, gets passed onto our residents and our constituents. So, this is a check and balance on the insurance company."

Batinick: "Okay. So... and the reason I know this Bill, I think it went through Labor Committee. I believe this Bill was at some point, some version of it, was going to go through insurance company, correct? It was in one of my insurance packets. My issue was, sometimes it was a win loss. We're talking about the way we calculate billable hours if there's quarterly hours, half hours, and how the billing gets worked that way. I think at this point, there are some others that want to speak on it and might be able to provide more clarity. My issue is that this is something that's allowed under their contract and then just when the contract gets redone, it's something that could be renegotiated. But I'm sure you and others will have other things to say, so I appreciate the answers to my questions, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Brady."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, in Insurance Committee, which you're the Chair of and I'm Minority Spokes of, I came out with an understanding from the action that day, even though the Bill was voted out, that we had... I thought was a clear understanding that the parties were going back to have

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

discussions and that this Bill would not move to Third Reading. Am I mistaken on that?"

Jones: "Yes, Representative. As I stated in committee, I gave no commitment to not... to hold this Bill on Second. The goal was that the parties would negotiate. Now, I will state for the record that this happened in 2016. So, Blue Cross Blue Shield undertook this audit in 2016 and this has been going on for three years and Blue Cross Blue Shield had the opportunity to negotiate and settle this. And now, we're here because we have these physical therapists, 4000 physical therapists around the State of Illinois who are not... Blue Cross Blue Shield is holding onto the money that they're guaranteed for the physical therapists."

Brady: "Okay. Well, I thought I saw or read where the audit finding the change that they made was in 2017. And then I also had, what I thought, was an understanding that negotiations were going to continue. So, if I'm mistaken there, I'm sorry for that, but I was a 'no' in committee and I'm going to stay a 'no' on the House Floor because we're entering into a private business contracts' ability here. And I think it's a bigger picture, especially when the companies were testifying in front of us, that they were going to negotiate on the legislation and get things resolved. Thank you."

Jones: "And let me just address that. So, these are national standards that Blue Cross Blue Shield has decided, through an audit that they conducted, to change. So, it's not like these are not standards that every physical therapist and every insurance company has to go through. Blue Cross Blue Shield

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

decided to change the rules in the middle of the game. So again, we want to provide a check and balance on Blue Cross Blue Shield to make sure that they're not only adhering to what they promised the physical therapists, but also that our residents are not caught up in this disagreement."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Representative, my understanding though is that, I mean, the company certainly has the ability to do what they want when they enter into the contracts. And if the contract spells this out, federal or otherwise, they still have that flexibility under the contract, from my understanding, of what they did with those they negotiated the contracts with. And so, I came away with the understanding, and if that's my mistake, that this was going to be... something that was going to be worked through and worked on before we stand on the House Floor like this today."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Unes: "Representative, during committee, I think there was a little bit of confusion because there was talk about a professional audit being done, but I think there needs to be some clarification. The company was not audited, and then in those audit findings, it was reported that they had to change this policy. Is that correct? The company actually hired another company to do an audit to see if there were findings in areas where they could save costs."

Jones: "So, Representative, it wasn't the company, it was Blue Cross Blue Shield who did the audit. They audited the codes.

58th Legislative Day

- So, they have the right to pay the codes or deny the codes and Blue Cross Blue Shield has taken the process of bringing in a company called Verscend. And it was Verscend who recommended to Blue Cross Blue Shield that they take the steps with the physical therapists and deny the codes based on the units that they were charging for physical therapy."
- Unes: "So... and that was my point, that Blue Cross Blue Shield was not audited. They did not have somebody come in and audit them. They actually hired a company. They hired a company to audit those codes for ways where they could save costs."
- Jones: "So, for the record, Blue Cross Blue Shield hired Verscend to audit the CP codes of the physical therapists around the State of Illinois."
- Unes: "And so... and I think that's where the confusion was in committee. In committee, I think some Members thought that there was a... like revenue came in and audited them, and that wasn't the case. It was that they actually hired a company to come in and audit those codes."
- Jones: "Yes, they hired... Blue Cross Blue Shield hired an out of state company to audit the CPT codes and they didn't notify any of the physical therapists around the state regarding these codes. So, they actually took money back where they wanted to... where the unit was 15 minutes, or 1 unit or 2 units, they changed it and it made it that they would only pay for two units which is what is in dispute right now."
- Unes: "So, if I'm not mistaken, Representative, current AMA guidelines say that if there is a therapist... it doesn't even have to be a physical therapist, correct? We could be talking about any type of therapy, speech therapy, occupational

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

therapy, it could be any of those. And if they bill for... if they do work for... let's say, one unit is 15 minutes. Anything over half of that, AMA guidelines say that you can bill for one unit."

Jones: "That's correct, Representative."

Unes: "And so, this would then change, in the middle of the game, change the rules and say that no longer can they bill that one unit the way the rest of the insurance companies... the way I understand it, the way the rest of the private insurance companies do, as they follow AMA guidelines."

Jones: "So, this Bill wouldn't do that. That's what Blue Cross Blue Shield did to the physical therapists. And to your point, we have 7000 occupational therapists, 3000 certified occupational therapist assistants; we have speech pathologists, 9000; speech language pathologist assistants, 241; licensed physical therapists, 12,000; and also, licensed physical therapy assistants that Blue Cross Blue Shield audit would impact. So, this is the numbers that... the changes that Blue Cross Blue Shield implemented through the audit of the out of state company that it would impact."

Unes: "You know where the hospitals or the med society weighs in on this?"

Jones: "I believe that they're neutral."

Unes: "And there's only one insurance company that has made this change. Is that correct?"

Jones: "Yes."

Unes: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Jones to close."

58th Legislative Day

- Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you, Members, for your questions. This Bill would not only provide a check and balance on Blue Cross Blue Shield, but also allow physical therapists to be treated with, not only respect, but also to be heard in the process. This is a good Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 653 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting in 'favor', 38 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 584, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 584, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 584, Leader Hoffman.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 584, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative from Madison County addressing the Metro East Sanitary District. It would require two, instead of three, commissioners to be residents of portion of the district from Madison County, and then would indicate that the mayor of the largest city in the district would be

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

on the board as well. That would probably be the mayor of Granite City. Currently, the Metro East District is governed by a board of five commissioners. This would continue that. It would also indicate that the individual who is the executive director could not have a severance pay and could not, basically, have a long term contract that was given to the current executive director. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Representative Meier."
- Meier: "Can we have Standard Debate, please?"
- Speaker Manley: "The Bill will be on Standard Debate. Chair recognizes Representative Meier."
- Meier: "So, Jay, on this Bill, we've debated this before. It's going to place the Granite City Mayor on this Metro East Sanitary District?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, he is the mayor of the biggest city in the sanitary district that is in Madison County."
- Meier: "Okay. Is that a conflict of interest with him being on the Granite City sewer system already? He's on... that's a separate board than him being mayor."
- Hoffman: "He... it could be... I apologize, it could be the mayor is designee. But I don't believe that is a conflict of interest, no."
- Meier: "Is he paid to be on the Granite City Sewer District?"
- Hoffman: "He's paid to be mayor. I don't know about the Granite
 City Sewer District. But he would not... I don't believe he
 would receive any compensation for being on this board."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Meier: "He would receive 14 thousand a year for being on this board, according to what I've been told. Wouldn't that be a conflict between his mayor's salary and being on the other Granite City sewer board? Why is he going to be on another sewer board?"

Hoffman: "If I would... I'd be willing to pass a trailer Bill that indicates that the mayor wouldn't receive any additional salary as a result of serving on this board. But if he has a designee, that person would. I'd be willing to put a trailer Bill. I don't believe it is. I don't believe, even if he did get paid though, it would be a conflict."

Meier: "Well, doesn't Granite City Sewer District receive about \$789 thousand a year from the Metro East Sanitary District? Would that be a conflict of interest?"

Hoffman: "Those are not grants. That's paying for sewer services."

Meier: "But is not that a conflict of interest?"

Hoffman: "He doesn't receive the money, no."

Meier: "The town he's representing does."

Hoffman: "They do, and I don't believe it is a conflict of interest."

Meier: "In the past, there has been massive flooding because of this pumps and this district has not been run correctly. We've just went through the fifth largest flood ever in the St. Louis area and there was no flooding. Why would we want to go back to when only half the pumps were working and this district was losing a million dollars a year when there's been a turnaround in the last couple of years and this district is operating in the black?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Hoffman: "It's my understanding they're not... they haven't been paying their bills. That's why they're operating the current way they are. And, Sir, if you want to talk about something that is untoward, talk about the person who is serving as executive director not even living in the district, getting a long term contract, indicating that he can't be fired after 90 days for doing a poor job, and if he is, if he is fired that he then would receive a severance. Now, this is an executive director who never ran this type of an agency before, now is running it and received a sweetheart deal."

Meier: "The sweetheart deal is for the taxpayers in that area right now.

Hoffman: "You don't live in the area."

Meier: "They don't have to worry about flooding. They don't have to worry about the cost of their flood insurance going up because the system is running correctly now."

Hoffman: "Representative..."

Meier: "For years, I've read in the BND how this district is not working correctly, it's losing money, it's causing flooding issues. This cost our businesses and all of our taxpayers in that area money."

Hoffman: "Representative, you don't represent even one inch, not even one inch, of the area that includes the Metro East Sanitary District."

Meier: "Representative, a lot of my constituents..."

Hoffman: "If you would let me..."

Meier: "...work in the Metro East Sanitary District. And when there's flooding there because half the pumps don't work, that effects their jobs, their paychecks, their businesses

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

that they have to go to. So, you can't say that this doesn't affect my district."

Hoffman: "Was that a question?"

Meier: "That's a statement. We have a district that's finally running correctly. You have people on that board that live in the Granite City address already on this board. So, it seems to be, the power grab right now, seems to be this Bill. And it's not for the taxpayers of the Metro East Sanitary District. It seems to be a power grab just to try to take over something that you're no longer in charge of and something that was running very poorly for the last several years. You can reference many articles in the Bellville News-Democrat talking about the problems this district had. I haven't seen that now in the last couple years."

Hoffman: "It isn't in your district, that's why you haven't seen it."

Meier: "The Bellville News-Democrat is in my district. It goes to my district. I see the articles. I hear from people who can't work when there's flooding there. I would encourage everybody to be a 'no' vote and let this be decided amongst the two districts, not come up to Springfield and try to dictate the way this is changed. You wouldn't be changing this right now if a Republican wouldn't have been elected in Madison County. You would have it going on the same way as it has. I am in favor of whoever does the best job. And right now, this district seems to be running correctly and that's good for the taxpayers. So, I encourage everybody to vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Representative Hoffman to close."

58th Legislative Day

- Hoffman: "Yes, you only hear part of the story. The truth of the matter is this sanitary district tried to put an illegal tax on only the poorest areas in the Metro East Sanitary District. Those areas are the poorest of the poor in Madison and St. Claire County. It was ruled illegal. It was ruled unconstitutional. And as a matter of fact, they had to pay attorneys to defend them in that lawsuit. That's why I brought this Bill, because of that. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 584 pass?'
 All 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 question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 44 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 654, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 654, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Yes, I ask that Floor Amendment #2 be adopted. It's my understanding this clears up any opposition. This is the extension of the professional engineers licensing and it removes opposition that may have existed."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 654. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hoffman and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman on Amendment 3."
- Hoffman: "I apologize. This is the Amendment that actually removes opposition from AFSCME and others, and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 654. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 654, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes, this would be the extension of the Engineering Act for DFPR. I know of no known opposition. This was worked out, negotiated between all the parties, and everyone is in favor."
- Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 654 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there

58th Legislative Day

- are 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to Senate Bill 657, Representative Omar Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 657, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Oh yes, this is similar to the previous Bill, but this deals with the Structural Engineering Association and the Structural Engineering Act. This changes the sunset. And when we adopt Floor Amendment #2 and Floor Amendment #3, it removes all the opposition."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 657. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hoffman and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "As with the previous Bill, this takes away the opposition of AFSCME. And there is no known opposition."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman moves for the Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 657. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Williams on Senate Bill 657. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 657, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams."

Williams, J.: "Yes, Madam. Senate Bill 657 extends the sunset on Structural Engineering Practice Act by 10 years to January 1, of 2030 and makes the modernization of changes throughout the Act, such as updating provisions to allow for electronic communications between the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and Licenses. Structural engineers are the highest licensed class of engineers in Illinois and perform especially complicated and large engineering projects such as bridges and skyscraper engineering. There is no opposition to the Bill and I ask for an 'aye' vote. And I am happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative, hello. Over here. Is this your first Bill?"

Williams, J.: "Yes."

Butler: "Can you tell me when Bill introduction deadline was?"

Williams, J.: "I'm sorry, repeat the question."

Butler: "Madam, can take this off Standard... put this on Standard Debate, possibly, for a first Bill?"

Speaker Williams: "Only on Long Debate."

Butler: "Unlimited Debate?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Manley: "Yes."

Butler: "Sure. Representative, do you know when Bill introduction deadline is?"

Williams, J.: "I didn't hear you. (inaudible) I really didn't hear you, say it again."

Butler: "Do you know when Bill introduction deadline is?"

Williams, J.: "No."

Butler: "Okay. Representative, when were you sworn into office?"

Williams, J.: "May 17."

Butler: "Very good. Well, what do you know about structural engineering?"

Williams, J.: "Well..."

Butler: "Are you an engineer?"

Williams, J.: "No. No, Sir."

Butler: "Do you know engineers?"

Williams, J.: "I do know engineers."

Butler: "You like engineers?"

Williams, J.: "Sometimes."

Butler: "Okay. I've got a few engineers in my family so you better watch what you're saying there."

Williams, J.: "Well, I work with a lot of operating engineers."

Butler: "I don't think they're structural engineers though."

Williams, J.: "Well, they're not as good as structural engineers, but they're still engineers."

Butler: "Mechanical engineers, civil engineers?"

Williams, J.: "Mechanical engineers, civil engineers, yes."

Butler: "Aerospace engineers?"

Williams, J.: "I don't know any aerospace engineers."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Butler: "Very good. Congratulations, Representative, on your first Bill."

Williams, J.: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Ford: "So, Mr. Williams."

Williams, J.: "Sir?

Ford: "You come here and you take a Bill from Phoenix just like that."

Williams, J.: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Ford: "How did you take the Bill from Mr. Hoffman like that?"

Williams, J.: "Well, it wasn't a take. It was a pleasure of letting me get in with him."

Ford: "I don't understand. It was a pleasure..."

Williams, J.: "Well, basically, Mr. Hoffman allowed me...

Representative Hoffman allowed me to have his Bill."

Ford: "Did you ask him for it or he just gave it to you?"

Williams, J.: "No, I begged him for it."

Ford: "You begged him for it. Well, did you tell him thank you?"

Williams J: "Yes, Sir. And if I didn't make it clear, thank you,

Representative Hoffman."

Ford: "Very good. See, he's from the West Side. Welcome to the General Assembly."

Williams, J.: "Thank you, Representative Ford."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams, J.: "I'm sorry. Well, seeing as there's not much opposition from the sides anymore, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 657 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 117 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', and 0 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations. Senate Bill 727, Representative Costa Howard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Costa Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Costa Howard on the Amendment."

 Costa Howard: "Yes, the... thank you, Madam Speaker. House Amendment

 1 is a Floor Amendment. It changes the underlying Bill's

 definition of Native American to mirror the current

 definition for American Indian or Alaskan Native in the

 Illinois Human Rights Act. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Costa Howard moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 727. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

 Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Costa Howard,

 Senate Bill 727. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Costa Howard."
- Costa Howard: "Madam Speaker, thank you. Senate Bill 727 creates the Native American Employment Plan Act. It requires CMS to develop and implement plans to increase the number of Native Americans employed by state agencies and the number of Native Americans employed by state agencies in supervisory, technical, professional, and managerial levels. Senate Bill 727 also creates a Native American Employment Plan Advisory Council. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 727 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 116 voting in 'favor', 1 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1167, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1167, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1167, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Kifowit."

58th Legislative Day

- Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a simple Bill that creates, subject to appropriation, a scholarship program for individuals that are over 30. They're considered nontraditional students and they could be actively looking for education in the event that they've been laid off, or they need to change jobs, or other circumstances. And so, this is, again, subject to appropriation, but it does create a nontraditional student scholarship program."
- Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."
- Batinick: "Representative, I see that it's subject to appropriation, I think you said that twice. Do you know what the cost of this would be if it was appropriated?"
- Kifowit: "I don't believe there was a Fiscal Note filed on this. I do not have that in my notes. It says the scholarship shall not exceed 2 thousand, per scholarship, per recipient, per academic year. And so, depending on what amounts, if any, are appropriated, that would be the amount of scholarships that would go off."
- Batinick: "I mean, do you have... is this millions, hundreds of thousands, tens of millions, do you have any idea how many people would be in adult vocational community college that you know?"
- Kifowit: "I think the number of scholarships would be predicated on how much is appropriated. So, if the state doesn't appropriate any money, there's zero scholarships, there would be zero money. If the state appropriates 100 thousand, it'll

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

be \$2 thousand increment scholarships up to that amount. It's really on the basis of the state appropriating the money."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Representative Kifowit to close. Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1167 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting
 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On this question, there being 109 voting in 'favor', 7 voting
 'against', and 2... I'm sorry, 0 voting 'present'. This Bill,
 having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed. Senate Bill 1272, Representative Welter. Out of the
 record. Senate Bill 1467, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr.
 Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1467, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1467. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1467, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Stava-Murray."
- Stava-Murray: "Thank you. So, it's appropriate that this Memorial Day we have SB1467 which gives greater access to scholarships for veterans or families of veterans. And so, this basically takes the requirement that there be 30 consecutive years in

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Illinois and reduces that to 15 consecutive years. And so, it's a minor change that expands access for those who have fought for our country."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1467 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kifowit. Hammond. Davidsmeyer.
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting in 'favor', 9 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1525, Representative Kalish. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1525, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Kalish, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Kalish on the Amendment."

Kalish: "Yes, thank you so much, Madam Speaker. This is an initiative of the National Association of Social Workers, a very important initiative to people in my district. It is... it requires that DCFS to provide eligible youth with an apprenticeship stipend to cover the cost associated with entering an apprenticeship. As we know, many of our youth who enter into these apprenticeship programs don't have the costs necessary to cover whatever tools are necessary to participate, so therefore, sometimes it prevents them from entering these programs. This is a subject to appropriation Bill. It has no cost associated with it. It will allow DCFS

58th Legislative Day

- the option whether or not to fund these programs. And I ask for your support."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Kalish moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1525. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Kalish. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1525, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Kalish."
- Kalish: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. What I said before, adding on that there are no known opponents at this time. And I ask for your support. Happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Manley: "On Short Debate, Representative Batinick."
- Batinick: "Very Short Debate, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Batinick: "Representative, and by the way, would prefer to call you something other than Representative. So, whatever you want me to address you as is fine by me. What is the cost of this particular program that's subject to appropriation?"
- Kalish: "It's subject to appropriation. We do not expect a high
 cost. We have not done a fiscal analysis of it. DCFS didn't
 come to us with any numbers."
- Batinick: "I mean, do you expect this to be something in the hundreds of thousands, millions, tens of millions?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Kalish: "No. No. No, in the tens."

Batinick: "Less than hundreds of thousands?"

Kalish: "In the tens, yes."

Batinick: "In the tens of thousands."

Kalish: "Right."

Batinick: "Even with staff? You think they have staff to implement this?"

Kalish: "This doesn't require any staff."

Batinick: "Thank you for your questions. Actually, thank you for your answers."

Kalish: "Thank you for your questions."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Representative Kalish to close."

Kalish: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1525 pass?'
All 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. With 116 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', and 0 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1529, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1529, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second a time previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Representative Hoffman. Senate Bill 1529. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1529, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This would amend the Illinois Power Agency Act. It would allow a one year delay of the delivery of renewable energy credits until June 1, 2012. This is a new utility scale wind... or utility scale solar, or brownfield sight projects, have been delayed in the establishment of an operation interconnection with applicable transmission for distributing the system. What this does is, the power agency hasn't been able get to the proper okay's on these types of projects and, therefore, we're just asking for an extension so that they can get to them and that they can still be viable projects for these renewable projects. I apparently said 2012, it's 2022."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1529 pass?' All those in favor say (SIC vote) 'aye'; opposed say (SIC vote) 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to Senate Bill 1557, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Mr... out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1591, Representative Walker. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1591, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1591.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1591, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1591 is amended by Committee Amendment #1 in the House, is the third part of a series of Bills that the Governor has put forward to develop new jobs in Illinois. The first part of this Bill is now the RND Tax Credit for employers and major companies who invest in RND. This tax credit exists today. What this Bill does is extend the sunset of it from the end of '21 to the end of '26. It's because when people invest in RND, they want to have a long time frame to understand the benefit they can get with a tax credit. So, this is extending the sunset for high tech companies. More significantly, I think, we passed Senate Bill 1919 which was the education and design part of a major statewide apprenticeship program that funded it through the community colleges and designed it. This is the part where the employer of apprentices will get a tax credit for the amount of money that each individual apprentice can receive up to \$35 hundred apiece for their educational expenses. There are a lot of pieces to this Bill that I could go through, but in fact, the goal is to really have robust, statewide, comprehensive apprenticeship programs that go beyond what we have today. I am open to questions."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Manley: "A reminder that we are on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Representative, we... you did a nice job presenting the Bill, both here and in committee. I believe that the language you have with respect to the RND Tax Credit is something I have filed myself. So, I am wholly in favor of that, as well as we've done apprenticeships. I do want to just alert Members of the Body, that while we are in favor of these measures, the Bill on the board says tax preventing data centers. This is not that Bill anymore, correct, Representative?"

Walker: "That's correct."

Wheeler: "So, we are yet to work through, with my friend Representative Zalewski, a tax center... a data center tax credit program. This is not this, but I whole heartedly support what you're doing here and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Walker: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Walker to close."

Walker: "This is the beginning of, I think, a revamp by the Governor's Office and the new administration, in concert with the General Assembly, on how we do business development in Illinois. These are just a couple of pieces. There are going to be more pieces coming along. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House... excuse me, Senate Bill 1591 pass?' All in favor say (SIC vote) 'aye'; opposed say (SIC vote) 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

58th Legislative Day

- Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1595, Leader Turner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1595. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Body. This is an extension of the Illinois Film Production Tax Credit. It extends the credit for five years through 2026. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for the support of the Body. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler. We are on Short Debate."
- Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Wheeler: "Leader Turner, this is an important measure for Illinois' film industry. I do want to just clear... I think our analysis says this actually goes through 2027. Is that what you show in yours as well?"
- Turner: "I think that your analysis may be a bit inaccurate. The way that I read it and the way we passed it through committee

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

extends this for five years through 2026 when it finishes up in 2021."

Wheeler: "Okay. Well, thank you for the clarification. I wanted to make sure we are on the right page here. This is an important thing for Illinois to be competitive with other states when it comes to film and television production. I fully support your Bill. Thank you."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further discussion, Leader Turner to close."

Turner: "I ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1595 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting in 'favor', 9 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1602, Representative Smith. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1624, Representative Andrade. Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1624, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1624, Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1624, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Manley: "Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1624 is an Amendment to the Illinois Protection Personal Information Act. Senate Bill 1624 requires any companies that currently collect data, who experience a breach requiring them to report to 500 Illinois residents or more, must also report that the breach to the Attorney General. And the Attorney General is required to report that information to the General Assembly. I wanted to make it very clear that it's important to note that the Bill only applies in situation where data collectors are already required to issue a notice by current law, by current law. We are not expanding the... who has to report. So, that's the only change that's being made. Thank you very much. If there's any questions, if not, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate, and the Chair recognizes Leader Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for Standard Debate, please."

Speaker Manley: "We will move to Standard Debate. Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wheeler: "Representative, we had a very good discussion about this Bill in committee. I know that my friends in the community bankers and some of the credit unions, I believe, had some concerns about this Bill here, and I know you addressed some of those in your opening statement. I want to

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

just put on the record that I made a commitment to them in committee that we would follow this up over the summer."

Andrade: "Absolutely."

Wheeler: "And we would work through a trailer Bill, if necessary, we would try and find a way to get that done to alleviate their concerns. You agree with that approach, Sir?"

Andrade: "Yes, I agree. I agree that we should. I mean, it passed in the Senate 59 to 0, which I know to a lot of Members here doesn't mean anything. But I just want to say, hopefully, they could have found at least one 'no' vote over there, but they chose to find them over here. But I'm willing to work with them and they gave me an Amendment that... it just carved them out. So, I wanted to work a little bit more, and just not a... just a carve out."

Wheeler: "You know, I want to... I appreciate that. I would put on the record, again, also that this is a concern about who owns data and how breaches are responded to appropriately. This is an issue we are seeing in many different facets in our environment here..."

Andrade: "Right."

Wheeler: "...regarding legislations coming forward. That's why we have an important committee like cybersecurity. I'm glad you Chair it. But at the same time, this is something we have to work through and so the companies understand, the associations understand, their responsibilities and how we address them when something doesn't go right. So, again..."

Andrade: "Right, right. Now, if the credit union wants parity, you know, we could require every business in the State of Illinois to reporting if that's what the opponents want. I

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

mean, I'm open to that. If they could be a chief sponsor of that, and I'd be a chief-co with them if they want every business in Illinois to now do it too. I don't know if that's what the Democrats or Republicans want, but if..."

Wheeler: "No, I think..."

Andrade: "I'm open to work with them and do everything necessary."

Wheeler: "I think the approach really should go in the direction of let's have the thoughtful discussion over the summertime, get to a resolution that clears up the maybe uncertainties or concerns that still exist. I look forward to that. I'll be voting 'aye', today. Again, with that in mind, that we'll have some discussions and a trailer Bill to follow up if needed."

Andrade: "And you, Representative Wheeler, you know that I believe that my committee and your committee of the minority spokesperson, we are one of the, probably by far, one of the most bipartisanship committees out there. So, I have always worked with you and I am committed to keep working with you and I hope we can keep this relationship that the committee has always crossed and worked with both aisles. And as Members know, I have always worked with Members on the other side too. So, I'm always open to keep an open mind."

Wheeler: "I'm grateful for that as well, my friend, and I look forward to further discussions on this Bill. Thank you."

Andrade: "I thank you very much."

Wheeler: "You bet."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Parkhurst. Do you rise in favor or in opposition?"

Parkhurst: "In opposition."

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Parkhurst: "I'm a member of a credit union, and the credit unions oppose. And I also have the Illinois Insurance Association and State Farm in opposition. I think that the Bill lacks parity. There is reporting requirements for owners only which is of the financial institutions and not for the merchants to notify. So, if you're going to have a notification requirement, I think that you need to have both the owners and the merchants be required to report, or neither required to report. The reporting requirements require the financial institutions, like the credit union, to report on the breach, but they don't have the factual details concerning a breach that they didn't commit. Yet, the merchant who... where the breach occurred, does not have to report. There is a lack of parity. It's not appropriate just to have one side of this equation report and not the other side report. Under your Bill, the merchants that cause the breach, would be exempt from recording the breach to the Attorney General's Office. The financial institutions who did not cause the breach but who are required to report it, must describe the nature of the breach, not merely the type of personal information compromised. So, the financial institutions will have difficulty submitting an accurate report to the Attorney General under the proposed standard because they don't have the factual details concerning a breach that they didn't commit. Describing the nature of the breach may require disclosure of the business entity at which the breach occurred, thereby creating liability exposure for these financial institutions, especially for credit unions. So,

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

mandating a legal requirement for credit unions to report incomplete third hand information on data breaches is burdensome to the community and their compliance departments doesn't make any sense. I think that you need to have both the merchants and the financial institutions report, or neither report. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Please excuse Representative Unes for the rest of the day."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Caulkins. Do you rise in opposition or in support?"

Caulkins: "I have a question, I'm not sure. I'd like a point of clarification, Ma'am. If Sponsor will yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Caulkins: "Thank you. What is the reporting requirement, the time line? How long, is it stated?"

Andrade: "At this moment, it follows the... it keeps what the current law is, which is a reasonable time. That's what it does right now."

Caulkins: "So, reasonable to whom?"

Andrade: "Reasonable... right now, it says such notification must be made in the most expedited time possible without unreasonable delay but in no event later than when the data collector provides notice to the consumer pursuant to this section, which is current law."

Caulkins: "Okay. I was curious as to what that is. I know that there's some issues with reporting and this solves, I guess, the question in my mind. Most reasonable, expedient, we expect the breach to be reported as quickly as possible?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

Andrade: "Correct."

Caulkins: "Okay."

Andrade: "Go ahead."

Caulkins: "Thank you for your answer."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Carroll."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Carroll: "So, Representative Andrade, can you please explain to me the genesis of this Bill? What made you decide to bring this forward?"

Andrade: "The genesis of this Bill is that we are trying to gather statewide information of large breaches. The state... the data collectors are already required by law to do this report, and even if one individual, they are already required... they already have this information. What we are requesting is if 500 or more residents of Illinois are affected by this one breach, then they should send that to the state of... Attorney General's Office so the Attorney General can have knowledge of what is happening throughout the whole state."

Carroll: "Okay, thank you. Is the opposition generally starting to stem from the Supreme Court case that held Great America responsible for some of the BIPA violations?"

Andrade: "I'm not sure. I don't know on about that one."

Carroll: "Okay. Sorry about that. Okay."

Andrade: "I'm not familiar with that, I'm sorry."

Carroll: "Okay. Well, to the Bill. This is a great piece of legislation. It's going to protect consumers across the board and my question goes to the fact that there's a lot of

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

businesses nervous because there's a recent ruling from the Illinois Supreme Court that's holding people that hold our personal information more accountable. So, Representative Andrade, I thank you for bringing this Bill forward and I strongly encourage the Body to support the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "We are on Standard Debate. Representative Ammons do you rise in support or opposition?"

Ammons: "I rise in support."

Speaker Manley: "We've already had three... well, actually more."

Ammons: "I'm not sure."

Speaker Manley: "So, Representative Pappas, do you rise in... you're okay? All right. Representative Andrade to close."

Andrade: "Thank you. I'm actually going to use the opponent's fact sheet here to actually prove a point. They're saying that... I just want to make clear that the Illinois Bankers Association is not opposed to this Bill. The major insurance companies are not opposed to this Bill. The Illinois Chamber of Commerce is not opposed to this Bill, they actually worked with the stakeholders across the aisle. If ... as one of the opponents from Kankakee spoke and said she wants parity. I am more than willing to be a chief-co on her Bill if she wants every industry, every business, no matter what size to report. I am more than willing to help her on that. If she wants every business of Illinois to be... have a burden on this. But this under existing Act, a merchant that discovers a breach of security personal information data believes it was acquired by an unauthorized person, must immediately notify the financial institution. This is according to the opponent's

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

fact sheet. Here, according to this right now, the merchant must report to the financial institution given information. So, that's it. So, thank you very much. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote. This is not an expansion out of anyone that would have to report. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1624 pass?'

 Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting in 'favor', 32 voting 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1558, Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1558."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative West."
- West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1558 is a City of Rockford initiative that came from my mayor. It... right now, in the Video Gaming Act, it states that non-Home Rule units of government may not impose any fee for the operation of video gaming terminals in excess of \$25 per year. My request is that we add, the City of Rockford may not impose any fee

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

for the operation of a gaming... a video gaming terminal in excess of \$250 per year. With that... the City of Rockford does not have Home Rule and with that fee as low as it is, we have over 450 video gaming terminals in our city which is the highest in the state. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. I will entertain any questions that you may have."

Speaker Manley: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Chair recognizes Leader Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I caught the gist of it despite the noise. I actually caught the gist of pretty much everything you said there. I see the IML, City of Rockford, J&J Venture Gaming are proponents. Yet, the Illinois Gaming Machine Operators Association is opposed. Can you speak to that?"

West: "Them being opposed is news to me. Give me one second. I don't see them as opponents on mine. Oh, there they are. I cannot speak to that. They did not come and speak with me to what their opposition was. So, I'm sorry about that."

Batinick: "You know what, I'm actually not overly concerned about that. I was just buying a little time."

West: "Okay."

Batinick: "So, my bigger concern here is the… you can raise… well, let's start with this. Rockford's not a Home Rule city?"

West: "Correct. Yeah, we tried them last year but we came up short."

Batinick: "Okay. So, this allows them, just for Rockford, to levy a special video game terminal annual sticker fee of up to \$250 per year?"

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

West: "Correct."

Batinick: "And right now, it's \$25 per year?"

West: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So, what we're going to vote on right here is allowing one town to raise a fee from \$25 to 250."

West: "As I used to say back in high school, if you could help a brother out, I'll come help you out momentarily."

Batinick: "I had a Bill we debated for about three hours. Could have used a little help, Representative. Maybe tomorrow. Maybe tomorrow. Okay. What do Home Rule entities get to do here with these situations?"

West: "I believe... Home Rule municipalities are able to set their own rates."

Batinick: "Unlimitedly?"

West: "At the moment, we believe that it's up to a thousand dollars."

Batinick: "Up to a thousand dollars. So, what you're doing is is you're taking a city where the residents did not want to be Home Rule, taking the Bill here and giving them the ability to be almost Home Rule in terms of the rates that they can charge for video gaming sticker fees, correct?"

West: "If you look at it that way. One way I'm looking at it is that since we are not Home Rule, that the City of Rockford needs to come to us, as Legislators, to help them to alleviate any cost that they may have and increase any fees that they need to increase. So, that's what we are in need of assistance with."

Batinick: "Okay, I'm just trying to clarify the Bill for our... for some of our Representatives on our side of the aisle. I'm

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

being asked to do Standard Debate real quick on this one so somebody could speak in support on our side, if that would be okay, Madam Speaker. Thank you. Thank you for your answers."

Speaker Manley: "We'll move to Standard Debate. Chair recognizes Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Cabello: "Representative West, can you tell me that the gaming industry that's located in Rockford, did they meet with the City of Rockford and stakeholders and agree to this through an agreement and a signed letter to the mayor and the General Assembly?"

West: "Yes, Sir. That is correct."

Cabello: "So, they are actually in agreement with this, and is there a moratorium on how... when they can come back and ask for more fee increases?"

West: "I believe there is a moratorium. I just... it escapes me how long that is."

Cabello: "It's a few years, I believe. But..."

West: "Okay, that's what I thought."

Cabello: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an agreement between the City of Rockford and the gamers. I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "There being no further questions, Representative West to close."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I look forward to a positive Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1558 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting in 'favor', 18 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 418, offered by Representative Butler. And House Resolution 419, offered by Representative Butler."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Scherer. What reason do you rise?"

Scherer: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Scherer: "Thank you. I wanted just a quick announcement that the food trucks will be back on Wednesday and just wanted to let people know that to prepare for it. And also, since I represent the same area as Abe Lincoln did and several of you have your families here at the Capitol, I wanted to mention that you could visit Lincoln's home, Lincoln's Museum, the Illinois State Museum, the Dana Thomas House, the Old State Capitol, the Lincoln-Herndon Law Office, or the homestead that is near Decatur. So, if your family's here, have them come and visit some of these very cool Lincoln sites."

Speaker Manley: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 28, at the hour of 9 a.m. All those in favor say

58th Legislative Day

5/27/2019

'aye'; 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. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 417, offered by Representative Butler. House Joint Resolution 80, offered by Representative Walsh. House Joint Resolution 81, offered by Representative Batinick. These referred to rules committee. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 459, offered by Representative Villa, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 516, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 689, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 690, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of these Senate Bills that were held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."