61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "The House will be order. Members will be in their Chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Jane Bradford who is with the Saunemin United Methodist Church in Saunemin. Pastor Jane Bradford is the guest of Representative Bennett. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Bradford: "Let us pray. Almighty God, hollowed be thy name. We thank you for these men and women who have answered your call to serve as Representatives of the people to our State Legislature. We pray your presence with and upon each of them. We pray for your divine protection for their families, their homes, and their health. May the fear of God be their guiding light, their joy, and their strength. At this Session of the House of the people begins its important work of the day, we thank you that you have already gone before them with the anointing of your spirit to bring about a successful Session. We pray that there would be unity of heart and mind over the matters that are closest to your heart, oh God. We pray your wisdom and light on every agenda item, trusting that you will lead them according to your perfect will. Spirit of God, shed your light upon each difficult issue and part the waters of any gridlock, making a way for just and right policies and laws to come forth. Policies that will mend that which is broken and laws that will protect and lift up its most vulnerable citizens. Lord, remove the obstacles that confound them. Forgiving God, forgive our sins, sin of selfpreservations, sin of manipulation, self of glorification and pride. We have all gone our own way and

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

worked to have our own concerns protected. We have failed to seek your way. We pray now that you would fill our minds with your thoughts and ways, for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are your ways higher than our ways, and your thoughts higher than our thoughts. God of all the people, I lift to you every Representative in this room called to protect the wellbeing of all people. Touch each one with your spirit and guide them into obedience to your call to do justice, have kindness, and walk humbly with our God, that they would be your instruments for the righteous governing of the State of Illinois, always for the glory of your name. Amen."

- Speaker Burke: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by...today by Representative Bristow."
- Bristow 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 Burke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Willis is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Willis: "Madam Chair, there are no excused absences from the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Batinick: "Madam Speaker, please let the record reflect that Representative Dan Ugaste is excused for the day."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 117 Members answering the call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- "Committee Reports. Representative Feigenholtz, Clerk Hollman: Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: adopted is House Resolution 422, Floor recommends be Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1797. Representative Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: Concur recommends be adopted, Motion to Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 137, House Resolution 425. Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 424. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 731; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1863."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Bennett, for what reason do you rise? Nope. Okay. Representative Bourne, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bourne: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."
- Bourne: "Thank you. Each year we do an art contest for K-8. We asks that it's Illinois themed. We've gotten a lot of wonderful submissions, but we invite our winners up to the Capitol to share their art. Today, we have three of our

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

winners: Avielle Spudich, Nathan Brown, and Lydia Cline are all in the back here. If you guys will give us a wave. And here is their wonderful artwork. So, I will have it at my desk today and in my office all year if you want to stop by and see it. And please welcome them to the Capitol and congratulate them on winning the art contest."

Speaker Burke: "Welcome to the Capitol. Representative Severin, for what reason do you rise?"

Severin: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Severin: "I have with me today someone that's pretty famous. He is the Governor of the Youth and Government for this year. His name is Matt Thery. He's from Sesser-Valier High School. And before I go any further, I want to introduce his mother and grandmother up in the gallery. I forgot to introduce the grandparents of my Page on Tuesday, so I wanted to introduce them. So, I want to tell you just a little bit about this young man. He's a fantastic young individual that has... he's got his priorities straight. He's got a lot going on. He was welcomed home with a parade when he won the governship of the Youth and Government program with over 1200 votes. Let me tell you a little bit about his guy. He's a junior at Sesser-Valier High School. He's been involved in nearly every extracurricular activity offered in his school. He also stays active in his community. He's a multi-sport athlete. He has a passion for baseball. He enjoys riding motorcycles, lifting weights, shooting guns. Did you hear that? Shooting guns. He's also involved with football, track, basketball. He's

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

active with the Future Farmers of America, the Outdoorsmen's Club, the National Honor Society, the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. He's a member of the high school band, the math team. Basically, he's the school. He also takes part in the Scholar Bowl. He's an active member of the Student Council and he also shows his spirit as a member of the Spirit Club. He also works. So not only is he involved in school, not only is he a straight-A student, not only is... right now, he is the valedictorian of his class even though he's a junior, he also does this, he works and I'm so proud of that. He also works for Acosta Construction and gives back to his community by doing volunteer work for the 4-H Youth Volunteer Program, and also the Sesser Little League. Is there anything in Sesser that you're not involved in? The only thing he's not involved in is trouble. So, we're proud of that. So, I want to introduce to you today, my Page, the Governor for the Youth and Government program for 2019-20, this is Matt Thery. How about a welcome to the floor?"

Speaker Burke: "Welcome, Governor. Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Hammond: "Madam Speaker, it gives me great satisfaction this morning to wish a happy 10th anniversary to our friend and colleague, Representative Patrick Windhorst."

Speaker Burke: "Happy birthday. Representative Swanson, for what reason do you rise?"

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Point of personal privilege."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam. I've got three great individuals I'd like to introduce here. So, these are some wonderful leaders from the Galesburg community. First with me is Christopher Lopez. He's from Galesburg, Illinois, attends Carl Sandburg College, one of the junior colleges within my district. He has a... he's working toward an Associates in Art and hopes to transfer to a four-year college. He just completed his freshman year and next year will be a sophomore. His activities include... he's a part of Men of Distinction, an organization which I proudly am an honorary member of. What Men of Distinctions do is they strive to better themselves and they mentor the young people within their community. All of this while also keeping high honors in school. He's involved in numerous community projects with Distinction. And on Fridays, he dedicates his time to Read With Buddies, a Reading Buddies program at Gale Elementary School. He earned the Spirit Award for his ability to encourage others to stay positive in the worst of times. He's also Dean of the Spring 2019 Men of Distinction line. So thank you, Chris, for all you do for our young people in Galesburg. Next... next is Elijah Stewart. Not only is he a very successful young man from Galesburg, but he also is a cancer survivor. So while doing his school work, he also had to deal with the life of beating down cancer. His intent, he plans to major in orthopedic surgery. We've had a long discussion, he does intend to be a Hawkeye and go to a Big 10 school but I'm still working on him about the other University of 'I' school. He's also part of Men of Distinction. He's in TRIO, which is a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

program for first generation students. So, he's a first generation student from his family. He's vice president of the Black Students Association and student ambassador. His community activities include Men of Distinction, where he does a lot of work with kids in and out of school, and doing community work within Galesburg. He earned a Collaboration Award for Men of Distinctions and academic honors this past school year. So, Elijah, welcome to the State Capitol. Next, I'd like to introduce Desire Matthews. She, too, is from Galesburg and she, too, has quite a resume. She's majored in psychology with a minor in sociology. She intends to go to Jackson State or Harrisdale College. She's going to be a sophomore in college. She is president, so Elijah works for her. She's the president of the Black Student Association. And just as the men are members of the Men of Distinction, Desire is a part of the Women of Character, a similar organization involved with community involvement, mentor young people, and provide leadership skills to the young people. She visits elementary, middle, and Galesburg High School, provides mentorship to the younger... she provides community service to Galesburg schools. And two days a week, if available, she makes time to team up with the Galesburg Solutions Group where she's a guest speaker and provides leadership mentoring and services as to working with students to help them set their own goals. She wants to give special recognition to Nakisha Lee, who's mentored her and pushed her into being in charge of her own destiny. Danashea Stuckey and Anthony Law... and I'll talk about Anthony Law in just a second... two individuals that have made a huge impact within her life;

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

two individuals that oversees her past, gave her countless opportunities that makes her feel free... makes her feel powerful and accepted. All three of these young people are escorted and brought here today by Mr. Anthony Law, who's up in the gallery here. Anthony, I hope you're standing and waving. He, too, is a veteran. But he's a coordinator at Carl Sandburg College. His title's Coordinator of Diversity and Inclusion at Carl Sandburg College and does a great job teaching our young people how to better themselves and better their community along the road. So thank you very much, all three of you, for being here today."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish, for what reason do you rise?"

Kalish: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Kalish: "I'd like to introduce my Page for the day. Standing with me, today, on the House Floor is Yitzchak Hamui. He comes from the West Rogers Park area in Chicago. He goes... he is nine years old. He is in fourth grade. He goes to Yeshiva Ohr Boruch. And I asked him what he wants to be when he grows up and he couldn't tell me. And so, what does your father do? He says, father's a rabbi. So I said, well what do you like to do on your free time? He's says he likes to study. So I said, well maybe you want to be a rabbi when you grow up, and he shook his head yes. So, we see a little future rabbi sitting before us on the House Floor. So, please welcome him to Springfield."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bristow, for what reason do you rise?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Bristow: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Bristow: "I'd like to introduce my Page for the day. This is Nolan Mabe. He is the son of my LA, Patty Mabe. So, this is her third child that's been paging this year. Nolan is 11 years old. He's in fifth grade at Ridgley Elementary. He wants to be an architect and he enjoys playing Fortnite. Please help me welcome him to Springfield."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins, for what reason do you rise?"

Caulkins: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Caulkins: "Good morning. My Page, today, is Mr. John Foreman, a retired National Guard senior NCO. A good friend from Decatur who has come to watch the workings of Springfield. I appreciate everyone giving John a good, warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Stuart, for what reason do you rise?"

Stuart: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Stuart: "I realize that they're a team from a different state, but for those of us that live in the downstate, and especially the Metro East, it's a really big deal that the St. Louis Blues are in the Stanley Cup Finals. And I had a wonderful Page here yesterday who asked for a 'Let's go Blues', and he wanted to thank Representative Hoffman for indulging him in that. And he believes that was the good luck charm that made

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

them win their first ever Stanley Cup Final game last night. So let's go Blues."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier, for what reason do you rise?"

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Meier: "Since this last election, we now have six active farmers on the House Floor now as Members. And we really aren't a caucus but we work together. And in Illinois, agriculture is our largest industry. Every county in Illinois, including Cook County, has farms. I want you to think about this and encourage all your constituents to please put out things on your Facebook pages. When Mother Nature finally gives us the chance, we're going to be farming. And could we have it a little quieter, please?"

Speaker Burke: "Members, please keep it down."

Meier: "There are always terrible accidents during farming season. Farmers and the public are hurt. We're going to be working 24 hours, 7 days a week, all family members, all farmers, trying to get a crop in. It's a very stressful time for us. Our equipment is large. People, when you're following a piece of farm equipment, you may want us to move over but you can't see what's right in front of us. We may not be able to move over at that point and time. We have farms right now moving all their belongings out of bottoms, off their farms, because of the flooding going on, worried about levies breaking, trying to get their grain to higher ground. It's... please just watch over us, say a prayer for our industry, this affects everybody's lives in Illinois because it affects the largest

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

business in Illinois. My colleagues from... the other farmers would also like to say a few things about this."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As a farmer... 2 years ago, I spoke on this House Floor about the veteran suicide rate. Well, a suicide rate among the farming community is 50 percent higher than the farm crisis in 1980. The farmers rate of suicide is 84.5 suicide deaths out of a hundred thousand population. Many of the factors... as my colleague mentioned, many of the factors contributing to this are commodity prices, input cost, and weather. Many of us have a lot of input costs already, anticipating putting a crop in, and we won't be able to do that. Most years, on our family farm, Swanson Family Farms, we'd have completed our planting by now, which would've been done 2 weeks ago as we had last year, and harvested our first of 4 crops of hay. This year, almost the first of June, we've only planted about 25 percent and no soybeans in the ground. But we are not alone. In Illinois, only 25 percent of the corn crop has been planted compared to 95 percent this time last year. Soybeans are running about the same. Soybeans and corn are what drive this state's economy with them being the 2 main harvested crops. These crops are especially important to us on the Swanson Family Farms, and all farmers, because the income is based upon the bushels of corn and bushels of beans. For me, having livestock on the farm, I rely on the hay and corn to feel my animals. But we do ship several bushels to local ethanol plants, river terminals. In my area, the best planting day is 10, May. Here we are the 30th of May. Every day we slip past that 10, May date my

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

yields decrease. I lose bushels per acre. If and when we are able to get in the fields to plant our crops, farmers will experience long days in the field and on the road moving from field to field. I, too, ask everyone traveling the roads to realize in most cases, my top travel speed is around 20 miles per hour. And me, with a big piece of equipment, that's fast. To you in your car, it seems like eternity. I take up a lot of the road and most likely, I'm surviving on that last... on that cup of coffee, and most of my meals have been out of a brown bag. So, please be careful, watch out for farmers. There's a reason there's a triangular red and orange device on the back of that vehicle called a slow-moving vehicle. Thank you very much. And to our farmers, best of luck."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bailey, for what reason are you seeking recognition?"

Bailey: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Bailey: "Thank you so much for this opportunity. And I'd also like to encourage... well, I'm a farmer as well. People ask me what I do. I tell them I farm, and then I tell them I'm a Representative. But as Representative Meier mentioned, every county has farms, so I'd like to encourage the Representatives when you head back next week, look your farmers up and encourage them because it is... this weather is concerning. My grandfather passed away in... he had a stroke in 1987. Thank goodness it was two days after I was able to let him know that my wife was pregnant with our first son. So... but what brought him... what was troubling him was the weather in 1987, the early spring. We were having the same kind of weather

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

that we're having now, and when farmers can't get in early, it cost money. It's a financial problem. So, when you head back this week, check in and encourage your local farmers, please, and let them know it's going to be okay and try not to get too stressed out about the situation. Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's an honor for me, today, to introduce three Pages that are here. All of them related to our Capitol family. We have today, Peyton and Owen Baugher, who are Mika Baugher's sons who, as you know, Mika works for the Speaker. Both of these young men are involved in basketball, track and field. They just graduated eighth grade and will attend Litchfield High School, the home of the Purple Panthers. We also have Jaylan Stotts, who is Jen Davis's son. He plays competitive soccer for SASA Soccer Club in Springfield. He currently is in fifth grade at Carl Sandburg, will be going into sixth grade. When he graduates fifth grade, early in June, he'll be going to Franklin Middle School next year. He's 11. I'd like to... I'd like to welcome them to Springfield and say... say welcome to Jen and Mika's sons. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McCombie, for what reason do you rise?"

McCombie: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

McCombie: "Thank you. With much satisfaction on a job well done and many thanks, I would like to give a shout out to my legislative aide, Liz Buckwalter. She is here from district

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

and has been here for a couple of weeks taking care of Representative Chesney and I because our LA has moved on. So, I just wanted to say thank you to her."

Speaker Burke: "Thank you, Representative. Representative DeLuca, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

DeLuca: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm so blessed, today, to have my daughters with me. My son is in school, but I'd like to introduce my daughters Sofia and Francesca. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Welcome to the Capitol. Representative Wilhour, for what reason do you rise?"

Wilhour: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Wilhour: "Thank you. As a third generation farmer, I think that it's important to reiterate what Charlie, and Darren, and Dan, and the rest of the people said here. Farming is the number one industry in the State of Illinois. You know, and as I... it's been a rough... it's been a rough couple of years in farming and, you know, it's been a rough couple of months getting the crops in. But as I look at my cash bids this morning, I'm looking at \$4.02 a bushel on corn, \$8.13 a bushel on soybeans. Folks, those are not even break-even prices. So, I think that this Body needs to be mindful that we need to not put excessive burdens and regulations on our industries. You know, farming is tough enough as it is. So, let's be mindful of that. We need to be working on opening markets, not closing markets. Let's be mindful of the ethanol industry in the State of Illinois and not put excessive burdens on

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- that because it's just as easy to put those... put those ports just across the river in Iowa, and Indiana, and Missouri. So, you know, just be mindful of the farmers, you know. Keep us in your prayers and really appreciate it."
- Speaker Burke: "Members, we'll be moving to Senate Bills on Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1244, offered by Representative Greenwood. Clerk, please read the Bill. Excuse me. The Floor Amendment that needs... should be adopted. Please bring this Bill back to Second for the purpose of adding an Amendment."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greenwood."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Greenwood on the Amendment."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the General Assembly. Floor Amendment #1 simply states that... subject to appropriation... that this House (sic-Senate) Bill is subject to appropriation for the veteran markers."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, Representative Greenwood moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1244. All those 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 Bolin: "No Further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Greenwood."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Madam Chair and... Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This is a Bill that we have

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

previously debated on the floor, and I brought it back with an Amendment for subject to appropriations dealing with the veterans markers. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wehrli is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Wehrli: "Representative, it was unfortunate we had to pull this one out of the record but I appreciate you bringing back this Floor Amendment. I do hope that moving forward, we can work in a bipartisan way to come up with a way to fund these to a higher level. These are... these are grave markers for our veterans and that... we need to do a better job of getting these done. So, I appreciate your efforts on this. I look forward to working collaboratively to find out a way to better fund this program."

Greenwood: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Greenwood to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House (sic-Senate) Bill 1244 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee Report, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, Floor

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Amendment(s) 2 for House Resolution 371, and Floor Amendment(s) 1 for Senate Joint Resolution 41; and recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2276."
- Speaker Burke: "Continuing on with Senate Bills on Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1321. Representative... offered by Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, will you please move this back to Second Reading for the purpose of adopting the Amendment?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1321, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Harris."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Harris on the Amendment."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, Floor Amendment #1 is the major portion of the Medicaid MCO Nursing Home and Hospital Omnibus Reform Act. If we could adopt the Amendments, and then I'll discuss it on Third."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Harris has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1321. All those in favor vote... say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Harris."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Harris on Floor Amendment #2."
- Harris: "Floor Amendment #2 is language that removes the oppositions of the credit unions, the community bankers, and the Illinois Bankers Association. It also adds language to

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

require the reporting of supplier diversity information within the Medicaid MCO program."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, Representative Harris moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1321.

All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1321, offered by Representative Harris."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1321, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Harris."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Harris: Assembly. House Bill... Senate Bill 1321 is the result of months of effort that involved all four caucuses, the Office of the Governor, Departments of Healthcare Family and Services, Human Services and Information Technology(sic-Innovation and Technology) and it does several things. Its main focus was to correct problems that have impacted each of us in our districts and our health care providers and also, you know, our residents who are on the Medicaid program who are having problems with eligibility with having their status being accidently erased from systems. It has... helping providers who have had difficulties getting paid, who have had their claims rejected or denied, or who have had problems with rostering and finding that physicians who submitted bills were not in the records of MCO's and a variety of other problems. This is a very large Bill that does many things to correct those, to

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

help our health care providers be paid at a more prompt manner and to bring transparency and accountability to the process. It includes several elements, including several steps that the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to increase transparency and accountability for the payment of claims, and to be an early warning system for providers of any potential problems they may have with claims they are for verification. submitting Ιt expedites eligibility applications by requiring less paperwork on behalf of those submitting applications and using electronic means through publicly available databases to verify such things as employment and income for applicants. It authorizes the study over the summer to begin to move Illinois down the road for value-based option payments. It also has provisions to expedite prompt payment to our hospital and nursing home partners who are suffering because of delays of Medicaid processing. It provides for standardized rostering and provider directories, and several other things I will not go through. But if there are further questions, I'd be happy to answer them. But in particular, I want to acknowledge the, you know, dedication, like I said, months of work by Leader Demmer, Representative Spain, Representative Lilly, Representative Gabel, who've worked on behalf of the House of Representatives on this and over the last, yeah, 18 months to 2 years. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to echo the statements that Leader Harris made. This Bill was a result of a number of months of meetings, bipartisan negotiations.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

We had involvement from all four caucuses from the Governor's Office, Healthcare and Family Services, DHS, DOIT. I think this is a good example of how productive those kind of discussions and that kind of work can be. I'm sure that most Members of this Assembly have heard from providers, from patients, from advocate groups in the last couple of years related to the processing time for applications and Medicaid, and the complexity and the time that it takes during the redetermination process. I think there's an agreement, a bipartisan agreement, that when we're talking about an efficient Medicaid system the state operates, part of that is making sure that there's not needless administrative or bureaucratic red tape that complicates that. We want to try to be able to deliver care to those who are correctly enrolled and qualify for the program in the most efficient way possible. And I think this Bill helps us get to that point in a collaborative... in collaboration with both HFS and DHS. There are a number of things in here that will improved processing time for those applications, make sure that we know that there's more integrity in the Medicaid enrollment roles and that the Departments, both Departments, are coordinating with each other and have the resources that they need in order to operate this very significant program that is not only a very large portion of the state budget, but also affects almost one in four people in the state. I encourage folks to support this initiative and I'd also note that I think this is part of an ongoing process. The Departments have done a good job of laying out a timeline for how they see the implementation of some of these initiatives, as well as things that they're

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

just doing administratively. And that's something that we, as Members of the General Assembly, need to continue to exercise our oversight of the Departments as they continue to make progress there. Hopefully, the timelines work out exactly as they've laid out but it they don't, we're going to try to revisit with them and make sure that we're all pulling in the same direction to reach the end goals of ensuring that the Medicaid system operates efficiently and effectively and that we have support, buy-in, and coordination for all the stake holders. I encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "Just one question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Burke: "He yields."

Walker: "Does this have the resources and the program designed to train the customer facing people as they evolve into this new system?"

Harris: "The answer to that is, while this Bill does not provide new resources because it's not an appropriation Bill, in the Department of Human Services lines in the budget, there are provision not only training, but to hire new front line workers for the FCRCs and for the various processing hubs for determinations and for long-term care determinations to make the process smoother and faster."

Walker: "This Bill has the potential and maybe the reality of ending a real nightmare for our constituents. I love that it's here. I'm going to vote for it."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Feigenholtz."

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

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Feigenholtz: "Leader Harris, I have a question about some of the new elements of what HFS and some of the providers talked about, about like a pipeline or a clearinghouse. Can you explain a little bit more about what the purpose of that is?" Harris: "Yeah, this is part of the transparency and accountability portion. As you know, any of us who have sat in meeting with our nursing homes, hospitals, doctors, you know, any medical provider, or with the MCOs, or with HFS know that there have been a lot of accusations about claim rejections, denials, about delays in prior authorizations and it... a lot of those discussions end up in finger pointing back and forth. The pipeline is simply a computer program that will be in the flow of information between all the providers to the MCOs that will capture and copy all the claims data. It will then do two things. It will send back to the provider, who may have submitted a claim that's going to problematic, a notice that your claim number 124 is likely to be rejected and then tell the provider what that reason for rejection is so they can fix it in real time and stop the delays. It will also then analyze all the denials, the reasons for the denials, and it will pinpoint at what point in the system there is failure, so that we can determine is there a problem on the HFS side, a problem on the MCO side, or a problem on the provider side. And it will identify universal problems to see if there are fixes in training, coding, or forms that can be implemented and then reduce the volume of claims' problems going forward."

Feigenholtz: "I think that this is a very important element of this legislation. As you said earlier, there was a lot of

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

finger pointing and no solutions and that this is going to serve as a referee, if you will, to provide us with real data, the truth about who's not doing what right, and fix the problem. And I think that in the last four years we have suffered from a lack of transparency and not a great deal of will to fix this program, and that the patients in the State of Illinois have suffered greatly for it. This is a program we want to be proud of and we want our providers, especially our hospitals and our long-term care providers, to be able to get an efficient and well-managed program. It's been great working with you on this and a great work group. And I have to say that the work that was done in this group was not easy but the new Department of Health and Family Services is a get-it-done kind of group now and we're delighted to have them. And again, Leader Harris, unbelievable work on this and I'm looking forward to seeing the fruits of and the solutions that you have set a path for. And I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Madam Speaker, will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

McSweeney: "Leader Harris, I always have had a great deal of respect. We've had a lot of good conversations and worked together on Medicaid issues. Will anything in this Bill increase eligibility requirements or increase state spending? I don't see that. I want to make sure I'm not missing anything. Is there anything in this Bill that, again, would increase state spending or increase eligibility requirements?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Harris: "There's nothing that changed eligibility here. It simply monitors compliance with current standards to be sure that, you know, only those who are eligible are enrolled in the program. It actually is going to save us some money on the state side and this has to do with what you would call the Medicaid churn. By simplifying the processing of Medicaid redeterminations, this will quarantee that people are not churned on and off the program. And what that means is of the several million people that are on the program, right now because of cumbersome, antiquated electronic systems, probably 40 percent are churned off every year. And then they have to come back and re-enroll because they are eligible but our data processing is so antiquated we could not keep up with the paperwork. And we have the cost of dis-enrolling them, then you have the worker time of reenrolling and starting a whole new application. And so, this will be a great savings to the state and in the future is going to require, you know, less persons to be involved in the processing and to make it a real time online system."

McSweeney: "To the Bill. I urge a 'yes' vote. I respect Leader
Harris on this issue. I wish we were doing much more on
Medicaid, but I urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris to close."

Harris: "Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you and please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1321... I'm sorry... 'Shall Senate Bill 1321 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 116 voting 'yes', 0

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1934, offered by Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman on the Bill."

Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This was called before, and I believe Representative Keicher had some issues on the Bill and we clarified those issues with staff. And I don't want to speak for him, but I think that we've agreed to move the Bill and then possibly do something tweaked together in the Veto Session. This is a simple Bill that deals with auto recyclers, junk yards. And salvage yards and it requires out of state junk... auto recyclers, junk yard dealers, and salvage yards to actually be licensed here in the State of Illinois. It also deals with the crushing of vehicles to say that you can't have mobile crushers, you would have to have the proper licensure and permits."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Keicher is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Keicher: "Okay. Leader Hoffman, thank you for working on this with me. I appreciate it. If we could just hammer out some things on legislative intent. So my concern is... I raised it on the floor the other day, is that we wouldn't be impacting any hobbyists who are fixing, remodeling, or rebuilding any

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

classic cars in their home garage. And it's our understanding that this is not intended to impact them, correct?"

Hoffman: "That... it is not intended and I think, after we looked at the draft, it would not impact them and it certainly is not intended to impact them at all."

Keicher: "And the agreement that you and I have is that we'll tighten up the language as we get to Veto Session so that we're explicit on not impacting those hobbyists?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Keicher: "Okay. Thank you, Sir. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I ask for an 'aye' vote and then would like to thank the Representative for working with me."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House... Senate Bill 1934 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are... on this Bill, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2050, Representative Edly-Allen. Out of the record. The Clerk is in receipt of Motions in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together in one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Manley on the Motion."

Manley: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that the following Bills can be heard in committee. House

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools, HR416. To House Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies Committee, SJR36. To House Executive Committee, SB262, SB485, HR417. To House Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee, HJR80 and HJR81."

- Speaker Burke: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirements are waived. Moving to page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 220... these are Bills... Senate Bills on Second Reading. Senate Bill 220, Representative Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Moeller."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Moeller on the Amendment."
- Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask that Floor Amendment #4 be adopted."
- Speaker Burke: "Can you describe it?"
- Moeller: "Sure. The... this Amendment addresses the concerns of the banking industry. It removes the new definition of 'loan modification services' that was included in the original Amendment. And with that change, the banking industry, the banking representative are neutral on the Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, Representative Moeller moves that Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 220 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 220, Representative Moeller."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 220 is an initiative of the Department on Human Rights. It is a Bill that is intended to clean up language from a prior version of a Bill that would modernize and streamline the processes of the Department on Human Rights. With the last Amendment adopted, it does two things. It clarifies when a party elects to have a complaint alleging discrimination in connection with a real estate transaction adjudicated in circuit court. It creates a definitive starting point for when... or a time period for when an administrative closure order is entered by the HRC. It also allows the Department to have discretion over when fact fighting... fact finding conferences are held in fair housing cases. Is the ... the feeling of the Department, they have a very rigid time period in which they have to conduct investigations on housing discrimination, and giving the Department the discretion on when holding these fact finding conferences will allow them to expedite their process and meet the requirements of that time period. With that ... with the removal of... with Floor Amendment #4, I am not... I believe there is no opposition to this Bill. I would be happy to answer any questions. I know that Representative Mazzochi

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

has... we've had several discussion regarding the fact finding conferences and I'm committed to working with her to ensure that her concerns regarding submitting evidence and testimony by both parties in a discrimination investigation are met. But with that, I would entertain any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mazzochi."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

"Thank you, Representative Moeller. I appreciate it. Just so that the Body is aware, one of the issues that came up in this is that these human rights adjudications, even when you're still at the pre-complaint process, can actually be very expensive for those who are accused, who actually participate in the process. And one of the concerns that I had in removing the fact finding process is that it may leave defendants without a meaningful opportunity to be able to present their side on the procedural side. That being said, the Department did indicate that they were aware of that concern and would try to work to address it. They did indicate that they had other mechanisms to gather information on behalf of the Department. But my concern was just making sure that the administrative record, even at the pre-complaint stage, could be made complete before the complaint decision initiates. And, unfortunately, we did not get the results back from IDHR yet, today, to make sure that they do actually have a part of that process that will, in fact, make sure that the defendant has that opportunity. But I do appreciate Representative Moeller's commitment that she will work... if, in fact, the defendant's rights are not so protected, that

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

she will commit to a trailer Bill so that we can fix that particular issue. And if that's resolved, I'm otherwise supportive of all of the other items within the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Thapedi: "Representative Moeller, I want to commend you for a job well done in pushing this Bill along. I do know that we did have this conversation in Judiciary yesterday and that you filed the Amendment to cure all the concerns of the banks, which is a... definitely a good thing. But I think it's important for the Body to be aware, and Representative Moeller can confirm this, that the director was actually there in committee with us and we actually looked at the language, all of us, and recognized that the director actually had the discretion and the parties could actually choose, if they so choose to do so, to waive that fact finding hearing. So, essentially, what the director explained was that while it was permissive, they still intended to make sure that the rights of any respondents in these actions would not be truncated. Isn't that accurate?"

Moeller: "Yes, it is."

Thapedi: "Okay. So what is your understanding? What is your plan moving forward?"

Moeller: "My plan is to continue to work with the Department to provide more clarity to the Representative from DuPage County so that there is a level of comfort that when these

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

investigations are conducted that both parties will have an opportunity to submit testimony for the record."

Thapedi: "Job well done. Madam Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote on this matter."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Moeller to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 220 pass?'
All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'... all
those in favor vote 'aye'; all those 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting
'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received
a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving
to page 6 of the Calendar, we have... still Senate Bills on
Second Reading... Senate Bill 1221, offered by Representative...
Leader Harris. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1221, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Harris."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Harris on the Amendment."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment extends the sunset for the Medical Practice Act by two years. There is also a provision that clarifies that there is still accessibility to physician disciplinary reports as IDFPR moves to a new storage platform."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, Senate Bill... Leader Harris moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

1221. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment... Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1221, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "That Bill does what I just said. Please vote for it."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1221 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? Moeller. Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1514, Representative... offered by Leader Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1514..."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me..."

Clerk Bolin: "...a Bill..."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. On... also on page 4 we have Senate Bill 1857, offered by Leader Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. Moving to page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 416,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

offered by Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 416, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendment. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hurley."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hurley on the Amendment."

Hurley: "I'd like to adopt House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 416.

This Amendment removes the opposition from ACLU, Cabrini

Green Legal Aid, and the Appleseed Foundation. And if I may
talk about it on Third."

Speaker Burke: "Would you like to adopt the Amendment and debate..."

Hurley: "I would love..."

Speaker Burke: "...it on Third Reading?"

Hurley: "I would love to. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "All right. Representative Hurley moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 416. All those in favor vote 'aye'... or say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 416, Representative Hurley."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 416..."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 416, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hurley."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Hurley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. This is an initiative of the Cook County Sheriff's Department. It simply states, if a detainee is found guilty of an administrative infraction in an act of public indecency or sexual misconduct in the penal institution, it could be considered by a judge in sentencing. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. And I'm here for questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, I was... I had been called off the floor to talk about the original Bill and that was the... the 90 days for credit part. So, I was focused on that and I wasn't focused on how the Bill got... is the Amendment an add or is it a gut and replace?"

Hurley: "Gut and replace."

Batinick: "Okay. So we are no longer doing the good behavior part.

What exactly are we doing with this Bill, Representative?"

Hurley: "We are not. This is going to do… go through the court system if there's an administrative… if there's an infraction in the jail, it will go to a judge and they will consider this infraction when sentencing."

Batinick: "Okay. Can you imagine a reason to be against this Bill?"

Hurley: "Excuse me?"

Batinick: "Is it all agreed everybody's all for it? Any... okay."

Hurley: "As far as I know, yes."

Batinick: "Okay. And went back to committee, correct, unanimously?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Hurley: "Correct."

Batinick: "Correct. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hurley to close."

Hurley: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. And thank you for everybody for working on this. I think everybody is... is happy with the outcome."

Speaker Burke: "Shall... the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 416 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of... excuse me, 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 117 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis: "Well, Madam Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence. Unfortunately, she left the floor. Many of you know Wanda Sharp, who is a legislative liaison for Secretary of State Jesse White. She frequent... where is she at? Oh, there... I thought she left the floor. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, everybody knows Wanda Sharp. She's a former Representative, been working for Secretary of State Jesse White for the last several years, but today is her last day and she is retiring. So, if you could please just give her a gracious farewell send off..."

Speaker Burke: "Enjoy your retirement."

Davis: "...for many, many years of service. We love you and appreciate you. Thank you very much, Wanda."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Welch, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

"You know, Representative Will Davis stole my thunder a Welch: little bit because when I first got involved in politics in 1999, my State Representative of the 7th District at the time, was Wanda J. Sharp, and every step of the way, she guided me and gave me advice when I served on the local school board. And since being here the last 7 years, she has not, you know, been shy about coming down to the front to my desk to give me advice on how I'm handling myself here in Springfield. To say she's been a role model and a mentor understatement. You know, she's been involved in proviso politics a long time but she's also a minister of the Gospel, a major player in the Progressive Life-Giving Word Cathedral in my hometown of Hillside. We love this woman and I think she deserves another round of applause, a standing ovation round of applause. 'Cause we're going to miss Wanda J. Sharp."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you rise?"

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I may be one of the only Members in this chamber who served with Wanda Sharp or certainly here today, very few. And I, too, want to echo what Representative Chris Welch and others and Will Davis have said about her. One thing you could say about Wanda Sharp, she is a lifelong public servant. She came here and governed and worked from the heart and she has been a blessing and a smiling face every time she walked on the floor, and just a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

really lovely woman and a good friend. Wanda, I don't know what you're going to do when you're not working, but I wish you only the best. And please keep in touch with us, we love you. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Burke: "Senate Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 459, Representative Villa. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 459, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 459, offered by Representative Villa. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 459, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Villa."

Villa: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Many of you might remember this Bill as my first Bill that passed unanimously out of the House under a different title, it was House Bill 205. The Senate used it as a vehicle for a different Bill and now it's coming back to you under Senate Bill 459. So, this Bill, what it does, it just makes sure that we're bringing language about mental health into the schools, that we're talking about mental health whenever teachers are also talking about health in... in their lessons. So, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. And I will be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Batinick: "Representative, it says the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance has no position as long as the Sponsor reads legislative intent that states that this legislation does not create a new course or a mandate."

Villa: "That is correct. This does not have a new mandate. It's not a new mandate."

Batinick: "Thank you very much."

Villa: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Villa to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 459 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 1418, offered by Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This would make sure that the Madison County Mass Transit District receives its federal funding through the Bi-State Development Agency. This codifies an agreement that

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

currently exists between the Bi-State Development Agency and the Madison County Mass Transit District."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "We'll wait for the Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me. So, will the… Representative Hoffman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1418. All those 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, further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1418, Representative Hoffman."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This Bill affects the Bi-State Development Agency and its makeup. The Bi-State Development Agency is a multi-state, bi-state, agency that involves St. Clair, Madison, Monroe County, as well as the City of St. Louis and St. Louis County. Currently, the Bi-State Development Agency has 5 members from Madison and/or St. Clair County. This would indicate that St. Clair County has 4 of those members and one of them would come from Madison County. The reason for this is that St. Clair County pays into the Bi-State Development Agency to the tune of \$57 million a year. And that the County of Madison has their own transit district and doesn't contribute to the Bi-State Development Agency for the issues... for issues such as transit. In addition, in order to make

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

sure that the Madison County Transit District, which is separate from the Bi-State Development Agency, receives its federal funds. We adopt... just adopted Amendment #3. I'm not going to say that this makes Madison County okay with this Bill, but it does make sure that their transit agency will receive all of their federal funding pursuant to an agreement with the Bi-State Development Agency."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier."

Meier: "Will Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Meier: "I'd like to thank you for your Amendment, which allows the federal money to still flow to Madison County. I'm still against this Bill. I represent part of Madison County. As it is now, I believe it alternates over which county has three members and which one has two and that changes every year. So, one year St. Clair County's got three and Madison County has two. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "I think... I don't ... I don't know if it changes every year.

It changes with every opening."

Meier: "With every opening? Okay. We... none of us know what the..."
Hoffman: "I apologize, I'm told it does change every year."

Meier: "It does change every year? Okay. None of us know what the future brings, none of us know if maybe Madison County would like the Metro Link to run a spur up into Madison County. Don't you think we need to have these alternating boards, so that if they decide they'd like to do that, they'd have representation there? And I believe that they're voting today, maybe, to put more money into the system. So, I'm not sure if that'll happen or not."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Hoffman: "Can I just say that I'm... I'm absolutely in support of...
of having Light Rail in Madison County, but currently it
doesn't exist."

Meier: "Right."

Hoffman: "And in Madison County, they... currently does not contribute to the Bi-State Development Authority because they have their own Madison County Transit. So, what I would say is that once they do get Light Rail, that we can come back, we can reevaluate this. But they don't and I know no plans to do it now. St. Clair County currently pays \$57 million into the Bi-State Development Authority annually and Madison County pays nothing. So, to have Madison County have more commissioners than St. Clair County, to me it, it just doesn't make sense."

Meier: "Well, it... it may be harder if... to ever get Metro Link up there if they don't have this chance every other year to have that third person on there. And like I say, I believe the board is voting this afternoon to... for a 10 year contract of putting money in. I'm against it. I'd encourage people to be against it. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "This is a local issue of equity and I just ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1418 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 question, there are 72 voting in 'favor', 44
voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next on the Calendar is Senate Bill 1484, offered... 1464, offered by Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1464, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Martwick."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick on the Amendment."

Martwick: "Madam Speaker, question of... of the Chair. Is Floor
Amendment 1 already been adopted? I believe it has."

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 1 & 2 have been approved for consideration."

Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I apologize for the delay and appreciate the indulgence. I would withdraw Floor Amendment #1 and I would seek to move the adoption of Floor Amendment 2."

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Martwick."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick to... on Floor Amendment #2."

Martwick: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #2 is an agreement between the State Treasurer's Office and the Illinois Cemetery and Funeral Home Association. It makes technical changes to existing law concerning unclaimed property and pre-need funeral and cemetery expenses by changing the period of

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

abandonment for funds, creating a process outside of RUUPA for abandoned, pre-need cemetery funds, and clarifies notification requirements of certain trustees. I know of no opposition and ask for its adoption."

Speaker Burke: "Leader Brady, can we debate on Third Reading? All right. Representative Martwick moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1464. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #... Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1464, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1464, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you. So, basically, I stated the summary of the Bill when we were presenting the Amendment. This is dealing with pre-paid funeral expenses. What happens when those expenses are not claimed, how that's dealt with. And this now clarifies that instead of those funds being transferred to the Treasurer's Office, when they become unclaimed, that they will be held by the trust for cemeteries. And then if the… if the beneficiary is located, then the funds will be paid out of that trust back to the beneficiary. I… I really know of no opposition on this Bill. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Brady."

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

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative, and I'm sorry I was off the floor when you were talking earlier, so I did not hear and I heard the brief explanation that you came... gave. But my first question would be, why is this change necessary and why is it only being proposed by the Illinois Funeral Home and Cemetery Association?"

Martwick: "So, it... Representative, I think you're probably aware that there was a... in fact, I know you are because we've worked on some of these issues together. There was a complete rewrite of the revised Unclaimed Property Act. And so, this was an agreement between the State Treasurer's Office and this group to... to refine how it treats those pre-paid funeral expenses. You know, I... I... my understanding is that this group approached the Treasurer's Office and talked about language and they negotiated extensively. In fact, this agreement was only had earlier this week."

Brady: "And... and that's wherein my concern lies, with the very group that you're alluding to. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just caution you that some years ago, over 49 thousand Illinoisans in a pre-need trust agreement through the Illinois Funeral Directors Association found that the money that they had put aside for the prepayment of their loved ones, when that time came, had serious, serious financial flaws and had not kept up with the pace of inflationary costs. And therefore, in that particular situation, the families, if that wasn't guaranteed, lost funds and the funeral homes who provided those services, definitely lost funds. And, Representative, my concern here

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

is that taking out an office such as the Treasurer's Office from a responsibility standpoint and giving this over to Trust through Cemeteries, who may or may not have a funeral home associated with them, would be a very serious concern of mine. Would have liked to have been part of any negotiations or discussions about this. And so, if I understand what you're saying, is the Treasurer's Office would no longer be the responsible party for unclaimed properties after a lengthy, lengthy discussions and task force work that was done for just the opposite. And now, those dollars and trusts would be given back to a trust that possibly a cemetery runs. Is that correct?"

- Martwick: "So, yes, Representative, that is correct. In the event that the cemetery does not have a trust, this would then go to the Comptroller's Office. And that was an agreement between the Treasurer's Office, the Comptroller's Office, and... and this group because of the... the fact that the Comptroller is so intimately involved with oversight of cemeteries."
- Brady: "Had there been any discussion with the Illinois Funeral Directors Association? Not the Illinois Funeral Home and Cemetery Association, but the Illinois Funeral Directors Association, regarding this change that could affect thousands of people across Illinois?"
- Martwick: "So, this Bill makes no changes to funeral trusts. That was done under the larger rewrite of this Act two years ago, so that remains unchanged. You know, I... I don't know who was reached out to on this Bill. What I can tell you is that the Bill was filed in February. It was extensively negotiated in the House and passed... I mean, its in the Senate and passed

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

55-0 and came over here in April. And, you know, negotiations continued. No one from the Funeral Directors Association every presented themselves for having an interest in this legislation."

Brady: "Well, passing the Senate 55-0 would the first concern that I would have."

Martwick: "Fair enough."

Brady: "And in a... in a very serious note, what... what I'm sensing here is that unclaimed property, which has always been the responsibilities of the Treasurer's Office, shifting this now to, if I understand, an association and trust within either a cemetery and/or possibly cemeteries that don't even have the capabilities of providing funeral services is something that I see red flags all around. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. Ladies and Gentlemen, this involves money that individuals set aside for the purpose of pre-need funeral services. And especially, especially, if it becomes a situation to where a responsible party cannot be found immediately, the Treasurer's Office has historically taken this particular responsibility by statute under their direction, whoever the Treasurer is. I have concerns regarding anything, anything, that would be entrusted to the Illinois Funeral Home and Cemetery Association dealing with pre-need funds and the direction and/or release of those funds. I would caution each and every one of you about this Bill. I'll be voting 'no'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walker."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Walker: "Do you have a... can you provide a clear enunciation of why the Treasurer's Office is in favor of giving up this responsibility?"

Martwick: "I can and I would have had that been a question. So, prepaid funeral expenses are still... because they are simply money, are still, when they are unclaimed, still wind up going to the Treasurer's Office under the Unclaimed Property Act and become a part of the Treasurer's attempts to locate. There's a difference here because these are related to the cemeteries. And there are interconnected with real estate. And so, because, you know, people are buying cemetery plots, they're buying a piece of real estate. Because of that, those monies... it's unclear who the beneficiaries are because of the interconnection with real estate. And that's why that they felt it was best to leave the money with the Trusts and allow that process to play out that way. And if not, then it would go to the Comptroller's Office."

Walker: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Thank you. Appreciate the questions. I think there's some confusion here. This does not relate to prepaid funeral expenses but it... it is... those continue to remain under the Treasurer's authority under the Unclaimed Property Act and this Bill is related to the pre... prepaid cemetery expenses. And... and there is a... a real legitimate reason why the Treasurer's Office negotiated in good faith to have these assets handled the way that they are. There is no opposition to the Bill. No one has come forth and said that there's a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

problem with this Bill. I think it's good legislation. I
respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, Shall Senate Bill 1464 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? DeLuca, Gordon-Booth, Lilly, Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1507, offered by Representative Edly-Allen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1507, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Edly-Allen."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Edly-Allen on the Amendment."

Edly-Allen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment 1 was drafted to address concerns of the committee members. The most pertinent parts of the Amendment include permitting judges, at their discretion, to provide the same privacy protections to defendants as are provided to plaintiffs. clarifying that in order to have a cause of action the person disseminating the image must be over 18 and must have had actual knowledge as opposed to new or acted with reckless... reckless disregard; removing a provision allowing persons to bring a cause of action even where the image was taken in a public place; limiting statutory damages to \$10 thousand; and

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- reducing the statute of limitations from 4 years to 2 years. May I also speak to House Floor Amendment 2?"
- Speaker Burke: "We'll do this one first. Representative Mazzochi,

 I see you have your light on. Would you... may we move..."
- Mazzochi: "Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. I'll speak to both when... when the Amendments are done."
- Speaker Burke: "Okay. Representative Edly-Allen moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1507. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Edly-Allen."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Edly-Allen on the Amendment."
- Edly-Allen: "House Floor Amendment 2 merely corrects the oversight whereby the statute of limitations for actual dissemination was moved down from two years in the House Floor Amendment 1 but the statute of limitations for a threat to disseminate was left at four years. This Amendment changes the statute of limitations for civil actions for threats to disseminate to two years."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Edly-Allen... seeing no questions, Representative Edly-Allen moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1507. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1507, offered by Representative Edly-Allen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1507, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Edly-Allen."

Edly-Allen: "Today, I'm presenting Senate Bill 1507 which establishes a new private right of action to protect individuals depicted and identifiable in private sexual images against individuals who disseminate or threaten to disseminate those images without their consent. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to initial... start with the Bill. As a prelude, I want to be clear that the Members of our caucus are fully in support of the general concept behind the Bill. The concern is that the language of the Bill is not yet ready. And if I can give a couple of examples. On page 4 of the Bill, line 12, we discuss conduct that doesn't establish by itself that an individual consented to what is supposed to be nonconsensual dissemination of a private sexual image. And one of the things that we say cannot prove consent is giving consent. That doesn't make sense. It's intellectually incoherent because what you have to be able ... I mean, if someone has given consent, you can't say I'm going to create liability because... unless you're going to somehow say that somebody has to be giving consent in real time, which is simply unworkable. One of the other concerns, it's on the same page in (c). This is one that is of particular concern. We're all aware that there are web revenge porn sites that

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

exist. And (c) says, 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impose liability on an interactive computer service.' We're basically immunizing from liability the very revenge porn websites that this Bill, I thought, was trying to stop. And to immunize them from liability when, you know, notwithstanding other statutes where we have tried to insert that liability and that ... and the language of this ... of other parts of this Act, is written to actually try to impose that liability. Again, the Bill's language is self-contradictory and I can't justify saying that we are going to immunize them from liability. Now, the original goal that we were trying to fix in the context of some of this language, was just to say, well if your computer system gets backed up or your phone is, you know, storing things to the cloud, that's not going to become actionable. But the language goes well beyond that. I don't think that was necessarily the Sponsor's intent was to give that type of immunity, but that's what the actual language that's being presented does. And I don't think any woman or man in this Assembly should feel comfortable immunizing a revenge porn website from liability. Furthermore, there's no definition of the standards for punitive damages. It's not clear that a parent can bring an action on behalf of a minor child. And because this is a Bill where we want to be able to allow people to seek injunctive relief, to say that you might not be able to bring an action until you're age 18 is certainly problematic because it means that image can be out there with no ability to claw it back. And, you know, I don't know that you can necessarily get damages in real time, I don't think you should have to wait

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

until age 18. So, I do believe that this Bill can be fixed to do what is right. It's not there yet. I had provided edits to the Sponsor that would fix these and other critical concerns, and I was told there wasn't time. I would ask the Sponsor to pull this from the record to try to get this fixed so we're not immunizing companies to do the very thing we're trying to stop."

Edly-Allen: "Representative Mazzochi, did you have a question?"

Mazzochi: "Yes. Would you be willing to pull this from the record so that we can fix the problems? Particularly with the issue of immunizing interactive websites, which will include all of the revenge porn websites out there."

Edly-Allen: "No."

Mazzochi: "So, you're okay with the fact that we are immunizing revenge porn websites from liability under this Act?"

Edly-Allen: "They are... revenge porn websites are not immunized from liability."

Mazzochi: "They are. See, because the whole definition of what these interactive websites are, under the federal statute that's cited in your Bill, specifically says nothing in this Act can be used to impose liability. And the whole reason why I... you defined a person as somebody who can held liable for the dissemination of a private sexual issue as including businesses or corporations, agencies, or other legal entity, is because you're trying to stop this from happening."

Edly-Allen: "Okay. It appears that you are conflating..."

Mazzochi: "It's page 4, line... line 19..."

Edly-Allen: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Mazzochi: "(c), 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impose liability on an interactive computer service, as defined in 47 U.S.C. 230(f)(2), for content provided by another person.' An interactive computer service is going to be the revenge porn website, the content would be provided by another person. That's the problem. And you're saying, no... nothing can be construed to impose liability. So, all of that stuff that we have in the rest of this Bill saying, if you provide, without consent, a sexual image to the website, that's not going to give rise to liability. We can't do that. And if you don't think that that won't be construed by an interactive web service as immunizing them from liability, your staff member who's whispering into your ear is telling you wrong."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mazzochi, you've asked the same question numerous times. Can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Mazzochi: "No... okay. So, I... so..."

Edly-Allen: "Can I just interrupt? And I'd like to go on the record to say that the Representative is confusing interactive computer service with Internet content providers.

And I would like to move the Bill to a vote."

Mazzochi: "Are you willing to at least commit to a trailer Bill to fix these problems..."

Edly-Allen: "Representative, we've..."

Mazzochi: "...before this goes into effect?"

Edly-Allen: "...we've had many discussions about the Bill. If you would like to write your own Bill, please feel free to do so.

But I would like to present this Bill for a vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Tarver."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Tarver: "Representative, I just wanted to thank you for all your hard work on this Bill. I know we had this up in committee, seems like quite a few times, and you were willing address the statute of limitations to make sure it was in line with more personal injury cases. I know for a fact I've had several conversations with you. I've seen the 15 potential changes that came from the other side of the aisle. I know you worked very diligently on this Bill. And I just appreciate the fact that you brought it forth and all of your hard work. I would certainly recommend that we press the green button."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Parkhurst."

"Thank you. I was in committee and I appreciate the Parkhurst: changes that you made to the Bill. The Republicans are in support of the intention of this Bill and we've been working with you to try to get that so we have a good Bill that prevents revenge porn. And in making some of those changes, I agree with Representative Mazzochi that you have immunized some of these Internet porn sites. And what we're... all we're trying to do is just to slow it down so we can make sure that we have a Bill that prevents revenge porn. And I find it appalling that you're not willing to take it out of the record or, you know, work further on this issue when there's clearly an ambiguity that now you're immunizing third parties to do what another person can't do. So, I think that the ... like she said, the Bill is not ready. And so, I would urge a vote of 'present' because we don't want to do more harm than good.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

And the Bill, as it stands, is going to do more harm than good. So, I urge a vote of 'present'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Didech: "Representative, thank you for bringing forth this Bill.

I just want to ask a few clarifying questions. My understanding is this is a brand new Act that is being presented, titled the Civil Remedies for Nonconsensual Dissemination of Private Sexual Images Act. This is a brand new Act. Is that correct?"

Edly-Allen: "Yes."

Didech: "And the provision that there's some questions about, (c) of Section 10 says, 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impose liability on interactive computer service, as defined in 47 U.S.C. 230(f)(2), for content provided by another person."

Edly-Allen: "Yes."

Didech: "Right. So, this does not limit any liability that a revenge porn website may be exposed to under a different Act, under common law, under any other different section of our statutes that currently exists?"

Edly-Allen: "Correct."

Didech: "Right. So, this... only in the purpose of this Act is to impose liability under the individuals who post those images up on the website. Is that correct?"

Edly-Allen: "Correct."

Didech: "Right. So, to the Bill. To the concerns raised by the other side of the aisle, I think the plain text of this Bill

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

is entirely clear that this does not limit liability of revenge porn website under current law. The intent of this Bill is to impose liability for some very serious bad actors who do post these images online. It's very narrowly tailored to meet that goal. And I would strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She will."

Connor: "I just want to follow up on Representative Didech's comments. So, just to understand this further... so, the... an Internet service provider would be something like a web hosting service, like GoDaddy.com or Google or one of these other large companies, correct?"

Edly-Allen: "Correct."

Connor: "Okay. And a revenge porn site would be run by some scuzzball who makes a site called, myexgirlfriend.com, correct?"

Edly-Allen: "Correct."

Connor: "So, what... basically, what this part of the statute does is it immunizes Go Daddy or Google or AOL for the actions of the scuzzball who starts up myexgirlfriend.com?"

Edly-Allen: "Yes."

Connor: "Okay. And, in theory, you can start up a website in a day and the service that is providing the scuzzball website owner with access to the internet or to post the materials may not be aware of what is being posted by that particular content provider?"

Edly-Allen: "Yes."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Connor: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to yield more time to

Representative Mazzochi, please."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. To address the two concerns that were just raised by the prior speakers. First, 47 U.S.C. 230(f)(2) is not limited to just the... a hardware provider. The definition that is, interactive computer service means information service system or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server. Including specifically, a service or system that provides access to the Internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions. Now, you know... so the... this covers, I hate to say it, Facebook, it covers Yahoo, it covers Google, it covers that and, unfortunately, what the ... what was referred to as the scuzzy providers as well because anyone can create their own website and host server and provide access. So, that's one of the problems. And to the concern that while we've got other laws that are out there that might deal with this, this is exactly the problem, is that we don't actually have good tools to deal with this. Because if we did, we would be able to go after the revenge porn websites in Illinois. And we apparently haven't been able to do that as events of the recent past have shown. That's what necessitated the Bill for Senate Bill 1507 and that, for example, is one of the reasons why we're trying to be clear that you can have, for example, corporate entities serving as the people who are doing the

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

disseminating. And, unfortunately, that's what's being immunized out. So, the very people we wanted to go after, because our current laws are insufficient, are now going to not be able to be covered under this Act. That's the problem. So, I really do wish that the Sponsor would have accepted the changes that could have fixed this problem. I think it's disappointing that we could have gotten this done and repaired and ready to go today. And you could have had a unanimous board saying 'yes'. I just have very real concerns that this is one of those catch-22 situations. Because I understand that we want to try to help people who are faced with this situation, but we've got to read these statutes carefully, folks. And one of the things that's been quite disappointing to me is that there are many instances where we don't read the legislative language and really think through how it will be applied. We rely on staff to figure that out for us and that leads to some unintended consequences when you're not understanding the full effect of the legal language. So, for that reason, I support Representative Parkhurst's position. And I would just encourage everyone to do a non-vote and we can come back and fix this, hopefully over the summer, so that it's ready in Veto Session so we can all have a Bill to be proud of, where we're not going to be accused of not taking this issue of the revenge porn website seriously."

Speaker Burke: "Our final speaker is Representative Pappas."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Pappas: "To the Bill. I find it really disconcerting that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not understand

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

the difference between not imposing liability and giving immunity. There's a vast difference between the two. And as my previous colleague stated, the fact that this particular Act does not impose liability does not mean that there is no liability under other Acts. Moreover, I think in this Body... you know, this is... this is a good Bill. This is a Bill that will protect people from the... from being victimized by people who they thought they were close to, people they thought they could trust, individuals they thought they could trust, who take most intimate moments and post them online in revenge. And we need to put those protections in place now. I... I say this from time to time, let us not let the perfect get in the way of the good. We can certainly pass another Act next year that will address the revenge porn sites. But we must, we must protect people from the individuals who do this today. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Edly-Allen to close."

Edly-Allen: "Thank you. For the record, Representative Mazzochi, I disagree with your interpretation of this Bill. It's a good Bill. It's a good start. We can make it better. And I ask for any 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1507 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 question, there are 94 voting in 'favor', 0
voting 'against', 18 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

passed. Senate Bill 1573, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1573, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis on the Amendment."

"Madam Chair, thank you for your indulgence on handling the Amendment. Floor Amendment #1, which I believe became the Bill, is an initiative of the Health Care Council of Illinois in establishing... establishes the Nursing Home Labor Force Program using the Long Term Care Equity Fund. The program is intended to promote, expand, retain nursing home labor, particularly, the number of certified nursing assistants in Illinois. The program will include scholarships for CNAs, registered nurses, or LPNs, retention... retention at centers for nursing home workers, and public relations campaign to promote and encourage professions... professions in nursing homes. We have identified, over time, any of you have talked to representatives from the association as well as the nursing homes, that they do have nursing home shortages. These are some dollars that have been kind of languishing, for lack of a better word, for a little while now. So now, this Bill is an effort to try to figure out what to do with those dollars, to be able to use those dollars in a positive way to try to help build the workforce in nursing homes, create some pathways for... pathways upwards for those who may start as a CNA to move into other positions. And my conversations with

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

HCCI, I'm also talking about the idea that in nursing home upper structures... sorry about that, Madam Chair. Again, but we also want to take the opportunity to meet over the summer to talk about ways to increase diversity also in upper level management with nursing homes. It's a conversation I've had with the association that they seem extremely, extremely interested in doing so. So, again, this effort, again, with these resources, could possibly be used to even create internship programs and create incentives for individuals who want to get into administration of nursing homes to start at the lowest rung as an assistant. This could offer or incentivize them to take the particular exam, I believe it's a nursing administrator's exam, to get that license that will then allow them to move up into VP spots. And hopefully, maybe even ownership opportunities as well. So, that's what the Bill... well that's a part of the Bill, but Amendment #1 just kind of lays out how we're going to start with the pathways portion of that. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish, you are seeking recognition. Do you wish to debate or ask your question once the Amendment is adopted? Representative Davis has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1573. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Davis: "Thank you again, Madam Chair. I'm going to handle Floor Amendment #2, well... which just adds some additional language agreed upon between the Department of Public Health and the Health Care Council of Illinois that of course takes language with #1 but it adds that the Nursing Home Labor Force Program... to establish the... excuse me. We are already establishing the Nursing Home Labor Force Program. This additional language provides that the program is contingent upon approval of the Federal Centers for Medicaid... Medicare and Medicaid Services because there is a federal connection to these dollars. And we must ask for that approval from the Federal Government in order to use the dollars in a way that I just described earlier. Be happy to... I'll ask for the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1573. All those 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, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1573, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1573, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you again, Madam Chair. While we did discuss the two Amendments that essentially layout some additional information that I want to add just to make sure it's real clear. Again, this Bill creates the Nursing Home Labor Force

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Program. The program will include scholarships for registered nurses, CNAs, LPNs, and provides incentives for retaining nursing home workers. These incentives may include... these may include workers, bedsides, medical staff. These could include support staff, administration, et cetera. Again, I talked about the administrative aspect of this earlier. It creates a public relations campaign carried out by the Department of Public Health to promote working in nursing homes. And this type of information will be a part of that discussion to encourage people who may want to start at a level and then work their way up. It also includes annual reports for the programs that is required. Again, it requires the Department of Public Health, in partnership with universities and colleges, with these scholarships, 60 percent of scholarships shall be provided to candidates living in Cook County where we have that significant concentration of nursing homes. Preference for scholarships will be given to single parents, again, CNAs, applications from communities that are economically distressed, immigrants, and other minorities. Just a little bit of background. Approximately 280 facilities in Illinois where staff levels... there are approximately 280 facilities in Illinois where staff levels fall below national averages according to the Kaiser Health Data. And according to a 2012 study by the American Health Care Association, turnover at nursing homes, unfortunately, is at 50 percent. Here in Illinois, there are at least 6 nursing homes with 1 nurse for every 100 residents. And nationwide, 70... 70 percent of nursing homes fail to meet Medicare standards of at least 45 minutes of staffing per

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

resident, per day. A lot of this data came from the young man standing behind me. His name is Patrick, one of our fantastic staff persons who did a lot of this research. And we are extrapolating also from this, as we talk about just overall shortages in some areas, that there is a need, again, to drive more minority participation into nursing home positions. The conversation over the summer will not only include just a pathway program for CNAs and how they can move up, but also how we can incentivize and encourage more folks at the administrative level to become engaged in nursing homes. Young people graduating with degrees in finance and business, and not only hospital administration degrees, can have the opportunity to work in nursing homes as well. But we've got to get them in the door and get them the appropriate licensure and then they can move up from there as well. So, that is what the Bill does. Thank you for your indulgence, Madam Chair. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Batinick: "Representative, that was pretty long there. Just... just wanted to clarify something. This is... this Bill is on Short Debate, right, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Burke: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate."

Batinick: "Okay. You had some Amendments. You did a lot of changes here. Was there any... was all opposition removed? Was there any opposition to this Bill?"

Davis: "I don't believe there is any opposition. I would like to think the..."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Batinick: "Thank you for the answers to..."

Davis: "...Amendments probably took care of that."

Batinick: "Thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Kalish: "Chairman Davis, you and I talked about the minority participation amongst the leadership within the nursing home industry and I... I think it's important to point out the representatives from Alden who are here today, where their owner, Floyd Schlossberg, prides himself in a high level of minority participation. And I think through your efforts and working with the great groups like Alden, we can use the language in this Bill to... to make that more of a reality in... in many more facilities. So, I thank you for your leadership and I really appreciate everything you're doing on behalf of the industry."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Rabbi. I appreciate it."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

Thapedi: "Leader Davis, is it true that nursing homes from across the state are... are struggling to hire and retain the workforce that they need to provide the highest quality of care even though that they're offering signing bonuses and are offering professional development opportunities to... to folks?"

Davis: "You know what, Representative, you're absolutely right.

And the unique thing about the signing bonus aspect of it is that, unfortunately, it allows people to shop around. So,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

they get the signing bonus, they'll stay for the six months, somebody'll offer them a signing bonus, then they'll move and take that and keep moving around. We've got to figure out how to create long term employment relationships with the nursing homes. And if money is that consideration, hopefully this Bill, and using the resources attached to it, will encourage someone that once they get it that there is a pathway up for them and we can give them scholarships and other incentives so that they can then move to the next rungs up the ladder and create long term relationships in their nursing facilities."

Thapedi: "And is it also true that the Medicaid reimbursement is also a crippling effect on the nursing homes ability to retain confident and good workers there as well?"

Davis: "As of matter of fact, part of our budget discussion is a backlog of... of determinations large redeterminations for nursing home residents. One of the things that we may have learned is that unlike some other health care facilities, when someone presents themselves at a nursing home, they cannot be turned away. They have to take them. So, that's whether or not the application is in and the decision has been made. So, some of our budget discussion is about dealing with a huge backlog of ... of determination ... Medicaid determinations for individuals who are now in nursing homes. So, certainly once we settle that and have some additional resources to help starting to address that issue then, yes, because nursing homes will be on a better financial footing. And then they can work to make sure that they don't have to cut staff because of some of the challenges

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

that they have with the state which, again, should help them firm them up and make them more stable."

Thapedi: "Is it also true that a similar program also exists in Wisconsin that's proved to be very helpful?"

Davis: "I'm sorry, Representative. Could you repeat that for me?"

Thapedi: "No, my question was that isn't there a similar program in Wisconsin that's proved to be productive?"

Davis: "Yes. As a matter of fact, a lot of what has landed in this particular Bill comes from... kind of the Wisconsin model. Who, again, went through the approval process with the federal CMS to allow them to be able to use these funds in order to help create these pathways. And again, a lot of what we're doing is modeled after that and they've had tremendous success in doing so."

Thapedi: "And is it also true that this program would be subject to federal approval? And in doing so, that there would actually be a partnership that would occur between our community colleges and universities as well?"

Davis: "Absolutely. Again, because the program... because the feds have to approve the use of the money in this way, of course when we're talking about training opportunities, wherewith individuals receive those trainings. So this encourages the participation and the partnership with our colleges and universities in a number of different ways. Even if we're talking about just, like, CNA programs and, again, moving up through that way. Of course, we're talking about nursing programs that rest at both colleges and community colleges as well. And when I talked earlier about looking at the upper management structure, so we've got young people graduating

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

with degrees, bachelors degrees, in various fields that could come in to entry level positions and management. Then they could work, they could take the exam for their licensure, and then have the opportunity to move up as well. So, this is a great way to engage our... our higher education system across the board to participate in this process."

Thapedi: "And it's more to it than just the managerial aspect from my understanding. That there will be some preference that will be provided to the CNAs, single parents, and applicants from economically depressed communities like mine, in which I do have a nursing home in my... in my district and they are very, very aggressive in trying to retain the best and the brightest workers that they possibly can. Is that accurate as well?"

Davis: "That is absolutely accurate."

Thapedi: "Madam Speaker, I encourage all the Body to vote 'aye' on this important piece of legislation."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins."

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

Speaker Burke: "He will."

Caulkins: "Yes. Thank you very much for putting this together, Representative Davis. This is a very positive approach to a very severe problem that we have in the nursing home industry. And I... I applaud you for your hard work and... and your... I guess, willingness to take this project on. We certainly hope that this will be funded and approved, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Will, one quick question here. I see here that's divvying up, and you did mention a little bit, so 60 percent of the funds are going to go to counties above 3 million. That is only Cook County. Is there a reason why 60 percent of the funds are going to go to a county that only has 40 percent of the population?"

Davis: "Well, I think... I think in this case, we're partly looking at the concentration of the actual facilities, Representative. While I appreciate what you said that more of the population of the state resides outside of Cook County. But I think you would... I hope that you would agree that the number of facilities that exists are more populous in the Cook County area, even northern... north or northeastern Illinois, if you will, then they are in downstate areas."

Skillicorn: "Is there a way to quantify that? I don't... I don't know if that's the case or not."

Davis: "I'm... I'm sure there is. And again, I'm just making an extrapolation because, I mean, that's... population is very spread out in Southern Illinois, which I'm sure you very well know. Even when you get to some of the collar counties, population is a lot more spread out and a lot less dense than it is in Cook County, whether it be City of Chicago or even areas like the south suburbs, like mine. So, there probably is a way to quantify it. I won't be able to get that number to you relative to this debate, but if that's something you would desire, I'm sure we can get that information to you."

Skillicorn: "And don't forget, just like you, I represent the suburbs. But if... if that's really the intent and argument,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

okay, fair. Why does the language specifically talk about other criteria? You know, the… goes into economics and other things like that. If that's the case, why don't we just go out and say that instead of divvying up what we do?"

Davis: "You might have to repeat that. I'm not..."

Skillicorn: "I just..."

Davis: "...sure."

Skillicorn: "...looking at the text of the Bill, it is... it doesn't say it's about where the facilities are located. It has criteria based on where these scholarships are going to be rewarded or potential scholarship consideration factors. I'm looking, it's probably page 2 of the Bill. I'm not trying to give you a hard time. I just want to point out..."

Davis: "No, no, no. I'm..."

Skillicorn: "...that if..."

Davis: "...I want to answer your question, Sir."

Skillicorn: "...if we're going to talk..."

Davis: "So, you're looking at..."

Skillicorn: "...about..."

Davis: "...you're looking at page..."

Skillicorn: "...the disparity there, let's find a way to quantify it instead of just kind of running with... how it is here."

Davis: "So again, you've got... okay, I'm where you are now. So, what is your question?"

Skillicorn: "Well, obviously you said it was based on where these facilities are located. We... we haven't quantified it. I mean, I haven't counted them, you haven't counted them, and I'm not running the Bill. But then, why does the text of the Bill not say where the facilities are located but it actually lays out

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

specific qualifications for the scholarships? And it's not based on where the facilities are, it's based on certain communities?"

Davis: "Well, I... I would argue that ... and, again, if you know anything about me, there's always an interest in trying to increase minority participation in a lot of areas. I think CNAs, as we know them, I think as a population of ... or a category of individuals, are generally more minority anyway. So, I... I can understand why maybe we direct some of this conversation to where we know at least what the current population of CNAs looks like to where they are. Which primarily more in Cook County. Again, I know you said you're in the suburbs, I'm not sure which ones so I won't profess to know what your... your ethnic or diversity breakdowns are. But certainly in Cook County where I am, not only City of Chicago but in the south suburbs, we have certainly denser populations of the categories that are listed here that we're trying to... to impact. But that doesn't mean that someone who lives in your area, which I believe may be McHenry? I... I think?"

Skillicorn: "Kane and McHenry Counties."

Davis: "Okay. Can't have access to this and... and still benefit from it the same way that someone... someone does. And then, I don't want to make the assumption that you don't have people of color who live in your communities as well, who again, could... who would be kind of prioritized, I guess... and that's my word... with regard to this and have access to this. But again, this is open to everyone across the state. But if, again, you look at that density, then that's where apparently, these dollars are targeted."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Skillicorn: "Well, thank you for providing the legislative intent."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much. The past Representative, if he wanted something specific, all he had to do was ask for it. He didn't have to go round the river and through the woods to get there. That... that's not a problem. The language is pretty clear on what we're attempting to do here. But, that notwithstanding, again, Members of the House, this Bill is an effort to try to increase that overall workforce. And that workforce is a shortage whether you're in Cook County, McHenry County, Coles County, Alexander County, Macoupin County, wherever you are in this state. This is an opportunity to shore up that workforce. And so, with that being said, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1573 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 question, there are 116 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, we have House Joint Resolution 75, offered by Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 75. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

CONCURRING HEREIN, that we designate the section of Illinois Route 251 from Bridge Street in Roscoe to Rockton Road in Roscoe as the Specialist Brandon Jacob Rowe Memorial Highway."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Sosnowski is recognized on the Resolution."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd appreciate the Members of the Assembly joining me as we stand in recognition of a fallen hero. Earlier this week, we celebrated Memorial Day by remembering the men and women who gave their lives to protect this great nation. Today, we gather in remembrance and in honor of Specialist Brandon Rowe. Specialist Rowe was a Northern Illinois native, born April 14, 1982 in Rockford, spent most of his life growing up in Roscoe, Illinois. He was a 2000 graduate of Hononegah High School and attended Rock Valley College before he enlisted in the United States Army to serve his country. He was a member of the 101st Airborne Division based in Fort Campbell, Kentucky. On March 31, 2003, he was the first Infantryman of the 101st to be killed in combat during Operation Iraqi Freedom and was the first from Northern Illinois to be killed in that war. Specialist Rowe's last act of kindness was towards one of his brothers. The medic serving with his unit was uncomfortable sitting where he was at in the tank that they were positioned in, and Specialist Rowe offered to change places with him. Specialist Rowe's death was the catalyst for the leader of his unit to get his men to safety, off of the tanks they had been assigned to, and find cover. The unit continued to fight for eight hours that day but no further lives were lost, making the

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

mission a success. Specialist Rowe was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, and others have been earned in recognitions of his military career. Specialist Brandon Jacob Rowe is survived by this mother, Wendy, and stepfather, Rick, who join us here today in the Speaker's Gallery. Today, I ask that we designate the section of the Illinois Route 251 from Bridge Street in Roscoe to Rockton Road in Roscoe as Specialist Brandon Jacob Rowe Memorial Highway, so that we can always remember his sacrifice and the love of his family. I would ask that the Body please join me in a moment of silence to honor this fallen hero."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Madam Chair. It is never easy to talk about someone that you didn't know but that gave their life for our very freedom. It is never easy to talk about somebody that died the way they wished, because your son, an American patriot, knew the dangers and he stood his ground for us. I wish we could do more for you, but as a grateful nation, one small thing that we could do was have that beautiful white marker on the rolling hills of Arlington Cemetery. I wish that everybody in this chamber, the next time they go, will stop by and visit that beautiful white marker. There are several others, your son is not alone. We thank you and God bless you."

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

Representative Sosnowski moves for the adoption of House

Joint Resolution 75. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed

vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Representative Williams, for what reason do you rise?"

Williams: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Williams: "I know at the end of Session, usually when we're done passing all of our Bills, we take time to thank staff for their hard work, but looking ahead, the next two days are going to be kind of a whirlwind, not just for us, but for the hard working staff that is toiling away as we speak preparing the budget, working on analysis, assisting us here on the floor. So, I just wanted to take a moment to thank the staff in advance for the great work they're going to be doing over the next couple very intense days and remind everyone in the Body to join me in really appreciating that and thanking them for their efforts. So, we're almost there guys."

- Speaker Burke: "Page 7 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1813, Representative Rita. Representative Rita. Take your time. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1813, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1813 makes technical changes to the Illinois Credit Union Act, which enables the credit unions to operate more effectively. Has a number of changes just in how they operate the… their credit unions. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1813 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 88 voting in 'favor', 27... on this question, there are 88 voting in 'favor', 27 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bryant: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "Thank you. In... today, I have the honor of introducing to the Body, Mr. Cameron Steele. Cameron is sitting... standing, actually. Cameron is standing in the back. He is the 2019 Valedictorian from Mount Vernon Township High School. Cameron spent his 4 years at Mount Vernon Township High School compiling an impressive list of activities and accomplishments. I think that you'll be impressed to have heard from Representative Severin and myself, today, to see the pool of talent that we have in Southern Illinois. He's a 4-year member of the soccer team, serving as captain his

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

senior year. Three-year member of the student council, serving as both treasurer and secretary. A Worldwide Youth In Science and Engineering state qualifier and first place finisher in the regionals for chemistry. A two-time national qualifier and three-time state qualifier in FBLA. He was the lead role in the Mount Vernon Township High School production of the musical Hello Dolly. He's also been an active member of the National Honor Society, speech and acting club, and the tennis team. Cameron is also a missionary, having served folks in New Orleans, and New York City, and he's also taken two trips to Tanzania. And will be returning for mission work there this summer. In the fall, he'll attend Olivet Nazarene University in Bourbonnais with a major in chemical engineering. So he's smart, he can sing, and he's a great athlete. Cameron's father couldn't be here today. Cameron and... Cameron's father, Randy, and I go back to before Cameron was born. Cameron also served as an intern for me this last summer. So, he's pretty special to us. Also, wanted to mention that Randy is a highly respected minister in Mount Vernon and I'm sure he wishes he could be here. Cameron is also joined in the gallery today by his mother, Mandy, and his grandparents, Jack and Evelyn... Evelyn Carter. Please join me in welcoming him. But I also want to say directly to Cameron, Cameron, I take great satisfaction today in introducing you. I know that you think that you've traveled a long road, you have not peaked in... in where you will go in this. And I know in the coming days that you and I are going to have lots of conversations about where you want to go with this. So, Body,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

help me in welcoming Cameron Steele and his family today, the Valedictorian of Mount Vernon Township High School."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins, for what reason do you rise?"

Caulkins: "Madam Chair, please record an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 1573."

Speaker Burke: "Let the record reflect that you intended to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1673(sic-1573). Representative... we have Senate Bill 1854, Representative Mason. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Mason."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mason on the Amendment."

Mason: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I am addressing Amendment #3, correct?"

Speaker Burke: "This is Amendment #2. Do you..."

Mason: "I do not want to adopt that one."

Speaker Burke: "Wish to withdraw Amendment #2?"

Mason: "Yes, correct."

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk, are there further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mason on Floor Amendment #3."

Mason: "Perfect. Thank you. Floor Amendment 3 replaces the information in the original Bill. And what this does, this addresses the issue of ethylene oxide in our communities. If

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

anyone was listening to or reading the news today, you may have heard that a new report came out around the Sterigenics facility in Willowbrook indicating the higher risk of cancer to people living around that facility. This is the same issue. Also last week, we passed Senate Bill 1852, which addressed the issue of ethylene oxide in sterilization facilities. There are also manufacturing facilities that emit ethylene like those around my district and affecting individuals in my community. So, what this does is it prohibits more than 150 pounds of ethylene oxide located in a county with a population of at least 700 thousand based on 2010 census data. It doesn't include sterilization sources because that is already addressed in Senate Bill 1852. And it allows the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency to reopen the permit if the agency determines that the sources pose a risk to the public. It also requires ongoing testing. For clarity, this Bill will only apply to those entities that, again, emit more than 150 pounds of ethylene oxide... oh, I'm sorry... as reported on the entities 2017 toxic release inventory and is located in a county with a population of at least 700 thousand based on the 2010 census. And I ask for an 'aye' vote to protect my community. I am... and all of our communities. I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick, this is on the Amendment.

Would it be okay to adopt the Amendment and debate on Third?

Representative Mason moves for the adoption of Floor

Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1854. All those in favor say

'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1854, Representative Mason. Please... please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mason."

Mason: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment is the Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote and welcome any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, a couple quick questions 'cause I... I heard what you said describing the Bill and I was looking at my notes. This affects any county 700 thousand or above according to the 2010 census, correct? That's what the Bill says?"

Mason: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Do you know what... our analysis says it affected Lake County, so I believe I read that. May not have. So, this is..."

Mason: "That is correct."

Batinick: "So it's... but it's more than Lake County, right?"

Mason: "Well..."

Batinick: "I'm just trying to get an idea of which counties this affects, Representative. That's all."

Mason: "Okay. So, it... it would apply to Lake County and Cook County with the population data, but then there is the further

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

restriction of emitting more than 150 pounds of ethylene oxide. So, essentially, it really is limited to Lake County and one facility there."

Batinick: "Because counties like... DuPage is about a million. I think my county is over 700 thousand. In your research of doing the Bill, is that that... though there's no... none of these facilities in those two counties?"

Mason: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So, we're just talking about Lake and then Cook?"

Mason: "One... yes, one facility."

Batinick: "Right. And I believe it says, this Bill would apply to Vantage Specialty Chemicals in Lake County and Elé Corporation in McCook, Illinois. Those are the two corporations that are in this?"

Mason: "No, it doesn't include Elé."

Batinick: "Okay. Okay. I see and that was fixed with the third Floor Amendment. We got lots of environmental groups that are obviously supporting this. And there's still some of the industry that opposed, as they probably would naturally oppose. Is that correct with the..."

Mason: "Yes, correct."

Batinick: "...Third Amendment? Okay. Thanks for answering the questions."

Mason: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "To the... to the Bill. I just want to thank Representative Mason for her hard work on this, which is one of the most important issues that I've worked on this year facing the people in my district. Everybody deserves the right to clean

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

air and clean water. And the concerns that have been brought to us have been very, very serious concerns about these facilities. We know that ethylene oxide is a carcinogen. We know it makes people sick and it is critically important that we pass this Bill today. Additionally, I want to thank the advocates who kept pushing us week, after week, after week to make sure that we address this important issue. They spread awareness. They made sure that we knew what we needed to do to keep people safe. And I'm very proud to be standing in support of this Bill today. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mason to close."

Mason: "Representative Didech said it well. This is a cancer causing chemical. We addressed this in 1852 with sterilization facilities. I believe that our district... our area with manufacturing facilities deserve the same protections. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1854 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion... and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting in 'favor', 17 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have Senate Bill 2128, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2128, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Amendment... or Floor Amendment #1 I wish to adopt. It makes technical changes regarding the practice of voice writer reporting. I think this is at the urging of the AG. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2128. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2128, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2128, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Chair. The Bill itself changes the title to Shorthand Reporters Act. It adds writer reporters through each provision of the Act. This was an accommodation to the stakeholders of the National Verbatim Reporters Association. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I did not get the memos today. No coat and tie day?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "It's... it's been a long May day, Mark, and we're just going to try to get through it together."

Batinick: "I got my gym shoes, so I appreciate the answers to the important question."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no... Representative Zalewski to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2128 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 question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bills Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 651, Representative Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move to adopt Amendment 3. Amendment 3 provides a small technical change as it relates to the inaction date. I'd like to move for its adoption."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no... Representative Gordon-Booth moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 651. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

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 Burke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 651, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read... please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 651 is an Agreed Bill that came out of the Senate. It is... the alternative electric suppliers industry is an industry that has been engaged in some very predatory practices in many of our communities around this state. They often go door to door and calling consumers, claiming to provide electricity and gas. They use misleading and deceptive, fraudulent claims to scam customers into paying much more money for their energy to simply do things like keep their lights on, keep their homes heated, and feed their families. According to the Illinois Commerce Commission, customers who switched their utilities from either ComEd or Ameren to an alternative supplier have paid more than \$600 million more in electricity costs in the last 4 years. A particular concern, the consumers harmed most by these practices and policies are communities of color, low-income communities across the state, senior citizens, and individuals for whom English is their second language. These are customers who end up paying the cost of signing up to one of these suppliers. The purpose of this Bill is to ensure that consumers fully understand what they are signing up for and that the supplier has an

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

opportunity to end contracts and to protect consumers, which have ended up with a lot of people from very marginalized communities paying the upfront costs, and again, some very predatory practices. This Bill is an initiative of the Attorney General's Offices. The organizations that are in support of this Bill are organizations like AARP, Citizens Action, CUB, Heartland Alliance, Legal Aide, Metropolitan Family Services, Environmental Law Policy. This was a bipartisan Roll Call coming out of the Senate. I'm open for any questions. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Wheeler: "Leader, we heard this Bill in committee. I know that you've worked on this for quite a while. I see Representative Thapedi there next to you, he also had many questions about this referring to the specific initiatives that this Bill covers, many of which we had tried to address in a rule situation awhile back. But I just wanted to reiterate to the Members that this is an Agreed Bill at this point. Is that correct?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes, it is."

Wheeler: "And that we addressed some very important issues regarding contracts that were on renewal were allowing the provider to really charge rates that were extraordinarily high compared to what the original teaser rate might have been. Is that also correct?"

Gordon-Booth: "Absolutely."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Wheeler: "Can you just briefly outline a couple other consumer protection measures that are added to this legislation?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes. Certainly. Part of the consumer protections in this policy, it will require suppliers to disclose the utility prices and to compare in marketing and solicitations, as well as what the ratepayers' monthly bills will be. One of the other protections in this Bill is that it protects energy assistance dollars from preventing LIHEAP and PIP recipients from being enrolled. Obviously, it's a very important program to many of us within the General Assembly. Those are resources that go to low-income communities to be able to help individuals be able to keep their homes heated throughout many cold winter Illinois months. The Bill also prevents automatic contract renewals from a fixed rate to a variable rate. So, one of the things that was happening was that you would see consumers have a very fixed low rate, and without any advance knowledge, they would see their rates jump exorbitantly, oftentimes, five times more on a monthly basis than what they had been experiencing before. And even if when they... and even when that would happen, it was very challenging to even be able to identify who to call in order to go back to their previous energy supplier. And... and so, people were oftentimes caught in a rat race. And even if they were able to identify the company by which had that had engaged them to change their energy provider, they were, oftentimes, locked into a contract that they were not able to get out of for years at times. What is also does is it eliminates their early termination fees and penalties that people were often saddled with. But it also outlines specific deceptive and misleading

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

conduct, which is modeled after the current administrative rules that can be brought as a violation to the Consumer Protection Fraud Act, including deceptively using someone's utilities name or logo or failing to disclose the identity of a supplier, and maintaining recordings of all solicitations for two years in an effort to try to hold people more accountable and provide a more transparent process."

Wheeler: "And, Leader, would... referring back to our committee discussion, we had a representative of industry there, who I believe made the comments along the lines that this was a very fair but tough negotiation, that they moved quite a long ways from their original position to where this Bill is now, all in an effort to, I guess, eliminate the practices of the bad actors while still upholding the industry as a whole and giving them a chance to compete. Would that also be an accurate reflection of your..."

Gordon-Booth: "Yes, absolutely. And even when going into committee, I'm sure that many of the folks in the room knew that there were a number of organizations within that particular individual's association that were concerned with a couple of elements of the Bill. And what we wanted to do is we wanted to ensure that we were bringing together the most comprehensive consumer protection policy as it relates to alternative electric suppliers. After that committee hearing, the issues that were even looming in that room, as a part of that association, we were able to address those concerns with that third technical Amendment that we just adopted a moment ago."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Wheeler: "Thank you, Leader. Quickly, to the Bill. I'd like to thank all the parties involved, the Attorney General's Office, the industry, Leader Gordon-Booth, and others who were part of this negotiation. This has been a long time coming. We dealt with this issue in JCAR over the last couple of years. It didn't get as far as it needed to. I believe we are in a place where it is now. I strongly suggest a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Burke: "Indicates she will."

Thapedi: "Leader Gordon-Booth, I want to thank you for... for bringing this piece of legislation. I think that the saying that a picture is worth a thousand words it probably the most indicative of... of what this Bill does. And I don't know if Members will be able to see this, this is a map of... of the City of Chicago. And if you can see it here on the monitor, the areas that are black and the areas that are dark colored reflect large amounts of activities of the bad actors taking advantage of black and brown communities. A picture is worth a thousand words. And if Members don't have a copy of this document..."

Gordon-Booth: "Yep."

Thapedi: "...please ask the Attorney General for a copy of this document. But again, a picture is worth a thousand words. I'd also like to thank you, Leader Gordon-Booth, for following up on the issue that we had been dealing with in JCAR for quite some time, as Leader Wheeler discussed. We were having challenges in terms of promulgating rules to rid out those

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

bad actors. And it was an aggressive stance that was taken by the ICC, but some of those bad actors were aggressively fighting back because they knew that the ICC wanted to drive them out of business, get them out of our state. And those bad actors were able to prevail. But by this Bill, today, Leader Gordon-Booth, you have won for the people that need protection, for people that need protection the most from these bad actors. And I do want to thank Mr. Kevin Wright from the industry group, who recognized in multiple conversations with me that there are bad actors out there. And he was committed to doing what he could... again, committed to doing what he could, notwithstanding the fact that some of those bad actors were his members. But he still recognized that in order to grow the opportunity for choice, because that's what this dynamic is all about, Aeris is about choice, and if it's done correctly, then it's a fair thing to do. But the problem is, what we see again, and the picture is worth a thousand words, with those bad actors taking advantage of people who could not protect themselves. So, with respect to the face to face solicitations that was at issue in JCAR, could you please explain, again, how this Bill addresses that issue?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes. So, what the Bill is looking to do is to create more transparency and accountability as it relates to how those face to face solicitations work. As you have articulated so well, the heat map that you see, particularly in the City of Chicago, on the south and west sides of the city, what you would see happening is many of these bad actors would go into low-income communities, African American

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

communities, Hispanic communities, oftentimes, communities where English was not the first language. And they would engage in predatory practices that would switch an individual from their current electric supplier to an alternative supplier with the intent, ultimately, of solely making money. And it was never about actually producing a good product for folks. So, as it relates... so as specifically to this policy prescription, what we're looking to do is to create far more transparency and accountability as it relates to the... to the actors that are in this place. And the folks who they're bringing on to try to promote their product."

Thapedi: "Thank you very much for that. And the other issue that we grappled with in... in JCAR and we got heavy resistance from those bad actors, again, was the third party verification component. How does this Bill resolve that third party verification component? And again, when I say third party verification, I'm talking about the scenario in which... if it does at all, and I'm not a hundred percent sure that it does. If it doesn't, that's something that we definitely want to follow up on. But again, when I'm talking about the third party verification, after that change of choice has actually been made, who's actually getting on the phone or sending a letter or doing whatever to the consumer to make sure that that was their decision to make that switch?"

Gordon-Booth: "So, what we're doing is we're not changing anything in the third party verification part of the process, but what we are doing is we're changing the process on the front end. So, on the front end... the front end user, as it relates to how these bad actors are getting folks sort of trapped in

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

these very frivolous contracts, that was where our focus was on the Bill, was more so on the solicitation side, not so much on the back end verification side."

"And... and what about contract renewal? That was another Thapedi: issue that we looked at in JCAR and we grappled with that issue as well, fighting the bad actors. And again, when we... when we talk about bad actors, we're not just making that term up. There's... there's actually a score card, correct, Leader Gordon-Booth? There's actually a score card out there of all of the Aeris companies that are... that are doing business in the state where they're ranked based upon their complaints from five stars all the way down to one star. And again, a picture is worth a thousand words for Members. If they don't have a copy of this document from the Attorney General's Office, please get a copy of it so that you know that this is fact, not fiction. So, if you could go back and explain to me quickly about what's going to happen with contract renewal, because, again, that was another issue that we were grappling with."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you so much, Chairman Thapedi. That was a... a very big issue. It's actually probably one of the biggest because it is what you ultimately end up dealing with as it relates to a person feeling trapped in these contracts. So the automatic contract renewal, there's a... one of the changes that was made, as it relates to the Bill, is there's a far more robust process by which individuals have to go about getting expressed consent as it relates to getting the contract renewal. And then we also embedded into the Bill the... there are no early termination fees. So, that was one of

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

the larger issues with individuals that realized that they were trapped in this contract, that was a very unsavory contract, with this alternative electric supplier. And even when they would try to get out they would be one, charged with, oftentimes, triple and quadruple their energy prices. And then when they would try to back out of that contract, they were then charged exorbitant rates, and above and beyond, that they were charged early termination fees. So, what we've removed in this Bill is those early termination fees. So, at any point... and if an individual decides that they have gotten themselves into this contract after they have... in a robust way, the company has to be able to provide how they went after very specific consent. There would still the ability for... for the consumer to be able to back out of that contract, early termination for any... for any reason whatsoever."

Thapedi: "And... and I think the biggest win on this Bill was obviously something that... that fought... that we grappled with in... in JCAR, and obviously opposed to by the bad actors, was the applicability of the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. Would you please explain what that means? So, those bad actors that are out there know what's going to happen if they keep pulling this kind of stuff that they've been pulling in our state and taking advantage of black and brown communities?"

Gordon-Booth: "So, what we're doing, as a result of the robust negotiations that happened through the industry and all the players, including the Attorney General's Office, what we have the ability to do as a result of this legislation is give the Attorney General the increased ability to go after

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- all of these bad actors. That was something that was challenged before as it relates to sort of what the authority of the AG was. And as a result of this legislation and the... the level to which the Attorney General is looking to lean into this issue, which this is his top priority this year, we will... he will have the ability, through the power of that seat, to be able to go after these bad actors that are operating in communities around Chicago and around the rest of the state and hold them accountable."
- Thapedi: "But when you say go after them, what... what are the potential penalties? And again, we're talking about the Consumer Fraud Act."
- Gordon-Booth: "So... So when we go through the Consumer Fraud Act, it sort of delineates what all of those penalties are. And that is the... that is the way by which Attorney General Raoul will be able to hold all of these actors in the industry accountable. So, it is all of the... it is consent... it is... excuse me, it is specifically rolled out to the Consumer Fraud Protection Act. And then based on an individual... the individual situations, their office will have the ability to determine what is the appropriate measure in that particular instance."
- Thapedi: "And they can recoup or go after them for attorney's fees and costs?"
- Gordon-Booth: "Absolutely. They will be able to go after penalties, fines, fees. They will even, actually, potentially be able to go after their license."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Leader Gordon-Booth, for bringing this legislation. Thank you to Attorney General Raoul's staff for

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

seeing this through. Thank you, Leader Wheeler, for working with us on this. Thank you to all the Members of JCAR who continued to stick in there with us on this to root out these bad actors. Madam Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect that the party of Gerald Ford will be without Deanne Mazzochi the rest of the day. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to thank Rep... Leader Booth for bringing this forward. As you know, I... I still am very lucky enough to have both of my parents alive, but they're elderly. And I installed Ring doorbell, which... which was a very good situation for me at my parents' home because as soon as someone rings the doorbell, one of these bad actors came to the house and actually said they work with ComEd. So, that's just something that... it's out there, and I think that also needs to be maybe looked at and included that if they misrepresent themselves that we can go after them even more. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Gordon-Booth to close."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the previous speakers point. Specifically, what he has... specifically, what he expressed in terms of what happened to his family, to his parents. That is indicative of why this piece of legislation is so critically important, that we pass this out of the House today. You have elderly individuals, you have black, brown communities and low-income communities across this state that are targeted specifically by these bad actors that operate in

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

the alternative electric suppliers' market. They oftentimes hold themselves out to be one of the ... one of the larger suppliers like a ComEd or an Ameren. All of that has now made illegal. Under this policy measure, they are doing this in a way, in the open, that allows them to make hundreds of millions of dollars on the back of unsuspecting people, senior citizens, poor people. And this is our opportunity to root out a lot of fraud that it ... as it relates to companies that build their business model on predatory practices on communities that are marginalized and that have been divested in. I think that this is a really strong piece of policy, a very strong consumer protection piece of legislation that we can all feel proud about going back home this summer and letting the folks of our community know that we are standing here in their interest, particularly, as it relates to their utility costs. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 651 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? Williams. Mr. Clerk, please
 take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes',
 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
 received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed.
 Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that I meant to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1813.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "Record will so reflect. Representative Keicher, for what reason do you rise?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Keicher: "I rise for the same reason. Let the record reflect that I had intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1813, please."
- Speaker Burke: "The record will so reflect. All right, Members, moving to the Order of Concurrence, starting on page 10 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2723, Representative Ramirez. Representative Ramirez. Out of the record. Senate... House Bill 2766, Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I'd like to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #2. It adds... this is the Police and Fire First Responders Suicide Task Force and First Responder Bill. I'm adding the task force to this Bill. We're clarifying Employee Assistance Program and replaces them with a Peer Supporting Counseling Program. And there's other clarifications about peer support. I'm here for guestions and would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2766?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2766. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2830, Representative Stava-Murray."
- Stava-Murray: "Thank you. I... I move that we concur with House Bill 2830. The Bill was, if we all recall, that parents cannot be fired for attending school related matters or meetings...

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

behavioral meetings at the school. And the language from the Senate simply clarifies that earlier in the statute so there's consistency across the whole statute. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Morgan. Representative Batinick."
Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "This is my... one of my new questions in my repertoire.

It seemed like the microphone was a little bit far from where you were speaking and I had a hard time hearing you. What does the... what does the Senate Amendment do? And where are all the groups on the Bill? And why... we'll start with there. Start with that, and why do we need this?"

Stava-Murray: "Yeah. So, this is the Bill that passed already. And the only minor change made to the Bill by the Senate was to clarify language that behavioral meetings and to have consistency within the statute that earlier in the statute where they're referencing what parents can attend, that it reflects the same language later on that was added."

Batinick: "And..."

Stava-Murray: "So, internal consistency of the language of the Bill."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm sorry. I was getting some conflicting information from my staff. I'm going to let that go for just a second. Amends the School Visitation Rights Act, provides that employers may use school visitation purposes for the purpose of academic and behavioral meetings in addition to school conferences. Provides that an employee may not be terminated for the use of school visitation privileges. What

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

are the current school visitation privileges? Or do we have that in..."

Stava-Murray: "So, this was already voted on. So, this is not part of the Amendment that we're voting on concurrence with.

This... that was already... everyone voted that should happen... I mean..."

Batinick: "Okay."

Stava-Murray: "...not everyone but there were enough votes that that should happen. That's not what this is about. This is simply a concurrence. And the concurrence is a minor language change at the beginning to make it consistent with the definition later on."

Batinick: "Okay. Yeah, I guess... I was reading... I was reading the Amendment. That was the analysis of the Amendment, that's why I brought that up."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah."

Batinick: "So, you're saying that was from the underlying Bill?"
Stava-Murray: "So, that was from the Bill that already passed,
and this is a concurrence. And the only bit of the concurrence
is that that behavioral and academic meeting is reflected
earlier in the statute now as well."

Batinick: "So, you need it reflected in two spots, correct?"

Stava-Murray: "So, it was already at the end because that's what we voted on. And that's what I had added, and that was my Amendment earlier. This concurrence vote is only on adding that same language up at the top where they're having the definition of what people can go for."

Batinick: "Okay. Yeah. Thanks for the clarification."

Stava-Murray: "Sure thing."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Stava-Murray to close."

Stava-Murray: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2830?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. 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 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Senate... the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2830. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2846, Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2846. It gives me great satisfaction to present this Bill today, and that we have... have come to an agreement with the insurance industry and PANDAS and PANS will now be coded under autoimmune encephalitis. And now, we can take a barrier away from families getting the treatment that they need. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2846?' This is final action. All in favor signify by voting 'yes'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2846. And this Bill, having received a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2854, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."

- Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 2854. This Amendment just makes the preference for firefighters permissive for all entities who make appointments to the departments. It... it adds that it's also permissive for the Board of Fire and Police Commissioners under the Municipal Code and for the Board of Fire Commissioners under the Fire Protection District Act. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2854?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill does concur... the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2854. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have House Bill 2884, Representative Guzzardi. Out of the record. Oh, nope. Not out of the record. In the record. Representative Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members, for your indulgence. House Bill 2884 was... has been gutted and replaced. So, I ask for your concurrence in the Senate Amendment. This Bill now pertains to a specific special ed co-op in central Illinois. And what happened is that the educators who are a part of that special ed co-op, the co-op was dissolved. And

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

so, their employer switched from being the co-op to being the local district. But because of an error in State Law, they weren't able to carry-over their accrued sick time from the co-op when they reverted back to their local districts. So, this Bill would correct that error. It's an initiative of Senator Manar, who represents this area. It affects about 140 teachers and paraprofessionals. And we ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I have nearly a zero tolerance policy for... for pension benefit increases. You're probably aware of that, correct?"

Guzzardi: "I am aware of your vigilance on this issue. Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "And how did I vote on this Bill in committee? I think this came to our committee, right, Pensions?"

Guzzardi: "I believe this Bill came out of your committee unanimously, if I recall correctly."

Batinick: "I did... I did support the Bill. So, I... I just wanted to make that clarification since it was a gut and replace. As spokesperson of the Pension Committee, I wanted to let my side of the aisle know that even zero tolerance Batinick thought this was the proper thing to do. So, thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, zero tolerance Batinick."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Burke: "He will."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Willis: "Representative Guzzardi, you must find a lot of satisfaction in having all of the support from the other side of the aisle on this."

Guzzardi: "It warms my heart, Leader Willis."

Willis: "Well, I, too, have satisfaction in seeing this happen in a bipartisan manner. So, in that, let's make sure that we pass this Bill. Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Guzzardi to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2884?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this issue, there are 110 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2884. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2895, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with House Bill 2895, Senate Amendment #1. And basically, it provides that the Department of Public Health shall ensure that all birthing facilities conduct continuing education yearly for providers and staff of obstetric medicine or the emergency department, and other staff that may care for pregnant or postpartum women. Also, it would require the continuing education to include the education modules and regarding

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

management of severe maternal hypertension and obstetric hemorrhaging. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions, but I move for the concurrence and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick. Excuse me. Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Flowers: "Yes."

Batinick: "Representative, wonderful to talk to you. I haven't spoken to you in a little while. I just wanted to make everybody aware, this is a gut and replace. Correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Batinick: "So, looking at your previous vote is not helpful, correct?"

Flowers: "I don't know if I would say that it's not helpful because the contents basically... it's the same. It's dealing with the education."

Batinick: "Okay. Well then..."

Flowers: "And the severe..."

Batinick: "Thank you for that. Instead of talking about what's the same, tell me what's different? I mean, I see that it was 109-2 in the House. So, I'm just... I just want to make sure we clarify what the differences are. I intend on voting 'yes' on this."

Flowers: "I'm sorry. Maybe I am misunderstanding what you're asking? You said you saw it was Senate Bill 192?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Batinick: "No, I... maybe I said it... you said this is... the Amendment is similar to the original Bill even though it's a gut and replace. And the House vote was 109-2."

Flowers: "Yes."

Batinick: "And you're saying there... although it's a gut and replace, they're mostly similar. I'm not concerned about the similarities as much as I am about the differences because then we can determine if those differences would change any votes. So, that's what I'm asking. What's different about the Amendment versus the underlying Bill?"

Flowers: "The difference would be that the Department of Public Health would have the... I think the Department of Public Health would have the Perinatal Quality Collaborative to be the organization to develop and to initiate the Birth Equality Improvement Program."

Batinick: "Okay. And this... so this Bill went through committee, looks like... looks like 4-0. Any other big differences, Representative, that you're getting handed to you over there?"

Flowers: "Representative, the other specific concern would be the hospitals. We wanted to make sure that the hospitals that actually had go for the training had the actual birthing beds, that these hospitals were qualified to offer their services. If not, the doctors and the health care providers need not go for the hemorrhaging training..."

Batinick: "Okay."

Flowers: "...and the birthing training."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. Madam Speaker, would it be okay if I yielded the rest of my time to Representative Hammond, who can clean things up for us?"

Speaker Burke: "Yes. Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Flowers: "Yes."

Hammond: "Representative Flowers, it was my understanding that prior to the Senate Amendment, there was some push back from the Illinois Hospital Association. And as a result of the... and that was because they believed that there could be a patchwork of training from hospital to hospital perhaps. And instead, with the Amendment, they have agreed that the Illinois Perinatal Quality Collaborative will develop the training and it will be used throughout all the hospitals throughout Illinois. Is that correct, Representative?"

Flowers: "That is correct, Representative."

Hammond: "Thank you. I appreciate your work on this, and urge an 'aye' vote."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2895?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2895. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2931, Representative Davis. Please proceed."

Davis: "Oh, I'm sorry, Madam Chair."

Speaker Burke: "You're on a Motion to Concur."

Davis: "I thought something had to be read first. I apologize.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #4

to House Bill 2931. This represents... and I'd like to... never

used this word before, but this represents the Omnibus...

Omnibus TIF Bill... TIF Extension Bill. For Members on both

sides of the aisle, all of the requisite letters have been

put in place per our process. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions... seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2931?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'... I'm sorry, all those... all those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting in 'favor', 9 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2931. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sosnowski, for what reason do you rise?"

Sosnowski: "Hi, Madam Chair. I rise on a point of personal privilege. Could I please have the Journal reflect that I meant to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1813?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Speaker Burke: "The record will so reflect. Representative Sommer, for what reason do you rise? You don't wish to be recognized?

 Okay. Representative Sommer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Sommer: "Madam Speaker, please let the record reflect it was my intention to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1813."
- Speaker Burke: "Record will so reflect. Leader Demmer on a Motion.

 Please, go ahead."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I make a Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1507 passed."
- Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Demmer has made a Motion to Reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 1507. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 91 voting in 'favor', 20 voting 'against', and 4 voting 'present'. And the Motion prevails. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1507."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1507 was read a third time previously today."
- Speaker Burke: "Members, on the… question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1507 pass?' Oh, excuse me. Representative Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had a conversation with Representative Edly-Allen about this Bill. During the course of debate, we had a couple of Members who expressed some concern about certain portions of the Bill. I believe that those Members will work on separate legislation to address those concerns. We support the underlying Bill here and I encourage all Members on my side to vote 'yes'."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1507 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? On this question... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. With one... on this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Willis, for an announcement."
- Willis: "The Democrats would like to call an immediate caucus in Room 114, please."
- Speaker Burke: "How long do you think you'll be gone?"
- Willis: "As long as it takes."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler is recognized for an announcement."
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Republicans will have an immediate caucus in Room 118. We'll probably go longer than the Democrats."
- Speaker Burke: "Okay. The House will stand in recess until the call of the Chair."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention, Members, the House will reconvene in five minutes. The House will reconvene in five minutes."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s)3 to Senate Bill 1881."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, we will begin with House Bill 2818, Representative Costa Howard. Please proceed."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that we... that we approve Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 2818. It... the Amendment contains the language of the original Bill, makes three changes. Changes the name of the program to include victims of stalking and sexual abuse, cross references definitions of sexual assault and stalking to the definitions in other sections of the statute, and adds a delayed effective date."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no questions... no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2818?' This is final action. 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 question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And we do concur in House Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2818. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Costa Howard, on page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 3101."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please proceed."

Costa Howard: "I ask that we adopt Senate Amendment #1 in concurrence. This is... the Amendment makes two changes. Gives DHS until July 1, 2020, it added six months. And in addition, the Amendment states that DHS may consult with the U.S.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Department of Justice regarding the human trafficking training program. I ask for an 'aye'..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick, for what reason do you arise?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

- Batinick: "I... you explained the Amendment but can you give us a little bit more on the underlying Bill? Because even though the Amendment might be small, it might change the effect of the underlying Bill. So, can you put it all together in one nice sandwich for us?"
- Costa Howard: "Absolutely. So, House Bill 3101 creates the Lodging Establishment Human Trafficking Recognition Training Act. It... it's the same Bill as before, requires our hotels and motels to do human trafficking recognition training."
- Batinick: "Okay. Is it... yeah, and we're supportive of the Bill. What's the status of Senate Bill 75? Isn't that something that's even more broad or similar that incorporates a lot of your Bill? Or are you not aware of that?"
- Costa Howard: "I'm aware of the Bill. I'm just trying to remember how... I apologize, Representative Batinick, I'm just trying to remember how they correspond. It's an extension of the Human Trafficking Program. This is specific language to our hotels and motels in their actual training programs."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further questions, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill
3101?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed
'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Representative DeLuca is very powerful. Very powerful, Representative. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received... the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3101. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Crespo on House Bill 3302. Please proceed. Please proceed."

"Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with Amendment #1 Crespo: to House Bill 3302. The underlying Bill extended the time line to file a complaint against CPS to 2 years for students that were denied special education services. The concurrence that came back establishes the date of September 30, 2021 by which complaints must be filed for denial of special services education. And it also establishes that CPS must provide written notification no later than 30 days after the school day of the 2019-2020 school years. That appropriate relief maybe available. And if I may for legislative intent, the intent of House Bill 3302, as amended by the Senate, is to extend the timeline for due process claims only for students impacted by findings included in the State Boards public inquiry. These findings are included in the report approved by the State Board in May of 2017. All other complaints will fall under existing timelines. A notification required under this section shall include a statement that the extended time for state complaints is only available for students impacted by findings identified by public... the public inquiry. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3302?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3302. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Hurley on House Bill 3396. Please proceed."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I make a Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3396. It's a gut and replace Amendment but it retains the Bill's original language. Makes the same changes in the Protective Order Act so there is a procedural consistency among the stalking no contact orders, the civil no contact orders, and the domestic violence order of protection."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3396?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3396. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Villa on House Bill 3405. Please proceed."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Villa: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3405. It adds language requested by the Department of Labor. And it will make the Wage Payment and Collection Act clear that the Department does have the ability to enforce wage decisions in Circuit Court. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wheeler."

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

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

Wheeler: "Thank you, Representative. This is a Bill that you and I have worked on a little bit here. And the underlying Bill, we didn't change at all in this Amendment, that happened in the Senate. Is that correct?"

Villa: "That's correct."

Wheeler: "We just made it clear that the department has the ability to enforce what we are trying to accomplish?"

Villa: "Yes, that's right."

Wheeler: "Perfect. Thank you so much for your hard work on this Bill. I appreciate you team work and your effort. Thank you" Villa: "Yes. And thank you for your collaboration as well."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further people seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3405?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting' no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3405. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

hereby declared passed. Representative Guzzardi on House Bill 3440. Please proceed."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This pertains to a measure that we passed earlier in Session which allows for consumers to bring reusable containers to the grocery store for the purpose of procuring bulk goods. This made some small changes at the behest of the DuPage County Public Health Department, simply clean up language that brought the Department on board. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative, I believe that Representative Murphy had asked something about... it sounds like some of the things you have fixed with the... with the Amendment regarding cross contamination. Is that what the DuPage Department of Health wanted fixed?"

Guzzardi: "Correct. Yeah, they had some clarifying language they asked us to add in that regard."

Batinick: "Thank you for that. And no numbers in this Bill?"

Guzzardi: "No numbers, very easy for me."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further individuals seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Manley, House Bill 3498. Please proceed."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. It's a page and line Amendment which differentiates between performing female genital mutilation and facilitating female genital mutilation by retaining the Class X felony and... I'm trying to read this, sorry. Six to thirty years of imprisonment for performing the mutilation but lowering the penalty for facilitating mutilation from a Class X felony to a Class I felony. This is something the Senate felt was important. I'm not sure why, but I move to concur."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3498?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3498. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Move to page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 3503. Please proceed. Please proceed."

Manley: "Thank you. I didn't know if it was me or not. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. I'm going to try not to have an attitude this time. It requires... so, there's a few changes

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

they made to the Hearing Aid Bill. It requires that in order for a hearing aid coverage to apply, the seller of the hearing aid be a licensed hearing instrument dispenser. And it... number two, it inserts language clarifying that the Bill does not require a group policy of accident and health insurance to provide coverage if the group fails to meet the mandatory minimum participation requirements set by the insurer. This change was instead an attempt to address concerns raised by the Independent Insurance Agents of Illinois, though they ultimately did not remove their opposition. Secretly, they love the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3503?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Villanueva. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill to 3503. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 13 of the Calendar, Representative Stuart on House Bill 3509. Please proceed."

Stuart: "Thank you. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 3509. The Amendment just simply, kind of, tightens up the language and clarifies which of the medically frail infants are covered by the insurance provider of pasteurized human breast milk."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 of House Bill 3509?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 of House Bill 3509. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers on House Bill 3511. Please proceed."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3511. It directs the Department of Human Services to develop an educational material... to develop educational material for health care professionals and patients about maternal mental health conditions. Such material must be distributed to employees regularly assigned to work with pregnant and postpartum women in birthing hospitals. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions and I move for its passage."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1... in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3511?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3511.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Buckner on House Bill 3584. Out of the record. Representative Crespo on House Bill 3586. Representative Crespo. Out of the record. On House Bill 3606, Representative Martwick. Out of the record. House Bill 3628, Representative Bristow. Please proceed."

Bristow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 36... that we concur with House Bill 3628. It's a minor technical Amendment made at the request of the Governor's Office of Management and Budget to clarify that adult education providers are reimbursed from appropriated funds. This does not change the original intent of the Bill. It was simply meant to clarify that this was not an unfunded mandate. The Sponsor has indicated she wishes... I ask for your concurrence... an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3628?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3628. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Thapedi, House Bill 3671. Out of the record. Representative Didech on House Bill 3677. Please proceed."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Didech: "I move to concur on Senate Amendments #1 and #2 on House Bill 3677. This is the Bill to establish the Partition of Heirs Property Act. Senate Amendment 1 just changes the notice requirement from the court to the plaintiff. It also provides that the court shall consider tax consequences as an additional factor to determine whether manifest prejudice will result from a partition in kind and it also allows the court to apportion costs to the proceedings to interested parties. Senate Amendment 2 corrects a typographical error in Senate Amendment 1. This Bill is a priority of the Illinois Farm Bureau. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3677?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3677. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harper on House Bill 3687. Out of the record. Moving to page 9 on the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 2, Representative Flowers. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for... I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2. As amended, House Bill 2 delineates 19 rights for every woman with regards to pregnancy and child birth. It requires HFS, DCFS, Department of Public Health, Department of Human Services, to post

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

information about these rights on their available Web sites. If applicable, every health care provider, day care center, licensed under the Child Care Act, Head Start, and community centers, must also post such information in a prominent place, including their Web site. The Department of Public Health shall adopt rules to implement this section. And moreover, Senate Amendment #1 removes the human rights violation language that was primarily components of House Bill 1. And this Amendment is a compromise to the introduced Bill which created rights to treatment and other services that may have been contrary to medical best practice. It also outside... outline rights of specific treatments and other services without regards to their actual availability in specific communities or hospitals. And I move for the passage and I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is there any discussion? Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding this Bill, I was involved in the committee and I appreciate the effort of people coming together, and a number of groups that were not in support of this, coming together with the Amendment that Representative Flowers put together. And I also support this as well. So, thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to really take this opportunity to thank Representative Bennett, because he was very instrumental in working with me, as well as the committee, to make sure that this work gets done. And I would

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

appreciate an 'aye' vote. And thank you again, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2? 'This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers, House Bill 3. Please proceed."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, House Bill... I move to Flowers: concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3. As amended, the Hospital Report Card Act to require the quarterly report... hospitals are required, under this Act, to be prepared... shall include each instance of preterm birth and infant mortality and each instance of maternal mortality. The Bill require that in these two cases, information including the racial and ethnic information of the mother and the disparity of occurrence across different racial and ethnic background must be included. And Senate Amendment #3 still requires hospitals to report the instance of preterm birth, infant mortality, maternal mortality, but now requires the Department of Public Health to collect the demographic information reported by the hospital to illustrate the disparities of those occurrence of the disparities and in that data across different racial and ethnic backgrounds. And again, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bennett is recognized."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Flowers, I know... it's amazing. You were able to do House Bill 2, House Bill 3, House Bill 4, and I think House Bill 5."

Flowers: "I'm working on 4. I'm working on 4."

Bennett: "Okay. Well, very good. I was also in committee with this when we were talking about this and again, this is an initiative of the Illinois Health and Hospital Association on this effort and I appreciate your efforts and your work with that. And I would like to support this as well. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "I just want to take the opportunity, once again, to thank Representative Bennett. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there's 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers, House Bill 5. Please proceed."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the Amendment to… #1 to House Bill 5. Senate Amendment #1 is a page and line Amendment that is the initiative of the Department of Human Services. Most of the underlying Bill is still preserved.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

House Bill 5 would require the Department of Human Services to ensure access to substance use services for pregnant and postpartum women and require that the Department of Public Health establish a classification system of levels of maternal care, raise a public awareness campaign on the importance of maternal care, and require hospitals, health care facilities, and birth centers to adopt a variety of protocols and quality improvement initiatives. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this Amendment, it is an initiative of the DHS for the concurrence. And again, I appreciate Representative Flowers' effort on this and working with DHS to get it to this point. I do rise in support as well. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Representative Bennett. I appreciate you and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On the Order of Flowers and Bennett, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bennett. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Finally, on House Bill 51. Representative Flowers."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Flowers: Amendment #3, which is a gut and replace Amendment, which removes the language from the underlining Bill. This Amendment requires the police training curriculum probationary police officers to include instruction trauma, informed response... I'm sorry... please forgive me. Okay. Thank you. The Amendment require the Police Training Act curriculum for probationary police officers to include instructions in trauma informed response designed to ensure the physical safety and well-being of a child of an arrested parents or immediate family member. And the instructions must include, but not be limited to, understanding the trauma experienced by the child while maintaining the integrity of the arrest and the safety of the officer, suspect, and other involved individuals. And to de-escalate the tactics that could... that would include the use of force when reasonably necessary and require whether child will require supervision and care. And currently, the curriculum include interview techniques that are age sensitive, trauma informed, victim centered, and victim sensitives. And the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standard Board and the Illinois Sheriffs' Association are neutral on the Amendment. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Is anyone seeking recognition? Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Hey, Representative. I didn't want to have my job threatened there. So, on this Bill, I just want to make clear,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

total gut and replace, it completely changes the... the underlying Bill? Correct?"

Flowers: "That is correct."

Batinick: "Okay. And what we're doing here, we're amending the Illinois Police Training Act and we're adding trauma informed responses for the safety and well-being of children of arrested parents or family members. Provides that the instruction must include understanding the trauma experienced by the child while maintaining the integrity of the arrest and safety of the officers, de-escalation tactics and inquiring about the child's supervision and care. So, that sounds like a pretty... a pretty noble cause. I just want to make sure nobody looks back and their previous vote on this particular Bill. And I just wanted you to confirm that what I read to you is the overall, broad intent of the Bill."

Flowers: "That is the Bill. And thank you very much for making that clear."

Batinick: "Thank you, Representative."

Flowers: "It is a total gut and replace."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one further seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 51?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 51. This Bill, having received a Constitutional

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Crespo on House Bill 1561. Please proceed."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I want to thank Mary Flowers for allowing us to present more Bills. So, I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 1561. The underlying Bill amends the School Safety Drill Act to create threat assessment teams and develop threat assessment process for school districts. Senate Amendment #1 remains... retains the underlying Bill but for security reasons, it removes the requirement that the school's threat assessment procedure be posted on the school's district website. And Senate Floor Amendment #2 removes the requirement that a regional threat assessment team be made up of an Illinois law enforcement alarm system's representative or an education officer from the Illinois State Police and instead, replaces him with a mental health professional member. And at the request of the Illinois Association of School Boards, it removes the requirement that the assessment team be trained at the... at Western Illinois University's Office of Public Safety. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1561?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1561. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Villa on House Bill 2076. Please proceed."

Villa: "I move to concur to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2076.

It removes opposition from the Illinois Retail Merchants

Association by having a beginning date of vetting BPA and
thermal paper as January 1, 2020."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, so you said you changed the underlining Bill, pushing the date back how far?"

Villa: "January 1, 2020."

Batinick: "Okay. And that was... IRMA agreed to that, I believe you said in your opening statement. In the original Bill, I had... IEP... IEPA, Chemical Industry Council of Illinois, Credit Union League, Chamber of American Forest Paper Association, and the Community Bankers all opposing. Did that agreement with IRMA also extend to all the other parties? Was any... did it remove all opposition or just IRMA?"

Villa: "That's right. We worked really hard to make sure to remove all opposition. I am very proud of the work that we have done on the Bill and I hope that you will support me."

Batinick: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further individuals seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2076?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2076. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Mason on House Bill 2643. Please proceed, Representative."

Mason: "Sorry. Sorry. Pardon me, just one minute."

Speaker Hoffman: "Take your time."

Mason: "Okay. Thank you. I am asking for concurrence for... no... yes, for House Bill 2643. This is the Bill that provides a 15 day cancellation period for senior citizens, aged 65 and older. It applies now, with the Amendment, only when the senior purchases home repair or remodeling services from an uninvited solicitor. So, if you recall, we were talking about home improvement, and if the senior invites someone to come to their home and sign a contract, then that would be excluded under this plan."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "It says here the Amendment is an initiative of the Home Builders Association of Illinois. That did remove their opposition, correct?"

Mason: "Yes."

Batinick: "Thank you very much."

Mason: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2643?' All those in favor signify by voting

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2643. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stuart on House Bill 2719. Please proceed. Out of the record. House Bill 2723, Representative Ramirez. Please proceed."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur Senate Committee Amendment 1 of House Bill 2723. Senate Committee Amendment 1 adds the following two changes to the task force on strengthening the Child Welfare Workforce for Children and Families. One person... so... and the following... these are the changes. One person appointed by the Governor, who represents a nonprofit that is statewide and represents the private sector of child welfare providers, and the second is two persons appointed by the Governor who each serve as the chief executive officer or chief administrator of a private sector welfare provider. I welcome any questions and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2723?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ealewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

2723. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2708, Representative Connor. Please proceed."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur in Senate Committee Amendments #1, 2 and Senate Floor Amendment #4. And these Amendments extend the effective dates so we can continue to work on this system for getting the DNA from missing people's family members into the system in order to establish whether or not their loved one's body has been located in another state. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Guzzardi."

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

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

Guzzardi: "Representative Connor, our analysis indicates that the ACLU is in opposition to this. Is that your understanding?"

Connor: "Yes. We extended the effective date. We are going to continue to work with the ACLU. Their... they have some questions on the system as it is. They... they are... I was told that I could say their opposition is not vociferous, basically."

Guzzardi: "Understood. Thank you, Representative."

Connor: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no further individuals seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 4 to House Bill 2704?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4 to House Bill 2708. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 2837, which is on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2837. It's a gut and replace that makes some technical changes and clean-up language to the 529 College Savings Program, clarifies language regarding to administrative fees collected by the Treasurer, and a variety of other clean-up measures that we need to administer the Section 529 plans the state has, Bright Start and Bright Directions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, I believe that the concurrence..."
Burke: "Excuse me... 1 and 2."

Speaker Hoffman: "Yes, 1 and 2. On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, you said this is a gut and replace Bill, but this substantially the same. The replacement is substantially the same as the original Bill with some clean-up words..."

Burke: "The original Bill was dealt with a different program of the Treasurer's, the ABLE accounts. And over in the Senate they... we passed the same Bill out of the House with the ABLE language. So in the Senate they gut and replaced it and put

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

in this language which all deals with 529 Bright Start and Bright Directions."

Batinick: "Can you tell us specifically what it does for those three?"

"It adds a federal citation in the definition of Burke: nonqualified withdrawal to align with the Internal Revenue Code; updates a federal citation in the definition of eligible, educational ... education institutions to align with a Higher Education Resource and Student Assistant Act of 1965; clarifies that fees collected in accordance with the Act are state funds for the purpose of administering the program; and adds language detailing the separate accounting currently provided to account owners annually in accordance with Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code; clarifies that the Treasurer may charge fees to cover costs of administration including record keeping and investment management expenses and that these fees shall be paid from the assets of the pool; removes outdated and incorrect cross reference to federal tax penalties for nonqualified withdrawals; removes unnecessary..."

Batinick: "Representative... Representative."

Burke: "Yes?"

Batinick: "It sounds like you are actually getting a little bit of a cold or a sore throat. I'm going to give you a little bit of a break. And thank you for answering that. Just a couple more quick questions. Are you satisfied with what came out of the Senate, with the Amendment that..."

Burke: "One hundred percent."

Batinick: "One hundred percent. And it sounds like there is some stuff at the state level but some penalties at the federal

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

level are still a problem... or there are still penalties at the federal level, not a problem with withdrawals... that withdrawals part?"

Burke: "Yeah."

Batinick: "Okay."

Burke: " Yes, exactly."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2837?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; if you're opposed, signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz. Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2837. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Davis, House Bill 2931."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chair and Members of the House.

I move to concur in Senate... thought we did this one. We didn't?"

Speaker Hoffman: "You want to do it again?"

Davis: "Not really, but I think we did this one."

Speaker Hoffman: "House Bill 2943, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Yeah, let's try... yeah let's try that one. There we go.

There we go. Let's try that one. I move to concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2943. The concurrence is with

regard to monies that would otherwise remain, or should we

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

say, balance of monies that would remain in the Vehicle Inspection Fund after paying the cost to the emissions... Emissions Inspection Program. If that is more than \$2 million dollars, then any excess cash will be remitted back into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund to be distributed as Motor Fuel Tax dollars are distributed. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we go to Standard on this? Standard Debate."

Speaker Hoffman: "Standard Debate."

Batinick: "How substantially different than the underlying Bill is this, Leader Davis?"

Davis: "I would say not... not altogether different than the underlying Bill. Because what we're trying to do was codify the process under which monies are transferred into the Vehicle Inspection Fund used to pay for the vehicle inspection program. That was a process that always took place but this is an effort to, kind of, put it in... codify exactly how it is done. So, again, the Amendment, which is probably the biggest change, sets forth that once those expenses are paid, if there is any additional dollars above 2 million in the Vehicle Inspection Fund, that those dollars will then be put back into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund to be distributed in the same way that currently Motor Fuel Tax dollars are distributed."

Batinick: "Okay. So it... a couple things. I'm going to go back to specific things in the Amendment. It says that the IML and the Illinois State Association of Counties oppose."

Davis: "On the Amendment?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Batinick: "Well, that... it actually is, on my analysis, right under the Amendment. But maybe I'm reading my writing wrong."

Davis: "Well... well, I'm not aware of them. I know that there was some labor issues at some point. But again, it's my understanding, remitting the balance of the funds back into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, again, should deal with anybody's objection. Because again, it's taking excess dollars, making sure they go back to the appropriate fund. And if any of those counties or townships that you mentioned receive Motor Fuel Tax dollars, then they should be happy that the additional funds are going to be redistributed back to them."

Batinick: "Okay. You know what, I'm actually going to call on the right hander over here to wrap this up for me."

Davis: "That's your closer?"

Batinick: "Yeah... yes, apparently. Thank you."

Davis: "All right. To the closer."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, thank you very much for all you're doing here. But a question I have... and forgive me, this was brought up from a constituent from mine, and so I need to ask the question. I'm not sure where it falls in line with concurrence, et cetera. But the phrase around Constitutional Amendment with a lock box, where the money is coming from the motor fuel to go to this other account and then back. Can... would you mind just taking a moment explaining it isn't or... I mean, it obviously, it must be Constitutional. But can you help me address that issue in terms of it's okay, and tell me why, please?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Davis: "Well, again, the... I guess the idea of the lock box was to make sure that Motor Fuel Tax dollars are used for Motor Fuel Tax purposes. We feel that funding the vehicle emissions or emissions program is an appropriate expense for the dollars. So again, it's a practice that's already existed and has been existing, but this is an effort to kind of codify the process with a caveat that any additional money that remains after you pay for the emissions program, goes back into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. But again, we feel that this program, the Vehicle Emissions Program, is an appropriate use of Motor Fuel Tax dollars because that's about cars and roads and... We think it's an appropriate use."

Bennett: "Representative, thank you for the indulgence and helping me understand more about how that works. So, I appreciate your time, Sir."

Davis: "Thank you."

Bennett: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick."

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

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

Reick: "Will, we had a discussion about this in the Revenue Committee, and can you give us a little back story as to the... the accumulation that had occurred in this fund up to the introduction of this Bill, please?"

Davis: "Well every year, again, after the expenses were paid for the program, the emissions program, there was no mechanism that triggered the return of monies back to the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. So, over several years, there had been a buildup of money in the program. I don't remember the number. I want to

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

say it's somewhere between 20 and 50 million. Somewhere in there, there had been a buildup of monies. So again, the concern was those additional monies, them going back into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, which is the Amendment that we have added in the Senate that would require above \$2 million, which is generally about the amount that remains in the Emissions Fund. Anything above that would go back to the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. For this one time only, that refund or return, if you will, is in the 20 plus million dollar range. But that's just going to be one time only because there had been a buildup of money in the fund. Moving forward, who knows what that will be but it won't matter. Because again, with the Amendment, anything above the two million threshold automatically goes back."

Reick: "So, what you're fixing to say is that money goes into this fund, we pay the vendor... That's the first job right, is to pay the vendor and make sure that that money is paid? And then, if there's 4 million... let's say 3 million left after the vendor is paid, 2 million stays in the fund and that extra million goes back to motor fuel?"

Davis: "And is redistributed using the same current formula that the Motor Fuel Tax dollars are distributed by."

Reick: "So, the big thing, of course, that we're concerned about is to make sure that that vendor gets paid. That's job one."

Davis: "That's job one."

Reick: "Okay. Thank you."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative McDermed."

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

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

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

McDermed: "Now, in Revenue Committee when this Bill came up the first time, I had a lot of questions about it because I did not, at that time, understand that the… these emissions fees were paid from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, right?"

Davis: "Correct."

McDermed: "And after you and the witnesses that you brought from DOR explained this to me... I'm not happy about money from the lock box going but I understand why it's been done. And it's been done this way for decades. And I just want to say that this Bill, this Amendment, is a significant improvement to the Bill and I would urge everyone to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2943?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2943. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis, on House Bill 2987. Please proceed."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment... #3, there we go... to House Bill 2987. What this does is it adds or makes changes to the makeup to the Criminal Justice Task Force. Unfortunately, because this wasn't enacted quickly enough under the previous administration, we had to bring the Bill back. We were able to pass it out and, because of its popularity, there are other

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

people that wanted to participate in it. So, we made some Amendments to change the makeup of the board and add some other groups to that. And that's what the Amendment does. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2987?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harper. Harper. Harper. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2987. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant on House Bill 3065. Please proceed."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3065. I gave a commitment in here when this moved over to the Senate that we would work in the Senate on some opposition from the area agencies on aging, as well as the Department of Aging. We accomplished that. I know of no opposition and I ask for concurrence."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing... Representative Willis."

Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Willis: "Representative, do you find great satisfaction in bringing a wonderful Bill like this forward?"

Bryant: "I do and it's been a long time coming."

Willis: "Well, I totally support this. Thank you."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Bryant: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition on this wonderful Bill, the question is, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3065?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3065. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lilly, on page 11 of the Calendar, House Bill 3086. Out of the record. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, for what reason do you rise?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

I just wanted to introduce my oldest son, Jared Gershowitz,
who is here with his mom this week in the home stretch. And
I just ask that you extend a warm Springfield welcome and say
hello, if you happen to stop by."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome to Springfield. Moving to page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 3113, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 3113. This is clar... there was a need to clarify the language relative to making it possible for skin cancer screenings to be considered preventative care. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, does this... gut and replace or it just adds to the Bill, right? The Amendment adds to the Bill?"

Cassidy: "They did a gut and replace that maintains the underlying intent but updated the language. And then, Amendment 3 reinserts something that was missed. The exemption of coverage that would apply in a way that would disqualify some certain health plans."

Batinick: "Okay. And it looks like the Medical Society supports, and the..."

Cassidy: "Yes, it was drafted in consultation with the Medical Society."

Batinick: "Okay. The Illinois Life Insurance Council, Blue Cross Blue Shield, America's Health Insurance Plans are neutral, as amended. So, there was some opposition but at least some of it came off with the Amendment. Correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Batinick: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "And there was no testimony in opposition when we did it."

Batinick: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 3113?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 3113. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Villanueva on House Bill 3196. Please proceed."
- Villanueva: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment 1 is a page and line Amendment which removes the requirement that the taskforce examine whether the state has parity in regards to the number of immigrants hired. Other than that, the Bill remains the same. I ask for a concurrence. Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3196?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Meyers-Martin. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3196. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 3237, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Please proceed."
- Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with House Bill 3237. It removes a cut scores for the approved Biliteracy Proficiency Test as provided in the underlining Bill in order to provide ISBE the flexibility to determine the scores via administrative rule."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3237?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3237. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 3671. Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3671. This is here for final action. The underlying language is essentially the same but there are some changes. For an example, the title of the Act has been changed to the Assistance Animal Integrity Act. There have been some other changes to comply with Federal Law and the Illinois Human Rights Act. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, the way I see this it looks like it's very similar to the underlying Bill, correct?"

Thapedi: "Correct."

Batinick: "That was unanimous. You got all kinds of support,
Manufacturer Housing Authority, Chicagoland Apartment
Association, Community Association, Metro East, Real Estate
Investor's Association. Looks like the realtors are
supporting. Just the Rental Property Owner Association is the
only one that doesn't support. But it looks like you got a
lot of momentum behind this, correct?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Thapedi: "That's my understanding as well. I know the Rental Property Owners, at least I heard that, they've never approached me specifically describing to me exactly what their objections are. Had they have done so, of course I would have addressed them. But I can only assume that the Senate got the job done."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Thapedi: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3671?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Motion, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3671. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Martwick on House Bill 3606. Please proceed."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Floor Amendment 3 and Senate Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 3606. 3606 is a... an Amendment to the Student Online Personal Privacy... Privacy Protection Act. And what it does is it creates a set of protections for student data privacy. It gives some transparency to parents about the contracts that schools have with data... with providers, internet providers, and the data that they collect from their children. It provides notice of breaches and it provides a method to correct inaccurate data that might have been collected by

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

children. Worked extensively with a whole host of opponents to the Bill. And made, I believe, seven or eight different Amendments to the Bill. And I think we're at a good point. Even the opposition did not testify in opposition to the Bill in the last Senate Amendment. So, given the work that we have done and the importance of this, I would be happy to answer any questions and respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "So, Representative, you just... mentioned the opponents. And what I'm seeing here, it says 'while Senate Amendment 3 represents the proponent's negotiations with the opposition, looks like the College Board is now neutral. But the... I want to make sure I have this correctly... the Illinois State School Management Alliance contends that the Amendment improves the Bill but they're opposed. CPS, CompTIA, and the Internet Association remain opposed as well. The other school management organizations are now neutral. What's the... what's their big opposition being that I wasn't in committee, Representative?"

Martwick: "So, Representative, and I'll be happy to tell that to you, but what I... the way I would explain it is this. In order... and again, I started out with about 40 opponents on this Bill from every imaginable sector. The vast majority of those opponents have been moved to neutral. The last negotiation I had was with the Statewide School Management Alliance, it was a 2 hour negotiation in Senator's Mulroe's office. And at the end, and I quote, the School Management Alliance turned to me

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

and said, I am so grateful for all of the work that you've done to address the myriad of concerns that we have with this legislation. But ultimately, it's still a mandate. And I turned to the Representative and I said, you can't support it if it's a mandate, I get that. That's your mission. Then she said, but I'm so grateful for what you did. I said, if you say that in the Senate Committee, it will be good enough for me. And so, she went and offered that to the Members of the Senate. There is a fundamental objection because ultimately, this does require them to do things that they're not currently required to do, which is why it is a mandate. Even though many of the school management groups have been moved to neutral, but statewide management..."

Batinick: "Sounds like they have a zero tolerance policy on..."

Martwick: "Well... and I understand that... that is their mission is to have that zero tolerance policy. But even with the work that we've done, I will tell you there was one in the last LRB draft, which was done at the last hour, there was still a technical mistake in it. And I have agreed to recommend an Amendatory Veto to clean up that one technical Amendment. So, I am doing... I've done everything I can to address all of their concerns but I understand that they ultimately have to be opposed. CompTIA and the Internet Association, very similar, did a great job addressing so many of their concerns that ultimately they were opposed, but appearance only, they did not offer testimony against the Bill."

Batinick: "Can you just refresh us... the... on the... looks like we have... Standard Debate, if that's okay, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Standard Debate."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Batinick: "I am going to let Representative Wheeler just talk about... I'm sure he's going to hit some of the... some of the underlying Bill. I appreciate... it sounds like you did a lot of hard work on this Bill. You said there is one technical change that is going to be... an Amendatory Veto?"
- Martwick: "Yeah, the language is already drafted. We'll hand it to the Governor and ask him to make..."
- Batinick: "So, this is... this is the first time I'm being told that it was guaranteed we're going to have a Veto Session. So, thank you for that. And I will hand it off to Representative Wheeler. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

- Wheeler: "Thank you. Before we get any further into the actual Bill, I just want to make sure I understood what was just said. We're actually going to do an Amendatory Veto?"
- Martwick: "Well, I am going to make a recommendation so that... and if the Governor does not accept that recommendation, then we would follow up with a trailer Bill."
- Wheeler: "Certainly, I understand. I'm just was thinking that, procedurally, that would be a new one. So, I... and I'd like to do that."
- Martwick: "Well, it makes sense, doesn't it? I mean, it is a...
 it's something that we had agreed to but because of the last...
 the eleventh hour of this last Amendment, it was missed on a
 LRB draft, and I recognized it and it was a promise I had
 made. So, I... as I try to live up to my word, like I said,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

even though they are an opponent, I gave them my word that I would do everything I can to fix that mistake."

Wheeler: "No, I appreciate that and I am thankful and grateful for your... your hard work on this. I know you've gone through many iterations of this and you have gone every direction possible to get something positive here. One of the initial concerns... just walk me through if you would, Rob... the costs that was... the potential cost increase to a district or school in the initial draft we ran out of the House was a concern, as I recall. Tell me what's been done, if you can, to address that concern?"

Martwick: "Well, so many things have been done. It would be hard for me to enumerate all of them, but some of the things that we did, there was a concern initially that all of the requirement was that... that schools post on a Web site all of the contracts that they have with providers. And we limited the details of those contracts. We allowed redactions to protect business... business secrets for... for the providers. We allowed schools that don't maintain Web sites to allow inspection of contracts in their office. We... for schools that contracted out for their Web sites, we allowed them to post links to the information if it was posted on other Web sites. So, we... we did so many things to try and make this... tighten this up to address those concerns."

Wheeler: "Well, I... let's just get right to it here. Thank you. To the Bill. This is a Bill that I was initially not in favor of. I do think that the hard work of the Sponsor and the many stakeholders in the process that occurred in the Senate. And I know that the House Sponsor was even involved directly in

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

those Senate discussions. So, I know that hard work that goes into that. He removed my concerns. I talked to some of the outstanding stakeholders who had still questions or had moved to support. And I'm in a comfortable place to vote 'yes' on this Bill and encourage others to do so as well. Thank you" Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall we concur in House Amendments... Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 3606?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 3606. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3687, Representative Harper. Out of the record. Turning to page 9 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 94, Representative Slaughter. Please proceed."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 94. If you recall, this Bill allows individuals that went to the Illinois Department of Corrections prior to our 1998 Truth-in-Sentencing policies to become eligible for sentencing credits, if and when they complete rehabilitative programming inside our correctional facilities. The concurrence Amendment clarifies and defines the sentencing credit criteria under this initiative, which would allow individuals to receive either a 40 day... 45 day credit, or a 90 day credit. It's extremely important to note that the concurrence Amendment

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

also represents an Agreed Bill by the Illinois Prisoner Review Board, the Illinois State's Attorney Association, and the Illinois Department of Corrections. The concurrence Amendment removes the opposition by all three of these entities and they're now all neutral on House Bill 94. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, myself and Senate Leader Lightford committed to not moving this Bill forward until we got an agreed Bill that removed opposition. This Bill is the result of a lot of hard work. House Bill 94 helps with our prison overcrowding, while also incentivizing and recognizing the completion of critical rehabilitative programs that lower recidivism for returning citizens. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this Motion, Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative, it sounds like you got some of the opponents off on it."

Slaughter: "All of the opponents off, not some."

Batinick: "All of the opponents off, even better. It was 7-5 in committee. Did we RBA this... did we recommend it to be adopted?

What were the votes in committee on this coming back?"

Slaughter: "I believe it was a party line vote. I believe."

Batinick: "Okay, 12-6-0. And you're trying to do a small incentive of... if this is a little bit of a smart recidivism Bill, for lack of a better way... way of putting it?"

Slaughter: "That's a... actually a great way to put it."

Batinick: "Okay. So, this is... this is the opposite of a penalty enhancement sort of Bill. Trying to middle this a little bit.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Had 61 votes before we think. I'm guessing this might end up in the 70-ish range this time, is that..."

Slaughter: "We'll see."

Batinick: "We'll see? Okay. I just wanted to clarify everybody that this is substantially... we voted on this before, see your monitors, you can quickly see what you did before. I commend the Sponsor for getting some opponents off of the Bill. I imagine it will do a little bit better this time and I'll sit back and listen to the rest of the debate, Representative."

Slaughter: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 94?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 94. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harper on House Bill 3687, on page 13 of the Calendar. Please proceed."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3687. This Amendment simply changes the time frame in which the State's Attorney must notify the school that a school employee is being prosecuted for a sex offense from un-commencement to upon arrest after commencement. It was made at the request of the Illinois State's Attorney's Association and removes any opposition. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Batinick: "Representative, it sounds like the Bill that we passed out of the House unanimously is substantially the same, just a little bit of a technical clean up. Correct?

Harper: "That is correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt... Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3687?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3687. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Calendar, on House Bill 1579. Representative Burke. Please proceed."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is... I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1579. The Amendments address two things. One was a concern of the Illinois Hospital Association, and we made a change that satisfied the Hospital Association. And then the other change just clarified that the amount of the recovery that a local unit of law enforcement could get for a violation was capped at \$10 thousand. I know of no opposition and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall we concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1579?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Moeller. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1579. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Buckner on House Bill 3584. Please proceed."

Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 3584, which has come to be known as the Buckner-Butler-Hurley-Wehrli Bill. It amends the civil... the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act to make changes to the law. This passed the House 111 to 0 on April 11. The Amendment is nearly identical to the original Bill and it maintains the original purpose while making a series of changes. It updates the language to reflect that the Bill also applies to individuals who may be paroled. It clarifies that statements made prior to the implementation of the Act are also confidential and privileged. It clarifies the victim impact statements made in public are not confidential and it reorganizes the location of language within the statutes. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Wehrli: "Are there any opponents as amended?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Buckner: "There are... there are none."

Wehrli: "Okay. Can you say the Sponsor's name five times fast, please?"

Buckner: "You said 10 times fast? I don't..., no, I can't."

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

Butler: "Beyond the fact that this is a Buckner-Butler-Hurley-Wehrli Bill, please excuse... please excuse Representative Unes for the rest of the day."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3584?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Stava-Murray. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3584. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Burke in the Chair."

Speaker Burke: "All right, Members, we're moving to the Order of Resolutions. On page 14 of the Calendar, we have House Joint Resolution 35. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Joint Resolution 35 resolves that the General Assembly support local governments that adopt Responsible Bidder Ordinances. The Responsible Bidder Ordinances are ordinances that set minimal requirements for all contractors and subcontractors bidding on publically funded projects. Local governments then choose

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

the lowest responsible holder that fulfills the minimum requirements. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 35. All in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 47, Representative Marron. Out of the record. House Resolution 115, Representative Arroyo. Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. House Resolution 178, Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, you have a Floor Amendment #1 that you'd like to adopt?"

Wheeler: "Yes, I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Burke: "Can you please explain it?"

Wheeler: "Yes, we clarified some terms regarding video sharing services, and put a more urgent focus on parents' involvement in this process."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 178. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Representative Wheeler on the Resolution."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Resolution that our former colleague Melissa Conyears-Ervin had originally filed. But I picked up... when I first saw this, I realized that the internet 'Momo Challenge' that was referred to in this Resolution was something that actually affected my life. My daughter Ava, who most all of you know

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

now, and her friends had come across this online. It was very disturbing to her and her friends and created a great deal of fear and then concern for us as parents. So, we took upon this Resolution to urge parents to be more involved in what their kids are doing online, and making sure that we encourage our video sharing services to police these types of situations as best as possible. Appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Carroll: "Thank you. I want to... I want to commend our former colleague Conyears-Ervin and you as well. This actually affected my son, he saw some of these videos as well, and this is really bad stuff. So, please add me as a chief cosponsor on this and let's make sure that we do this well. I really appreciate you bringing this forward. Thank you."

Wheeler: "Thank you. It's the real deal. So, thank you for saying so."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler to close."

Wheeler: "Again, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is something that affects more people than you may realize. And we do want to encourage parents, and video sharing services, to take responsibility in these situations where possible, and do the best we can for our children. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "On House Resolution 178, all those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted.

Representative Williams on House Resolution 210."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill... or this Resolution is simply an acknowledgement of the Foster Care Shadow Day, which the Foster Care Alumni Association coordinated earlier this year. I think a lot, more and more of us are participating in this very important day to work with the youth in care, to show them what the possibilities are for them, how their government works, and to have them involved in the process. We hope to continue this tradition every year, and increase participation. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "No further discussion. Representative Williams moves for the adoption of House Resolution 210. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 214, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 214 directs the Auditor General conduct a management audit of the Department of Human Services process by selecting independent services for... the process of selecting the independent service coordination agencies for FY20. I know that Representative Hammond is also interested in this. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 214. Members, this is a recorded vote. 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 question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. House Resolution 216, Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. House Resolution 241, Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 241 urges Congress to pass legislation that would fix our broken immigration system. It was brought to me by my constituents who came to Springfield to provide moving, and frankly, wrenching testimony, particularly, with regard to how our current system rips apart families. In fact, today, as I present this Resolution, I am heartbroken. Just Tuesday..."

Speaker Burke: "Members, please."

Mah: "Just Tuesday, I learned of the deportation of a beloved Lutheran pastor Betty Rendón. Pastor Betty and her husband came to this country in 2004 to seek refuge and asylum after fleeing from guerrilla rebels in their civil war torn native Columbia. Their application was denied but they stayed here nonetheless. Betty studied to become a Lutheran pastor and has served her congregation with love and dedication for the last 15 years. Last week, she and her husband were arrested and led away in handcuffs, as if dangerous criminals, and then detained. On Tuesday morning, they were placed on a flight back to Columbia, leaving behind their distraught and mom, devastated daughter, a single and 5-year-old granddaughter, who may never see her grandparents again. At a vigil organized by the community yesterday, the little girl, five years old, told the gathered crowd, I love my family. While states are powerless to change federal immigration law so that this little girl can be with her family again, we can nonetheless, urge Congress to do the right thing, especially

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- if we profess to support and value families. I urge your 'aye' vote. Please. I urge you to think of Betty Rendón and her family and how Congress needs to do the right thing so families can stay together. Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Mah moves for the adoption of House Resolution 241. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 115, Representative Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Madam Chair. House Resolution 115... 115 urges the President of the United States to abolish the Federal Jones Act to allow Puerto Rico to receive relief supply from foreign vessels in the instance that there is a shortage of US vessels and ships to Puerto Rico. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Arroyo moves for the adoption of House Resolution 115. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the… Resolution is adopted. Representative Arroyo again on House Resolution 216."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Madam... Madam Chair. The... House Resolution 216 declares November 1 as 'Schaaf-Yang Syndrome Awareness Month'. I think that I want to adopt Amendment #1. Is there an Amendment on there?"
- Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee, and no further action is required."
- Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."
- Arroyo: "So, we want to ... we want to dedicate November 1 as 'Schaaf-Yang Syndrome Day'."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Representative Arroyo has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 216. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 244, Representative Murphy."
- Murphy: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Resolution 244 requests that ISBE study the impact of school districts beginning their school year at various points throughout August, as compared to starting after Labor Day. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Burke: "Excuse me, Representative. You have a Floor Amendment that needs to be adopted. Is that what the Amendment does, as you just described?"
- Murphy: "Floor Amendment 1. Yes. It just takes out the third thing that they would have to study."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Murphy moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 244. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. House Resolution 244, Representative Murphy."
- Murphy: "Once again, House Resolution 244 requests that ISBE studies the impact of school districts beginning their school year at various points throughout August as compared to starting after Labor Day. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Murphy moves for the adoption... for the adoption of House Resolution 244. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 287, Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Madam Chair."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Miller: "This Resolution establishes April as National... National Financial Literacy Month. And I thought it was appropriate that this apparently is on Springfield time 'cause this was in April. But in an effort to highlight the importance of financial literacy and teach Americans how to establish and maintain healthy financial habits... I know several Presidents in the past, including President Obama, has recognized this and acknowledged this. I know one thing that currently I'm working on in regards to this issue is I'm working with Dave Ramsey and Financial Peace University and private donors to fund the Financial Peace University in some of our local high schools up and down the 110th and in East Central Illinois. Another thing we're working on is a STEM project in... in Englewood also. But anyway, thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Miller has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 287. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 303, Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 303 declares April 2019 as 'Elgin Earth Month'. The Elgin Sustainability Commission created the 2019 Elgin Earth Month Planning Committee to help expand Earth Day into a month long community awareness initiative on environmental issues, and sustainable practices. House Resolution 303 declares April 2019 as Elgin Earth Month and encourages Elgin residents, businesses, and institutions to celebrate Earth and promote the protection of our species and environment."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Speaker Burke: "Representative Moeller... seeing no questions, Representative Moeller moves for the adoption of House Resolution 303. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 307, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This would urge the creation of the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Cultural National Historical Park."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 307. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 317, Representative Morgan. Representative Morgan. Please proceed. At your leisure."
- Morgan: "Apologies, Madam Speaker. This... this Resolution is for 'DNA Day'. This is in honor of the... the founding and the scientists who identified the genome that we all have used for medical research and scientific research for decades since. In honor of those that found and identified the human genome. And ask for an 'aye' vote in support."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Morgan moves for the adoption of House Resolution 317. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 327, Representative Halpin."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 327 honors our auctioneers and makes May 4, 2019 as Auctioneers Day in the State of Illinois. As I mentioned, I think last week when

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

we extended their License Practice Act, auctioneers have a long and storied history here in the State of Illinois and I believe we deserve to honor them May 4, 2019. And I made a pitiful attempt at an auctioneers chant earlier this week. And so, I ask that you not ask me to do that again. Thank you, Members. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Burke: "I'm sorry I missed that. Representative Halpin moves for the adoption of House Resolution 327. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 335, Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I move for the adoption of House Resolution 335. It simply extends the reporting date for the findings of the Commission to Reform Child Care in Illinois. It was from September 2016. It will be extended through December 31, 2020. Representative Margo and I believe that we got a lot of work done on this commission. And we thought that we should continue the commission working with the different child care providers across the State of Illinois to improve child care. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you. I rise in support of this Resolution. It has come to our attention, both Rep Ford and my attention, that private child care is under... is in a difficult situation right now in our state. There are a number of circumstances impacting privately owned child care, which are largely women owned small businesses located in all of our districts. And Rep Ford and I intend to do some work through this commission

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

and through a Resolution that I've got coming up this evening in committee to try to get some traction for the benefit of our private child cares throughout the state. Thank you for your support."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Ford moves for the adoption of House Resolution 335. This is a recorded vote, Members. 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 Resolution, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. House Resolution 337, Representative Turner. Out of the record. House Resolution 339, Representative Villanueva."

Villanueva: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 339 declares October 13, 2019 as 'Metastatic Breast Cancer Awareness Day' in the State of Illinois and urges citizens of Illinois to become informed and aware of metastatic breast cancer, and to support funding for programs to reduce barriers to breast cancer screening, detection, and treatment for underserved women. As the loved one, the mentee, and someone who has had two aunts fight breast cancer, and a mother who is waging a battle currently with another form of cancer, it's my honor to be able to introduce this Resolution to this Body. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Villanueva moves for the adoption of House Resolution 339. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 337, Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On behalf of Leader Turner, I just wanted to make sure that we move House Resolution 337, which is similar to House Resolution 266 that we did recognizing Alpha Phi Alpha Day in Illinois being May 8, 2019.

 And I ask for its passage... its adoption. Thank you."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of House Resolution 337. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Ammons on House Resolution 341. You'll be thanking me for this."
- Ammons: "Thank you very much. I certainly will, Madam Speaker.

 This Resolution, it declares the fourth Thursday of May 2019
 as the 'State of Illinois Day of Gratitude'. And we move for
 its adoption as well. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Ammons moves for... moves for the adoption of House Resolution 341. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 342, Representative Swanson."
- Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 342 is to declare August 2019 as 'Spinal Muscular Atrophy Awareness Month'. You may recall last year we passed legislation to do testing of newborns for spinal muscular atrophy. SMA is a rare disease, and what it does, it causes the neurons from the neck to the legs to be dead and child... children not being able to move their legs. It's a terrible disease. Through a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

lot of new medications and a lot of new medical processes, there's getting to be more hope. But 1 in every 11 thousand babies is born with spinal muscular atrophy. I've got a little girl, she's 4 years old, her name Lily Parlier, in my district. And we're just trying to bring a great amount of awareness, to not only her, but to many people in Illinois who have spinal muscular atrophy. So, I would certainly ask for a... favorable vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Swanson moves for the adoption of House Resolution 342. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 343, Representative Elizabeth Hernandez."
- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 343 urges Illinois to divest from any for-profit companies that contract to shelter migrant children."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Hernandez moves for the adoption of House Resolution 343. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Resolution... House Resolution 348, Representative Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 348 recognizes the 50th Anniversary of Priesthood for Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople, which will be on October 19 of this year. Bartholomew is the spiritual leader of over 300 million Orthodox Christians worldwide. And I would ask for the Resolutions approval."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Butler moves for the adoption of House Resolution 348. All those in favor

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 362, Representative Flowers."

- Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 362 is calling on the state to implement the provision of a relatively new Federal Law that grants Illinois exciting opportunities to reform our... system in support for youth and families. We need action and all children across the state deserve to grow up in a safe, secure, and stable family. This is the primary goal of child welfare agencies and DCFS. Implementing all aspect of the Family First Prevention Service Act would provide the Illinois Legislature with a groundbreaking opportunity to transform our child welfare system. I look forward to any answers or questions you may have in regards to this Resolution."
- Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Flowers moves for the adoption of House Resolution 362. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Members, turning back to Senate Bills on Second Reading. On page 6 of the calendar, we have Senate Bill 687, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 687, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski on the Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1. Floor Amendment #1 deals with a change that we

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

had to make... related to LGDF in the Governor's proposed rate structure. The Senate estimated LGDF anticipated revenues. We checked with GOMB and we came up with a more accurate number, so I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Burke: "All right. Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 687. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 687, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I present to the chamber Senate Bill 687. It is the commensurate rates to the Governor's proposal to change to a graduated tax structure in Illinois. The rates fall into 2 different categories depending on whether the person is a joint or individual filer. Effectively, for a period of income from 0 to 10 thousand for individual filers, it would be 4.75 percent. From 10 thousand to 100 thousand, 4.9 percent of net income over 10 thousand. For \$100,001 to 250 thousand, a rate of 4.95 percent for a portion of the net income over a 100 thousand. For a period... for an income of \$250,001 to \$350 thousand, a rate of 7.75 percent for that portion of the income over 250 thousand. For an income from \$350,001 to \$750 thousand, a rate of 7.85 percent of the portion of net income over \$350 thousand. And for incomes over \$750 thousand, a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

net... a rate of 7.99 percent of net income. The change for joint filers is... in that \$250 thousand dollars to \$500 thousand range, the 7.75 percent, a portion of net income over \$250 thousand applies. And for incomes from \$500,001 to a \$1 million, a rate of 7.85 percent of a portion of the net income over \$500 thousand applies. And for net incomes over \$1 million, a rate of 7.99 percent of that net income. The Bill would also raise the corporate rate from 7 to 7.99 percent. There would be commensurate tax credits into the Bill. The property tax income credit would increase from 5 to 6 percent. There would be a child care credit and there would be an adoption credit. There would be an increase in the LGDF for local governments. And we believe that this rate structure would raise the appropriate route of revenue to pay our bills under our new graduated income tax structure and set the state on a more stable financial course. I ask for the adoption of the rates Bill, and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Members, as we go to debate everyone will be recognized and we'll be using the five minute timer.

Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Madam Speaker, to the Bill. Here we go again, taxes, taxes, and more taxes. This would be the largest tax increase in the history of the State of Illinois. And we know this is just the first step toward higher taxes. The 3.4 billion isn't the real number. The real number is \$10 billion, and the middle class is going to suffer. This is a Trojan horse, we all know it. We all know this is being used to sell the voters on falsehoods next year about what this Bill will really do. This is a massive tax increase, there is no ifs, ands, or

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

buts about it. It doesn't index for inflation. It's going to hurt families. It's going to drive people out of this state. And very specifically, it's going to kill jobs because it's going to hit small businesses. As I said the other day, 90 percent of the small businesses in the state are structured as pass-through entities. They are going to pay dramatically higher taxes under this Bill. That is going to send jobs to other parts of the country. We need to focus on doing what is right. We need to do pension reform. We need to do Medicaid reform. We need to cut spending. This is a massive tax increase. This is bad for Illinois. Stop the madness. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We had an opportunity... to the Bill. We had an opportunity to talk about this in committee, so I won't ask any questions of the Sponsor. But just wanted to touch on a couple points for the benefit of the membership here, some questions that were asked of the Governor's staff and the Sponsors and some of the supporters of this legislation, and it raises several concerns. As was brought up previously, what... what is the definition of rich? Many of you will remember previously... in previous General Assemblies, your own Speaker of this chamber brought up a millionaire's tax. And that was starting at a million dollars of income, which would add three percent. Many of you cosponsored that Bill. Many of you voted on that and supported that. Now all of a sudden the definition of rich has changed in these latest rates. That's an extremely big concern. And we've already seen, just in the arguments over the last month

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

and the different proposals that have come into place, a multitude of different rates that have been structured. And this just points to the problem of this type of rate structure introduced not having any constitutional and protections within the legislation or within the previously approved Constitutional Amendment change. Just to highlight a couple problems with this legislation, many of you have seen these rates and you know that it does give some potential savings to those individual's in certain income brackets. But, arbitrarily, at two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in combined income, the tax rate almost jumps up three percent. No incremental increase, no adjustment for increase in income. There's just automatically, at a certain amount, boom, a certain three percent interest. And then of course at the million dollar rate, those individuals' businesses are penalized for their entire income. They don't even get the benefit of the lesser rates for the lesser income. I also asked in committee, of the Governor's staff, their definition of rich because apparently, another provision of this legislation defines rich as those that make sixty thousand dollars. The reason I say that is I point to the child tax credit. For a family of sixty thousand dollars income, the tax credit starts to fade away. How... how can that be? How can that be justified as a wealthy family so that we're going to get rid of the savings that you potentially say that families will have? Additionally, there's a PTAX proposal savings on the property tax, which really amounts to next to nothing. If we look at our analysis, and I think your analysis agrees also, most families may save anywhere between

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

six dollars and sixty dollars. Certainly not much of a tax savings that many proponents of this are banning about that all taxpayers will save money. Certainly a disservice, I think, in this overall argument on how these rates are set up. The other thing that was asked in committee is where does this three point five billion dollars in new revenue goes? One of the answers we received was, well, two hundred million will go towards paying down our pension liability. Two hundred million dollars out of three point five billion and we have no plans for where these dollars will go. This is just a poorly structured package. It gives no guarantees to the taxpayers. It's a huge tax increase across the board. And those same folks, proponents on that other side of the aisle and the Governor's Office, say that this is going to be a tax savings for low income families and working middle class. But I fail to see how that will happen when we look at billions upon billions of other dollars that are being proposed in additional taxation in a regressive manner. Everywhere from a gas tax, to a streaming tax, to taxing this, beer, wine, everything. Look at all the additional taxes that will affect people of all incomes. You're not saving anybody any taxes. You are charging each and every Illinois resident more tax. Sure the wealthiest will pay more than that but there's no cost savings. So please, when you're arguing this, please don't arque that there's going to be savings or people's taxes will be held neutral, 'cause that's the furthest thing from the truth. I please ask for a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wheeler."

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

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Representative, I'm looking through our analysis of the Bill here, and in my notes as well. I'm looking from the perspective of a small business owner, something I talk about quite a bit. You and I have talked about many times. I'm looking through here and I'm trying to find some element of a protection or incentive or even a consideration for small business. Can you point me to something in the Bill that would address that concern?"

Zalewski: "Well, if you come at it from the premise that small businesses may not... that file as s-corps, may not generate \$250 thousand in AG... adjusted gross revenue every year, those small business owners are going to see a tax cut as a result of this Bill. So, it very much depends on the small business you're talking about, the type of work that they do, and in... in the context of how they're filing their taxes to know what... what kind of tax relief they'll be getting out of this Bill."

Wheeler: "So... but the tax relief you're referring to, Mike, is really pretty small compared to the increase that you see at the top end. Would you say that's correct?"

Zalewski: "Can you repeat that, Keith?"

Wheeler: "Sure. The... that tax reduction you just referred to in your comments really fades away when you compare it to the top end. If you do make that 250 thousand threshold, that jumps up quite a bit. So, I guess the tax cut versus the tax increase, one's much larger than the other."

Zalewski: "It does, but I'm reminded by my colleague that we're told that empirical data show that 95 percent of small

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

businesses have an adjusted gross income of less than \$250 thousand."

Wheeler: "Sure. No, I understand that and I know those numbers exist. We're talking about companies who actually make enough money to qualify for these kinds of incomes. At the same time, most of those companies are the ones that are going to be the job creators, ones that have a larger staff, larger payroll, the ones who are considering expanding and investing in Illinois. Those are the business, I guess, that I'm trying to look at 'cause they're on the threshold of this tax Bill increasing on this. Just to point out, when the Federal Government did their last tax reform, they implemented a 20 percent pass-through as like a discount on business income. There's nothing like that in this Bill, is there?"

Zalewski: "No."

Wheeler: "Okay. Just making sure 'cause the effect of that seemed to have a tremendous impact at... at the national level that ultimately created a windfall for the State of Illinois that we've seen in the form of increased revenues that weren't expected by COGFA and other agencies. Thank you, Mike. I'm going to go to the Bill here. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a situation where we can't seem to have it both ways. We took in account in committee discussions regarding the actual Constitutional Amendment itself. The total effective tax rate to justify moving to a graduated income tax by saying, well the people at the lower end of the income spectrum, they pay a higher effective tax rate versus what the wealthier members of our society do. We need to look at that from the perspective of small business and how business works in

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

general in the State of Illinois, and how this affects the cost of doing business in the state in context with all of the other things that we put on the backs of small business owners. Look at our property taxes. Look at ... we just increased the minimum wage in a very drastic way, our work comp costs are still high, unemployment insurance is still expensive. The litany of regulations that we never seem to slow down on in this place. We have to put it in context of how we are going to create jobs. According to our analysis and what I've read online, our corporate income tax rate goes to 10.45 percent with this. This it is the third highest in the United States if we pass this. The pass-through entities like small businesses, like s-corporations and LLCs, they move to 9.45 percent. That puts them at the fourth highest in the country. We are not going the right direction when you look at how we compete with other states. By the way, that last number, I want to say it included the personal property replacement tax, which is just a surcharge on income tax again. The Tax Foundation shows that with this measure we move from thirtysixth best state business tax climate in the country, which is nothing to be proud of, to forty-eighth, which is near the very bottom. Take into account we are also currently ranked just forty-sixth in private sector job creation. We need to slow down and examine what it is that puts us in context of how we compete with other states. The ability for Illinois to compete, as our reputation, we are trying to... attract job creators to our state, keep the best and brightest from Illinois universities to stay here, invest here, build a business, and build a career here. This is going the wrong

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

direction. We don't stop an exodus with a Bill like this. We don't create job growth and economic growth with this. This approach of taxing the rich and saying it doesn't affect anybody else just drives out opportunities and jobs for middle class families and the people at the low end of the income spectrum who are trying to help the most. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

McDermed: "Representative, I'm really interested in why a party and a Governor that campaigned about families and about middle class families, has included in his package a marriage tax penalty. That seems to me to be completely unacceptable and outrageous."

Zalewski: "I don't agree with the characterization of it as a marriage tax penalty. I think that what the Senate sent over reflected the idea that there were two different types of filers, and they did the best they could to reconcile the fact that there were instances when marraige... married couples would file one set of taxes and individuals would file another. And we're giving that choice here and we're doing the best we can."

McDermed: "But the marriage tax penalty remains for all but the wealthiest taxpayers. It seems to me that in the State of Illinois, and from what I've heard repeated since... in the 5 years that I've been here, is that we encourage families. We want our families to be successful. We want our families to be able to do the best for their children. When we have a flat tax it doesn't matter that there are 2 income earners in

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

the family, because everything is taxed at the same amount. When you start kicking families into a higher tax bracket because there are two earners, which by the way is by far the most common situation in my district, we've... we're creating a penalty, a detriment to families in our state. I don't understand that. It's bad policy. We ought to be encouraging our families. We particularly ought to be encouraging middle class families who have children that need to go to college and have a lot of expenses coming into their future. I... I don't understand this at all. It's completely unacceptable. And is not even a problem that exists in a flat tax. Let me ask this question. So far I haven't seen ... well I'm going to go to the Bill. Okay, so ... we've got these ... these rates in here. We've got a proposal for a graduated tax, which will almost certainly open up the ability for this or the temptation for this group here, in the Illinois General Assembly, to increase taxes much more simply. Because when you pit various districts against each other, and various income groups of people against each other, it's always easy to increase taxes on higher earners and not on lower earners. And so, the temptation to do that is even more increased by the fact that we haven't addressed a single one of the drivers of our expenses. Not one. Not pensions, not Medicaid, not salaries, and not K-12 education. All those things have been increased in the latest budget. Not a single one of them has ... a single one of those areas has reform been addressed. We... the best we could do, the best we could this year was to say that we're not going to short our pensions as we had originally planned. We're not going to take our windfall and

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

pay down some of our pensions, which as everyone who has ever made an extra payment on their mortgage knows, will greatly reduce your liabilities going forward. All we're going to be able to do with our windfall is stay even. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, who will be affected? The middle earners here, that are going to get your... in this Bill, with these rates, you're going to get, on average if you earn less than \$10 thousand, oh, you're savings are going to be \$6.67. If you earn less than a \$100 thousand, your savings are going to be, oh, \$37.75. And if you earn less than \$250 thousand, your savings are going to be \$64.46. But how long is that going to last? Is that even going to last one more fiscal year, if this should be enacted, when not one single one of our cost drivers have been addressed, even one dollar's worth? I said it the last time I got up to speak about this issue, I'm going to say it again, these are teaser rates. These are lying rates. Watch out."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Reick: "Thank you. Representative, a couple questions here. First thing is are these tax credits. Are any of those tax credits refundable? Meaning, if your tax liability is driven to zero by those credits and there are excess credits left are those tax credits then refundable to... to the taxpayer?"

Zalewski: "No."

Reick: "They are not?"

Zalewski: "No. I'm told no."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Reick: "Thank you. Obviously, one of the most hardest hit groups of people in this state are the elderly, who are living on fixed incomes and whose property taxes are being driven up, up, up every year. My question to you is, is there any way or is there any consideration of making the property tax credit, since they don't pay any income tax on their retirement income, this would be a very nice thing for them to have in terms of maybe paying an extra electric bill or going to the grocery store. Is there any effort been... was there any discussion of making the credit for people over age 65 or on fixed incomes to make the property tax credit so that they can get at least some of that money back? As part of this rate..."
- Zalewski: "It... just relates to your previous question that if
 their income falls below zero they could get a refundable
 credit?"
- Reick: "Yeah, it does, but this is for specifically for that group of people."
- Zalewski: "I... you know what, Steve, I'm not sure that that concept was ever discussed in the context that you probably just described. I would say that as we've had this debate over the course of this spring, we've... we've done our level best on this side of the caucus to make property taxes a central component part of this discussion. I would tell you that there are probably colleagues here on this side that feel like there's still more work to do, and we're going to have an effort led by my colleagues to get that done. But for the moment, this is the proposal that we think puts the state on the path of fiscal stability, along with offers the property

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

tax relief within the construct of the rates Bill that we can pass."

Reick: "So, how much is our current pension debt?"

Zalewski: "I... I would... if you're talking about TRS, SRS..."

Reick: "The whole five pension."

Zalewski: "I'm... \$134 billion."

Reick: "Okay. How much of the money that's supposed to come out of this tax increase is going to be allocated toward making additional pension payments?

Zalewski: "Two hundred million dollars."

Reick: "How much are our pension payments going up every year?

Not dollar amount... not percentage, but dollar amount."

Zalewski: "I don't what the latest certified payment increase
 was. Eight hundred..."

Reick: "But it's pretty much assumed that that money... that's going up every year, because by the end of the Edgar ramp we're going to be paying \$20 billion a year into our pensions."

Zalewski: "That's correct."

Reick: "Okay. Thank you. I'm going to go to the Bill. There are some things in here that are objectionable. The one is the inability of married couples to file at the federal level jointly and being forced then to file jointly at the state level. So, let's... let's take an example of a married couple, one of whom is a school administrator and the other one is a fireman. Easily, easily, their income could exceed \$250 thousand. And under this rate structure, their income would be taxed at 7.75... or 7.75 percent instead of the 4.95 percent, if they were allowed to file separately, each take... claiming his or her own income and paying taxes on that. So, not only

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

are you bound in matrimony 'til death do you part, the state is binding you in a tax matrimony until death do you part. Not for your benefit, but for the benefit of the state. I also am looking at the number of people who are going to be subject to these various rates based on our estimation. And I think I talked about this when the Constitutional Amendment was... was spoken about. But I see a... in the bracket of a million dollars plus, the ones who are going to be subject to all of the... all their income is going to be subject to the highest rate, there are 24,500 people in the State of Illinois who make that kind of money. Out of which it is inspected there is going to be 2.6 billion, with a b, dollars of tax revenue... Tom... which would then be 2.5..."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me, Representative Reick. Representative Bourne, you've indicated you'd like to yield your time to Representative Reick. Four minutes, Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Representative. Twenty four thousand and five hundred people who are subject to the maximum tax rate responsible for two point five billion, with a b, dollars of tax revenue in a year. COGFA has told us with quite certain... with reasonable certainty, and I have a reason to trust them, is that when the next couple years we're going to suffer an economic downturn. In 2008, when we had an economic downturn, we had the crash. In the year following that crash, Illinois, which was then taxing income at three percent instead of the seven point nine five percent we're talking about now, Illinois lost personal and corporate income taxes of one point six billion, with a b, dollars. Now here's the problem folks, if we have another economic downturn, the people's whose

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

incomes are going to be most affected by this are those who are making the most money and paying the most tax. So, when their income goes down, the drop in tax revenue is going to be precipitous. And I would ask the ... the Sponsor of this Bill, has any provision been made to provide for what happens when that happens? Are these rates going to be... are these rates going to be enshrined for five years? Is there a sunset? Is there a time limit that they won't be changed? I don't think that that is... I didn't see anything like that in this Bill. So, what we're looking at is a pig in a poke. Or as my good friend from Plainfield said, teaser rates. The fact is, is that we've had people on this floor already saying that we're not raising the rates enough. The rates aren't high enough, we need more. How long is it going to be before the next downturn comes and the first thing they do is run to their microphones and say we need more revenue and therefore we either need to broaden the brackets or raise the rates? Folks, this is not a good idea. The progressive income tax is really, if you look at it, not much different than what the Speaker gave us in 2014 as his millionaire's tax. It was a lousy idea then, this is a lousy idea now. The people of Illinois, I think, are going to realize that... what a lousy idea this is. And hopefully, smarter minds than ours will prevail and this ... this Constitutional Amendment will go down in flames and these rates will go down with them. But the fact remains is that if the Constitutional Amendment passes, there is no way in God's heaven that this... this rate structure is going to survive the first winds of an economic downturn. No, vote 'no'. Thank you."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "Thank you very much, Madam Chair. You know, I... it would be easy to start counterarguments. I don't want to do that. I want to say ... and I listened very carefully not only to you, but to my constituents, and a lot of experts over the years because I've been an advocate of a graduated tax for Illinois. I think we can agree, and I've heard it in your comments, that we want to protect small businesses. We want to protect the middle class. We want growth in Illinois. Everything I've done this year, and I hope to continue to do, is going to be about providing more jobs in Illinois. The ... and I come from business background and a financial background. interesting thing about your arguments, and many of them are very good, is that about eighty percent of what I've heard so far in the discussion on the graduated tax and this rate structure is a belief that it automatically is false, that what is in this Bill aren't going to be the rates in the near future. I've heard them called lies. I've heard them called the Trojan horse in the press. I... I will agree with you that if these rates are significantly changed, that about 80 percent of your arguments actually hold water. But there's no reason to believe, in my mind, that these rates will significantly change. It is hard to change tax rates. So, if we focus just on this Bill and these rates I think you'll find the following things true. And I think many of you understand this, the ... seventy-five percent of the jobs created in this state are not created by big companies, they're created by small companies. Seventy-five percent are created by businesses of fifty employees and less. I... I think

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

many of you have understood that 'cause I've heard it in your comments. The... the small businesses that are creating those jobs, eighty five percent of them by actual count, not estimation, are filing in pass-throughs, through LLCs, subchapter S, other legal entities whereby they pay individual rates on their corporate earnings, or what... on their business earnings. If we have a structure that, by fifth grade arithmetic, will save money for over ninety percent of individuals then the vast bulk of our small businesses who are job creators will actually get a tax cut, not a tax increase, in income tax based on this rate structure. Now, I fully acknowledge if this rate structure changes then the argument is different. But the reason I support this rate structure is because if we stick with this rate structure it actually helps the job creators in Illinois. And I think if you really look at it, many of you actually realize that. The other two points I want to make, I've heard some real interesting arguments about a graduated tax system itself being somehow counter to the American Dream. It just grates you the wrong way, including me sometimes, that it takes away the whole idea that I'll pick myself up, have a great idea, make a million bucks a year, and I'm going to be a successful entrepreneur. I've most of spent my career entrepreneurs, both as a lender and as an entrepreneur myself. When people get a great idea that they think they're going to make a million bucks a year, they don't consider for a minute that, oh my God, I'm not going to start my company because someday when I make that I'll take home nine fifty rather than nine sixty-two. They don't think that a minute. It is

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

not a disincentive to entrepreneurs and it is not counter to the American Dream. That... that just is amazing to me that people think that. The other thing is some people will tell me that it is naturally unfair, and I... I get that argument. You can say that paying ten percent on this amount and ten percent on that amount is a fair, equitable arrangement. The problem is when you talk about tax burden. Ten percent of a person making ten thousand a year is a significantly higher burden than ten percent on a person making a hundred thousand a year in terms of burden, because they have fixed expenses and variable expenses just like a business. It ... so, I'll accept that there's an equity and an emotional attachment to a fair tax that way, but then when you talk burden it's not actually equitable. I support this because I support job growth in Illinois. And I will stick with you if you want to maintain that we need to keep these tax rates where they are, because if we do, then we agree."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Leader from Chicago yield?"

Speaker Burke: "I believe he's from Riverside."

Zalewski: "I'm not from Chicago. I live in Riverside, Allen, but thank you very much."

Skillicorn: "Well, thank you for the correction, Leader."

Speaker Burke: "He will yield."

Zalewski: "And I'm not a Leader either, so unfortunately... but other than that... other than that you nailed it."

Skillicorn: "I even... I even asked some of my colleagues if you were a Leader."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "Go right ahead."

Skillicorn: "Will the Member from Riverside yield, please?"

Zalewski: "I will. I will."

Skillicorn: "So first off, how much revenue is this expected to generate over our current Tax Code?"

Zalewski: "Three point five billion dollars."

Skillicorn: "So, 3.5, let me make a note of that. And then, let's talk a little bit. How hard is it to raise taxes? Is this... are you going to need to do it again like a simple Majority or do you need to have a Supermajority to raise these rates?"

Zalewski: "In a normal Session, up until the end of the May 31 deadline, it requires a simple Majority to pass a Bill to raise the Illinois income tax rate."

Skillicorn: "Okay. And I think some of my colleagues are going to ask you about a Constitutional Amendment that we're talking about that would create a Supermajority requirement, but that... I'll let that go. So, to the Bill. We're talking about a three and half billion dollar tax hike. I call this a jobs' tax because it's a tax on jobs. So, let's talk about a history lesson here in Illinois. So, back in 2011, the dead of the night, Governor Quinn passed the temporary taxing hike with no reforms. In 2017, I witnessed a tax hike passed here in that summer, a permanent tax hike with no reforms. And today, I haven't heard about any reforms. All I've heard about is another tax hike. So, let's talk about why wouldn't we add a requirement for a larger Majority? Why is it just a simple Majority? I do remember one of our Senators said that he wanted to have a more flexible Tax Code, a more nimble Tax Code. That concerns me. I would much prefer having to have a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Supermajority to raise these rates. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a jobs' tax, it's a tax on jobs. Now, the people don't want higher taxes. What do they want? They tell me they want term limits. They tell me they want a hard cap on property taxes. They tell me they want legislative map reform. So far we haven't talked about the reforms the people want. All we've talked about is more taxes, more spending, more money from their pockets. And these are pocket book issues, specifically, your hands in their pockets. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a tax on jobs. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm so confident in my ability to suede people, 'cause my track record this Session has been so fantastic, I'm going to request an immediate verification should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes. And at this time, I would..."

Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification."

Batinick: "Would the Representative from Riverside yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I knew something was up when you walked by and you had a coat and tie on..."

Zalewski: "I know. I know."

Batinick: "...and didn't want to make eye contact with me. It's been going back and forth... we're supposed to trust that we're not going to change rates yearly. Is that correct?"

Zalewski: "Mark, I've been down here ten years. I have seen two Illinois income tax increases. One of which was only necessary because we let the first one sunset. I, in my life, don't

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

think that you can sit here in your good faith way and say that these rates are... are flimsy and that they're going to subject the State of Illinois to a volatile tax structure. I think it is incredibly hard to pass an Illinois income tax rate. And I think that we are settling in on these rates for the foreseeable future because it's very hard to pass an Illinois income tax increase."

Batinick: "Okay. Well... and part of that is settling on those rates for the foreseeable future also causes a problem because people are going to inflate into rates. I mean, if you're going to do something that was honest, you would actually have an inflation adjustor in there... like the..."

Zalewski: "And... and if you did that, Mark, then I think we would be accused of politically allowing for rates that are higher than what we're putting on paper. So, it cuts both way."

Batinick: "Well, that would be the opposite… it would be a reduction. It would be the brackets would go up every year, right? So… so that…"

Zalewski: "So..."

Batinick: "You do it the way the Federal Government says because eventually 250 thousand a year is going to be poor, right?"

Zalewski: "But if we did it that way, would you support..."

Batinick: "I'm going to have to move on. I think..."

Zalewski: "No, no, no, but I want to make this point because it's
 a... it's a critique..."

Batinick: "Are you going to yield me five minutes?"

Zalewski: "...it's a critique of the Bill. If we did it that way
 would you support the rate structure?"

Batinick: "I am... I'm a flat taxer."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "Got it."

Batinick: "But if this is an important tweak of the plan about how it affects... how it affects the middle class. Did you have... did the House have them put in the rates? 'Cause it seemed like what the Senate just dropped all of sudden, here are our rates, we're going to take up what the Senate decided to do."

Zalewski: "We... we had numerous conversations with the Senate, myself, Representative Martwick, and Leader Turner. We... we came to the best place we could on the rates and, eventually, the Senate sent over this structure and we feel like it's the best place to go from here."

Batinick: "Okay. And I... I brought this up during the other debate before. We've opened up, one way or another, there's markers, there's the things we did with the MCO situation, there's IRMA came up with a plan. We've opened up \$3 billion without really doing any of the hard reforms. We've opened up \$3 billion and we're going to balance our budget this year. Yet, we're being told we need \$3.5 billion more. Where is the money going?"

Zalewski: "We... we talk about money going toward the pension payment. We talk about money going toward... to fund an evidence-based school model that drastically underfunds our schools right now. We talk about operational needs of the state. We talk about the things that we need to fund, core services in the state. If the alternative is from year to year to year to lurch along and try to find magic bean revenue sources to patch holes, then... then my suggestion to the people of the State of Illinois is next fall go to the ballot box and make your own decision about which option is better. I

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

would suggest stability is better than what we have right now."

Batinick: "Okay. Representative, you mentioned... you mentioned pensions and I know the ... another one of my colleagues brought this up. We have ... we have found, opened up, and if this passes in a short window of time, \$7 billion, approximately between \$6 and \$7 billion, on a roughly \$40 billion budget. It would've taken \$2.4 billion to flatten out the pension ramp and provide real relief, like in my district, 15 to 20 percent relief on property taxes. I mean, that was the proposal I filed. That was the proposal I made a video on and talked a lot about. What we're talking about doing is we're talking about putting \$200 million towards a \$135 billion unfunded pension liability. As I mentioned in the other debate, that's like putting a \$1.67 a month towards a \$13,500 credit card bill. That's not an honest, serious way to help the middle class. And I'm going to have to have Representative Severin maybe yield me some time."

Speaker Burke: "Representative, your time's come to a close.

Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "I'll yield my time."

Speaker Burke: "You'll give your time to Representative Batinick?

Thank you."

Batinick: "The frustrating part about that is I had a lot of people ask me, well, where do you come up with \$2.4 billion? And I would show different ways to come up with 2.5. A 15 to 20 percent property tax reduction, the biggest 2 issues we have, high property taxes and our unfunded pension liability. We find almost \$7 billion and we're throwing 200 million to

it. And by the way, the Governor's original plan was to low ...

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

skip pension payments to the tune of 900 million a year. And he hasn't projected out what he's doing with the pension payment next year and the year after. So we have all this... all this revenue that we're coming into and it's for new spending. And we haven't addressed... we haven't addressed... we have not addressed the cost drivers. I mean one of the most..." Zalewski: "Well I... I feel the need to respond. As a person who voted for Senate Bill 1 in 2013 and was a Member of a caucus who put a pro-rata share more votes on that Bill than your side, respectfully... and that's not a critique, it's the fact... we put our marker down on pension reform in 2013 to the risk, to the political risk of a lot of our core constituencies who have earned a benefit and feel like it was deserved paid. That Bill went to the Supreme Court and all the people, all the people that insisted that pensions were the problem of this state, that they were the bile that were causing the state, when that Bill went to the Supreme Court, not one of them, not one of them raised a whisper to suggest that that Bill was a good... that was a good Bill. So now here we are five years later, we're struggling with these problems still, and we're being told, yeah, but if you just fix the pensions things will be all right. Respectfully, Representative, I did try to fix the pensions and I... I didn't get any help from the very people who claim it's the problem right now."

Batinick: "So, you're saying pensions are... or aren't a problem, because now you have the money. The way to fix the pensions is to start funding it..."

Zalewski: "No."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Batinick: "...instead of skipping it. Seven billion dollars. I had my kids down the other day. One in Mississippi, one in Missouri. And here's the frustrating part about that. When Governor Pritzker was elected I said, you know what, Republicans don't like tax increases. But if the Governor's actually going to take things seriously, and if the Governor's actually... if they raise taxes for the purpose of fixing property taxes and stabilizing pensions... you know what? If you decide to stay in Illinois, you decide to stay in Illinois. The state's going to be around. I was just saying to my colleague, what well are you going to go after when this doesn't work, when the next recession doesn't hit and we're still not addressing pensions? You just whispered it to me, the middle class. That's why the rates are going to change. There's almost seven billion dollars' worth of open up revenue, and it's... it's like we're a young kid that hit the lottery and went to Vegas. There's been no restraint. There's been no seriousness in making this a better business climate for the state."

Zalewski: "Representative, that's fundamentally untrue. We... we passed Medicaid reform when we were asked to pass Medicaid reform. We passed pension reform when we were asked to pass pension reform. We asked... we were asked to make this state a better place for education, we funded evidence-based model. Just because we think an idea is good for the state doesn't necessarily mean it's bad for business. And just..."

Batinick: "I appreciate your time. I'm going to go to the Bill 'cause I'm not going to ask another... you'll be able to close on me. I mean, I did a scenario of somebody who has a \$100

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

thousand income, 2 working class people. They're getting maybe a \$100 worth of this tax cut. And that's not including all the new taxes that we're posing on them. And that's not including all the mandates and expenses we're putting on local governments that's going to increase their property taxes. So, they're getting \$100, here but their probably getting more than a \$100 in... in new expenses somewhere else or property tax increase. And here's the analogy I would say. This is what you're trying to sell to the State of Illinois. There's 2 people, you punch 1 in the face, that's upper income earners. And the middle income earners are going to say, well thank you for not punching me. They're not getting anything out of this. Just because we're not punching the middle class in the face now, we're setting them up for failure in the future. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go directly to the Bill. So, I... I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their passion, but you know I'm... as I sit here and I listen to this debate, I almost can't... I think back to the time when I was a child, and I remember that the political structure of our country back in the '70s. And when I was a kid, the Democrats were the dreamers. The Democrats were the ones that were looking at all the societal problems and they were all going to fix them. And the Republican Party, they were the business people. They were the ones in the suits that said, hey, kid, that's a great idea but how the heck are you going to pay for that? They were the ones who were fiscally responsible. And to my Republican colleagues, I just

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

have to ask, when did you give that up? When did you stop using math? When did you sacrifice the high ground on fiscal responsibility? You're no longer the party of balanced budgets. You're just the party of no. Fiscal responsibility does not mean saying no. It means balancing your budgets. So, 'bout some facts, right? We're running structural deficits. Regardless of how much money we bring in any one year, the projection between now and 2045 is that we will run, under our current system, \$224 billion short of the revenues we need to balance our budgets. According to COGFA, the tax rate that we would need as of January 1, 2019 is 6.5 percent. So, when you sit there and you talk about what are you doing for the middle class, we are holding the line on income taxes while solving a structural deficit. When you do that you prevent future tax increases. This is mathematics. Now, maybe it's not something we're all comfortable with, but you know COGFA is a great resource. They'll do the math for you. The fair tax acknowledges that we have the eighth most regressive or unfair tax system in the country. And it solves our structural problems by raising the revenues so we can live up our commitment to fund education and we can pay down our pensions responsibly according to our ramp. In fact, with a \$200 million increase... and by the way, that's the Governor's proposal. Folks, we're the Legislature. You want to put more into the pension payment? We can do that. We're the ones who get to decide how that money is spent. So, advocate for that. I'll join you. Did you hear me? I'll join you. But to sit there and say no is to ignore these problems. And the history of this state is that the Legislature ignoring the fiscal

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

problems of our state has led to the need, the absolute need for increased taxes year, after year, after year. And if you don't solve this problem now, and this was in COGFA's own statement, if you do not solve that structural deficit, that 6.5 percent flat tax that we need right this moment, will go substantially higher, substantially higher tax rates will be needed. Is that you want to deliver to your middle class residents? Do you want to go back and say no, no, no, I'm opposed to this, even though it should be 6.5. And when it goes to 7.5, I'll be opposed to that then. And then when it pushes up to 8.5 flat, well I'll be opposed to it then. When are you going to say, yes, I will solve the problem? I will do what is fiscally responsible. I will make sure that your kids can be educated, that our pensions are paid off, that we relieve your property taxes, and we prevent the need for future tax increases. It's math, folks. We can do it if we use math. This has the math. You know what doesn't have math? Just saying no. It's time to do the right thing for the State of Illinois. It's time to do the courageous thing. It's time to make the tough decisions to solve our financial problems. Don't say no, say yes."

Speaker Burke: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "I move the previous question. No, I'm just kidding. I'm just kidding. I'm just kidding."

Speaker Burke: "There's no time for frivolity."

DeLuca: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

DeLuca: "Thank you. Well, Representative Zalewski, question. In the analysis it talks about an adjustment to how the LGDF is

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- going to be handled. Can you give us a little bit of an idea of how it's going to be calculated?"
- Zalewski: "So, based on the new rates, LGDF would benefit to the tune of \$100 million."
- DeLuca: "What will the new rate be?"
- Zalewski: "Well, it's the graduated rate structure. So, what happens in LGDF is monies from... derived from the Illinois income tax rate are placed into the Local Government Distributive Fund."
- DeLuca: "I understand that. I'm asking what will the rate be, not the income tax rate, but the LDGF rate."
- Zalewski: "Oh what will the rate... what will the amount be? The Senate introduced it to 7... 10.75 percent, Anthony. And then we... we took GOMB's numbers and we arrived at the idea that it would be \$100 million. We're trying to get you the exact rate though."
- DeLuca: "Well, I don't think that's correct because the goal is to get... at least with the Bill that I have, the goal is to get back to 10 percent."
- Zalewski: "Right."
- DeLuca: "Right now, we're at 5... I think we're at 5.75. What is the rate going up to? There's going to be a slight increase.

 Do you have an idea of what that might be?"
- Zalewski: "We... still think it's more than 10 percent, is what I'm being explained by staff. I... I think you're coming at it from the perspective of the original deal with LGDF was 10 percent of the monies derived would go to the local governments, correct?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

DeLuca: "Well, yes. But the question is, currently we're at about 5.75."

Zalewski: "Right."

DeLuca: "So, in this proposal, do you know what the rate is or will be under this proposal?"

Zalewski: "I... I'm not going to be able to answer your question in the form of a hard number, Anthony, because I don't know what the rate will be. I will tell you that whatever \$100 million more than what they would get right now equals in a percentage increase is their rate they're going to get."

DeLuca: "Okay. If... if staff is able to find that..."

Zalewski: "We can find that out for you."

DeLuca: "...answer out before the debate's over, it'd be great to know. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kalish."

Kalish: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will my colleague from Riverside yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Kalish: "Thank you. Mr... Mr. Sir, the... we heard our friends on the other side of the aisle say that this is a poorly structured package. Can you just address that comment, please? Was this a poorly structured package?"

Zalewski: "I would say a couple of things to that question. The Governor... we have a Governor who made a graduated tax the lynchpin of his first year agenda. He took it upon himself to put a companion rates' piece out to go along with the Constitutional Amendment. A lot of time and a lot of effort went into that legislation. As I mentioned, it was a heavily

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

negotiated piece. I don't think it's poorly constructed. I think it's constructed in terms of what can pass over what derives the most benefit for the citizens of the State of Illinois."

Kalish: "Thank you for that response. I agree with you. And then our colleague from Arlington Heights mentioned how hard it is to change rates, and you... you mentioned that same comment a few minutes ago. You know, I'm on the record as saying that maybe our top rate is... is a little bit too low. Can you address that point? Is... is our top rate too low because that's the... that's what we can get... that is what politically is what we can handle? Or is it... is that top rate really going to help us into the future and we will not have to come back and change rates again? I'm concerned about that."

Zalewski: "I mean, I think Members of our caucus have been on the record as saying that the rates are too low. I am not among those who feel that way. I am among those who feel like this is where we go in a place of stability for the state and also allowing for a... a firm rate structure that will be sustainable."

Kalish: "And... and finally..."

Zalewski: "Competitive in other states."

Kalish: "...I support this legislation but I just also want to be on the record as saying that I believe 250 is also low. That in... in my district and in other districts, \$250 thousand to start seeing a ramp up. You know, this was originally supposed... touted as a millionaire, billionaire's tax, and \$250 thousand isn't a millionaire. Now, we've done the math and we know that it's a low number, but if it's okay with

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

you, I'd just like to... you know, I'm urging an 'aye' vote but I'd like to be on the record for that comment."

Zalewski: "I... I understand what you're saying, Representative, that you wish the rate... the \$250 thousand threshold for you, it causes you some discomfort. We still think that it offers appropriate relief to middle class families."

Kalish: "Okay. Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank
you, Sir."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Burke: "He will."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you said earlier... you talked about how you've been here for 10 years and you've really only seen 2 tax increases, 1 because the other 1 expired, correct?"

Zalewski: "I've seen two Illinois income tax..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, two. That's what I mean, two income tax increases. Why do you think that was?"

Zalewski: "Why do I think what was, C.D.?"

Davidsmeyer: "Why do you think there was only 2 of those in the last 10 years?"

Zalewski: "Because the first one was necessary to..."

Davidsmeyer: "No, I'm saying why... why don't you think there were more tax increases?"

Zalewski: "They're hard to pass. They require 60 Members of the Illinois House and 30 Members of the Illinois Senate and the Governor to sign. Arguably a difficult thing politically for people to live with, a tax increase."

Davidsmeyer: "And why is that?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "Because people feel like they don't get appropriate return on investment for the... appropriate return on investment for their tax money."

Davidsmeyer: "I would argue that the reason why it's tough to pass a tax increase is because you're doing it to everybody. You're doing it to everybody. So, by dividing people, it's easier to pick off smaller groups, right? That's what hyenas do to animals in the pride land, right? They divide them. They sanction them off. They go after the smaller group because they're easier to attack. It's... I mean, that's exactly what we're trying to do here. Because it's easier to raise taxes on 24 thousand people than it is to raise to taxes on 12 and half million people, right? I mean, is that fair to say?"

Zalewski: "I don't agree with your characterization of the Bill..."
Davidsmeyer: "No... and I... I wasn't attacking you that way."

Zalewski: "...as a hyena bait measure."

Davidsmeyer: "I wasn't calling you a hyena. That's not... I wouldn't do that, but that is the same general concept. So, the Sponsor of the Constitutional Amendment, earlier, basically said we've got to pass this tax so that we don't have to pass another tax, right? And to that, I think I have to say it worked pretty good last time. 'Cause we passed a tax increase two years ago and now we're coming back for three and a half billion dollars more, correct? Three and a half billion?"

Zalewski: "What we did... C.D., in respect, what we did three years ago, in the summer of 2017, was save the state from the brink of a cataclysmic event, which was... which was the amount of

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

things that could have gone wrong if we hadn't done that was bad. And I think..."

Davidsmeyer: "It was difficult. I understand."

Zalewski: "...we need to get out of the habit of always being in crisis mode and we need to get into the habit of having a... a tax structure that is more reliable, more sustainable, and treats people based on the way that... based on their appropriate income level."

Davidsmeyer: "So, if history tells us anything, in the past... in your 10 years here, have we ever had a set aside for a rainy day fund?"

Zalewski: "I think the state has a rainy day fund. I don't know if it's mechanically functional right now. So..."

Davidsmeyer: "We've got six and a half billion dollars in unpaid bills. I... I hope we would put that towards paying off old bills. But do you know if we've ever had money in that rainy day fund or if we've ever appropriated money to the rainy day fund?"

Zalewski: "I don't know the answer to that question."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I would... I would venture to say, no, we have never put money in the rainy day fund. Because every year that I've been here, and it's been the last six years, we've spent every single penny we've had. Not only that, but we've spent more than every single penny we've had. So, why would I believe that raising an additional three and a half billion dollars, we won't spend every single penny? And... and the reason I ask that is because we know that our pension payment continues to grow, right?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "Well, my question for you, C.D., is why is the assumption that..."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm not running the Bill. I..."

Zalewski: "No, no, no. But I... you asked a question. And what I'm saying in response is, why is the assumption... to my friend from Chicago said the other day on the graduated income tax... why is the assumption that spending itself doesn't equal investment? If spending itself doesn't equal in making our Higher Ed system better, making our evidence-based model work for every single school district in the State of Illinois, finally putting enough money towards the pension system so we can get out of this habit of having to come up with solutions every single year. The assumption that spending doesn't equal investment is a faulty premise."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. Responsible spending, and I agree with you."

Speaker Burke: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative.

Representative Keicher."

Keicher: "I yield my time to Representative Davidsmeyer."

Speaker Burke: "Okay. Five more minutes, Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, I don't disagree with you that some spending is investment. I don't disagree with you, but I'm going to go back to the debate that we had on the Constitutional Amendment itself, when the Sponsor of that legislation said, we have an inability to manage our finances. We've proven that inability and I mentioned that in that debate as well. But just this year alone there was \$12 billion in new spending that came out of here proposed. That's insane, right? You're talking

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

about 3 and a half billion new dollars and 12 and a half billion dollars in new spending."

Zalewski: "It's... it's insane if it were true. But we're skeptical
 that that's true, C.D."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, what about the… we've still got the marriage penalty on middle class families, correct?"

Zalewski: "We don't… we don't feel it's punitive to marriage… to married couples. We feel that it is hard to solve for the… the joint filers versus the individual filers. The Senate did the best they could under the constructs of the Bill. We've accepted the changes the Senate sent over."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, marriage penalty, check. I would argue that you're telling the people of the State of Illinois that...

I mean, it started out 97 percent were going to get a tax cut, correct? What's the new tag line?"

Zalewski: "No, we're still sticking with that one."

Davidsmeyer: "You're still sticking with that?"

Zalewski: "Ninety-seven percent of working families in Illinois get tax relief under this Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "Ninety-seven? Because the commercials that I've seen that the Governor's put out have said, ninety-seven percent will not pay anymore. So, you're... you're backing off of that? I mean, you're not backing off. You're saying ninety-seven percent get a tax cut. So, if I make ten thousand dollars, we're going to go back to this, six bucks, seven bucks. If I make... if I'm an average person, make up to a hundred thousand dollars, forty bucks. That's my tax cut, forty bucks."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Zalewski: "C.D., have you asked the Governor's Office to compute the average adjusted gross income of constituents in your district to see how they fair under this proposal?"
- Davidsmeyer: "No, he... he did give me the number of millionaires that would be affected by this, and 20 percent of them have already left. So, 20 percent out of my district have already left."
- Zalewski: "But you... but you have... you don't have a universe of knowledge on the amount of individuals that would see a tax relief out of this proposal, correct?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Well, tax relief... this tax relief is completely false."
- Zalewski: "No, no, no, I'm asking... C.D., don't..."
- Davidsmeyer: "You're talking pennies. You're bribing people with pennies so they'll roll over on their neighbor. That's what they're... that's what you're doing. You're bribing them with pennies so they'll roll over on their neighbor. I... the reason why I don't like this is because I don't trust people here to do the responsible thing. And I will go back to the statement, the inability to manage our finances. Every day... every day in this General Assembly, some new form of spending or some expansion of a program that will cost taxpayers more money goes through. When we have this, when we have the division, the divide and conquer kind of ideal here, there's... that's exactly what's going to happen. We're going to keep going after small groups. We're going to split these... we'll split these tax brackets up even more if we have to so you have to go up after smaller groups. I think it's completely ridiculous. I urge a 'no' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Halpin."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to talk a little bit about, I guess, this hyena metaphor. But I'll go beyond that and just say this current system that we're under, it doesn't protect the middle class. And frankly, it protects the rich. And the way we know this is just by looking at the stats for the past 35 years. And I brought this up when we talked about the Constitutional Amendment itself. Who's done better over the past 35 years under this flat tax system? It's the top 1 percent. It's the people that have had their incomes tripled over that time period. And it's the rest of us, the 99 percent, whose income has only gone up 9 percent. So, ask yourselves, who is being protected by the current system? We have to do something different because even if... frankly, even if it were true that the middle class were somehow protected by this system and they... and the statistics are wrong and the middle class are actually doing better than the wealthy under this system, the middle class apparently doesn't want the protection. Because I've heard reference about the surcharge referendum that we had several years ago. And 60 percent... over 60 percent of my county and my district voted to support that. And it wasn't because it was a million dollars versus \$750 thousand or \$500 thousand. It was because the middle class and the working poor know they're getting the short end of the stick under the current system. They may not know the exact number that the bottom 20 percent has an effective tax rate in the State of Illinois of 14 and a half percent or 14.4 percent. They may not know that number but they know that they're falling behind while their neighbors that are

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

making those large incomes are getting ahead. They know that they pay more as a share of their income to buy the gallon of gas... the gallon of milk per week for their kids, for the new car that costs a little bit more than it did last year. They may not know the statistics but they know what's happening, and so they voted for that referendum. It was widely supported across the State of Illinois. And many of the districts, both on my side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle. The people, I would agree and I hear this when I go door to door, the people don't trust government. They don't trust Illinois Government. They don't trust the Federal Government. If you go to any state in the Union there's probably not many governments that they... that they trust. But here in Illinois, the people I talked to in my district see that we're not paying for schools. They see that the state's not paying for schools, and so, their local school district is raising their taxes. They see that we're not paying for roads, and so, cities are raising their property taxes to try to keep up. And also they see the roads and bridges crumbling around them. They don't trust that we're investing in higher education. They see their kids and their neighbor's kids deciding to go to Missouri or Iowa because we don't know if Illinois is going to pay those MAP grants this year. We keep cutting spending. I talked about it the other day, we cut higher education by 10 percent. We cut across the board 10 percent. And when we talk about responsible spending as being an investment, this is the exact opposite. Not only are we... we're, quote, saving money in the short term, but how many students is it costing us that go out of state for higher education and never come

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

back? We need to spend that money now. We need to do it in a responsible way. And I will say one last thing, we... I agree with folks on the other side of the aisle that say \$200 million a year for pension is not enough. We need to front-load the pension payment as much as we can or else that debt's going to continue to grow. But if we leave things as it is, we're certainly not going to be able to pay what we need to pay, let alone... we're not going to be able to afford to pay 200 million, let alone what we actually need to pay. So, think very seriously as you're deciding to vote on this if you are standing for the middle class, because the current system isn't working for people in my neighborhood. Think long and hard. This is a way to try to fix the direction of the State of Illinois. It's a good plan going forward. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wehrli."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Representative, earlier you said that this tax plan will raise about \$3.5 billion. Do you... is that correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Wehrli: "Do you agree with Representative Batinick's point that we're going to spend 200 million additional dollars on pensions?"

Zalewski: "That's what the Governor's indicated he wants to do with the revenue."

Wehrli: "Okay. Is that above fully funding... you know, fully funding pensions?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "I think the Governor would say that of two... whatever the certified payment is on the... whenever they do it, he'd like to see \$200 million in addition to that..."

Wehrli: "Additionally? Okay."

Zalewski: "...go to the certified payment."

Wehrli: "And was the Governor not willing to skip pensions until a windfall hit the state that we're... I mean, we're all benefit from?"

Zalewski: "I think the Governors' proposal was... was put forth not knowing that the April surprise was going to come."

Wehrli: "Right."

Zalewski: "And then when he... when it came in he pulled it back."

Wehrli: "Okay. So, we have 3.5 million, we're going to take... which includes funding to the appropriate level with an additional 200 million. That leaves 3.3 billion left. Is that correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Wehrli: "Okay. What are we spending that on?"

Zalewski: "I think it's... it's going to be up to the Members of the General Assembly to decide that."

Wehrli: "Okay. Are there new... I mean, usually when you go out and you buy something or you spend money investing something, and I'll get to spending equal investment in a little bit. But what do the taxpayers get for that?"

Zalewski: "You know, I... I keep hearing we're going to... this new spending.. this new money equals new spending. We..."

Wehrli: "That's why... that's why I'm asking. I mean, are there new programs in there."

Zalewski: "Well, and what I would... what I would say is a couple of things. First, this chamber, a couple of years ago, passed

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

an evidence-based funding manual... model that is going to cost..."

Wehrli: "Okay. So, it's going to go to something like that... like the evidence-based funding model, which I actually put a 'yes' vote on. So, I understand the importance of funding education."

Zalewski: "Education, Higher Ed, critical investment probably in human services, probably critical investment in..."

Wehrli: "Okay."

Zalewski: "...things that rebuild our communities. I think there's any number of things this money will help accomplish."

Wehrli: "Are you... do you serve on the Audit Commission?"

Zalewski: "I do not."

Wehrli: "Okay. Are you familiar with any findings that we see coming out of the Audit Commission? I mean, I had the… really, the sort of sad thing to listen to an audio of one of the Audit Commission's and they literally lost \$54 million. Are you aware that our spending in Illinois is very, let's just say, not very well monitored? Would you agree with that statement?"

Zalewski: "I think the Auditor General often finds things in state agencies that are problematic."

Wehrli: "Okay. Do you think we should tighten those up first before we went to... before we go to the taxpayers looking for more money? If... if we're asking taxpayers to invest more and more in the State of Illinois should we at least give them the reasonable comfort of saying we appreciate your dollars and we're very... we do our fiduciary responsibility with them and we oversee them to a high standard?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "There's no audit finding in any state agency that is going to fundamentally change the need we have to invest in education, Higher Ed, and critical human services."

Wehrli: "But you don't invest in things that... like when like \$54 million just up and disappear, that they literally can't account for. And that's just one agency on one tape that I happened to listen to this week. So, I don't know what other findings are out there. But my point is, 'cause we don't do a very good job, we're not very responsible with the taxpayer's dollar. Which gets to spending doesn't always equal investment. It doesn't. Sometimes things in Illinois ... we have a long history of our... our books not balancing. Which I'm going to go straight to the Bill now. Earlier, it was stated that you Republicans over there, you're the party of fiscal conservatives. And, you know, then we brought up images of the '70s under Carter. Wow, I mean, what an analogy there. Let's talk about the economy under Carter where there were rampant inflation to the ... you know in the tens. And then the lines for gas. I mean it's... it's just crazy. That's an analogy for Illinois right now. We just spend, spend, spend. We don't know where we're spending the money. We need better controls on it. So, if we want to instill in people a sense of good government, we need to provide them with that. The programs that we're going to expand here are not ones that are effective. I will absolutely agree that we need to do investment in certain areas. But to just go to the taxpayers first gets back to my argument yesterday, that we're doing the easy vote first. This vote... we're going to here, oh this was such a hard vote for us, and for those that go up on it.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Oh, it's so hard to raise taxes on people. No, the hard vote is actually doing the pension reform, is actually doing more Medicaid reform. You know, Illinois has 26 percent of its General Revenue Fund go to fund pensions. The next closest state is 6 percent. We need... we need to address that on a goforward basis but instead we're just going to reach into people's pockets even deeper and not have any accountability to it. This is a terrible Bill. The next recession is going to crater Illinois. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "I yield my time to Representative Reick."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Reick."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've heard comments that it's Reick: very hard to raise taxes. Didn't seem like so much the other day. Seventy-three votes popped up pretty fast on the old board there when we decided to go to a progressive rate system. Parenthetically, I will go... I will modify my friend from Jacksonville's comment regarding hyenas. The idea of divide and conquer is as old as Philip of Macedonia. Yeah, it's... it's easy to raise taxes. The real hard thing to do is to live within your means. It's hard to live within your means with... as long as you're having to bend your knee to special interests that come in and say we want more. We want workers comp rates that are unsustainable. We want prevailing wage laws that... that spring from a law that is seventy years old and should not have been passed in the first place. The hard part is living within our means. And it's been said many times over on the other side of the aisle that we are incapable of living within our means. Why don't we try doing that instead

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

of having a hootenanny every time we get seventy three votes to raise taxes on a very small minority of people in this state? Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "To the Bill. As a Democrat in Springfield, I'm not used to being outnumbered, but folks, it's happened tonight. There are officially more strawmen in the room than Democrats. These strawmen have varied in form from nonexistent doomsday rate models, to a more colorful description of hyenas. What they have in common is that they're all tall tales. What I haven't heard much from across the aisle yet about tonight is anything about driving businesses out of the state. This is actually surprising to me because stability of a state's finances actually does impact whether companies want to invest here. So just as you have abandoned the math that get ... leads to the balanced budget, it seems you have abandoned businesses as well. For what? Or maybe the better question is for who? Let's be honest, it's not the middle class. They will always be in the majority. Whether or not they're in a smaller group or a bigger group, the middle class is a big group in and of itself. So, who exactly would it be easier to raise rates on? The ultra-wealthy, the donors. Let's be clear, that's who's protected by a flat tax. My district cares a lot about a balanced budget. I'm obviously going to be voting for this tonight. And I strongly recommend anyone who cares about a balanced budget and their actual constituents and not their donors, to vote for it as well."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins."

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

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much, Representative. And please feel free to call me Dan, we won't criticize you for that."

Zalewski: "Okay. Will do, Dan."

Caulkins: "Thank you. First off, it was said that small businesses and people that create businesses don't consider taxes as a reason why they go into business. And I'd like to propose maybe to you that people that do start businesses consider taxes as to where they move to or from. Does this tax structure... does this process attract businesses to Illinois? Will it help retain businesses in Illinois?"

Zalewski: "I think if you treat it as a global concept, which as a graduated tax structure, it creates a stable economy and state for the State of Illinois. Our access to global cities, our access to global markets, our access to good... students of higher ed make this a desirable place to open a business. Yes, I do."

Caulkins: "And you've said on your side that..."

Zalewski: "And I... I want to be clear, I wasn't the sayer of the statement about the taxes don't drive people out. But I understand."

Caulkins: "One of the premises is that a reliable tax system is favorable. And we've already heard, in fact, from you the words 'for the moment' referring to the tax rates. We've already heard from other Members on your side that this tax rates aren't enough, that they already... they don't... they should be higher. We should have addressed them already. How does that play to a reliable tax rate?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Zalewski: "So a couple of things. Madam Speaker, could I... Madam Speaker, it's hard to hear Representative Caulkins."
- Caulkins: "I apologize."
- Speaker Burke: "Members, could we please hold the noise down?

 Thank you."
- Zalewski: "I... I've said that Members on my side feel the rates aren't high enough. I don't agree with that statement. And then, I... I think the thing I said about are these the rates, my answer was yes, for the foreseeable future. Because I think it's very, very difficult to put Members of the General Assembly, both in the House and the Senate, on an income tax vote and have it go to the Governor for signature. That doesn't happen very often, so..."
- Caulkins: "I understand, Sir. But your Members have expressed a desire, or their opinion, that this... these tax rates aren't stable, that they desire to have higher rates or change the brackets. And how does that make the people that are looking at this state, whether to come or stay, feel about this tax structure?"
- Zalewski: "Well, I think the people that are worried about that dynamic will come to the other Members of the General Assembly, like myself, who said they're fine. I probably won't support Representative X concept to raise them and they'll be comforted by that notion."
- Caulkins: "The number that is on page seven, Sir, three... three and a half billion dollars. Can you... can you tell us how you got to that point? We've read other, I guess, studies that say that this tax structure, that this rate, will raise substantially less than that."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Zalewski: "I... I think we based our number off of a collaboration between COGFA, which is our official forecasting arm of the State Government, along with the Governor's Office of Management and Budget."
- Caulkins: "And if... it this falls short, if the naysayers are correct, and this only brings in two and a half billion dollars instead of three and a half billion dollars, what happens?"
- Zalewski: "I think then we can I... I think we would not do anything other than deal with the revenue that came in the door through the implementation of the rates."
- Caulkins: "So, why can't we do that now?"
- Zalewski: "Well, I think there's plenty of people who feel like the people deserve a choice whether to vote for a graduated tax structure that fundamentally changes the way we tax people in this state and... and enables us to fund core services."
- Caulkins: "But... but you say that we're going to have to deal with it if it doesn't come up. Why don't we try doing that now?"
- Zalewski: "I didn't say we'd have to deal with it. I want to be clear. The question was, what happens if the revenue doesn't come in."
- Caulkins: "Correct."
- Zalewski: "My question is, we... we would have to deal with it because that is the dynamic. But I'm not... I'm not concerned that that's going to happen."
- Caulkins: "Well, Sir, thank you. There are... other organizations, other people that have looked at this that feel that you're not going to see the revenue that you like."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

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

Windhorst: "Yes, I yield my time to Representative Caulkins."

Speaker Burke: "Go ahead, Representative Caulkins."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. This won't take much longer. The...
we're asking... to the point, we're asking for three and a half
billion dollars in this tax increase. And I presume we're
going to see more coming, more requests for more taxes,
another three, another two and a half billion dollars in
taxes. Is that... is that enough?"

Zalewski: "I would not assume that. That's a faulty assumption to say that today, as we sit here, if the graduated income tax is approved by the voters, and this Bill were implemented, that there would be a hunger for more revenue. I don't think that's true."

Caulkins: "So, this is the last tax Bill we'll see until when?"

Zalewski: "Until we see what the graduated rates, if implemented..."

Caulkins: "No, but I mean other taxes."

Zalewski: "...how they work for the State of Illinois."

Caulkins: "We're not going to see a streaming of rev... liquor..."

Zalewski: "Well that... we're talking about... if you're talking about how this Bill will affect the need to fund a capital infrastructure Bill, I think that's... that's a separate dynamic. And I think that ultimately Members on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle are going to be asked to vote for things to fund a capital infrastructure Bill."

Caulkins: "Recreational marijuana tax, I mean, more and more taxes. This is... this is the issue. I... I'd like to thank you

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

very much for your very thoughtful responses. I'll go to the Bill, Ma'am. This Bill is... will not solve our spending problems. This is like giving an alcoholic an ATM card that's fully loaded. We don't... we don't spend our money wisely and we're just going to give ourselves more money to spend, and it'll continue to go. This Bill will not attract or retain businesses. It's going to create more uncertainties as to what the tax structure in this state will be in the future. We need to have certainty and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Chesney."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Chesney: "Representative, is there anything in this Bill that addresses the property taxes?"

Zalewski: "Yes, there's an increase in the property tax... income tax credit."

Chesney: "Are you aware Members on your side of the aisle are...

filing Bills as we speak to put together a task force..."

Zalewski: "Yes."

Chesney: "...to abate some of that?"

Zalewski: "No, I'm not aware of a task force to abate it. I'm aware of a task force to comprehensively look at property taxes."

Chesney: "So, does this Bill not address property taxes?"

Zalewski: "No. The..."

Chesney: "CNBC ranked Illinois number eight in the overall tax burden. I tried to find the most generous one I could quickly.

Does this Bill improve the ranking, or you think it will reduce the ranking in overall tax burden?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "Andrew, that's a hard question to answer with... with literature in front of you and not in front of me on based on what you're looking at."

Chesney: "Well, CNBC just recently ranked Illinois as the eighth overall tax burden. If you're going to pass \$3.4 billion in tax increases, will that improve our ranking or decrease our ranking?"

Zalewski: "What's CMC?"

Chesney: "CNBC."

Zalewski: "CNBC. So, what are the factors that go into the rankings?"

Chesney: "Okay. U.S. News ranked Illinois number two in..."

Zalewski: "No, no, no. Andrew... Andrew, hang on. Hang on. You're creating..."

Chesney: "U.S. News ranked..."

Zalewski: "No, no, no. No, Representative..."

Chesney: "I'm going to ask some questions."

Zalewski: "No, Representative, you are doctoring the record here.

You can't make a statement like that and simply move on to
your next talking point. What are the rankings CNBC used to
determine the tax structure? And then I can answer your
question."

Chesney: "I'll have to get back to you. U.S. News ranked Illinois number two in population loss. Do you think this Bill improves this?"

Zalewski: "What are the factors that are used in that to determine it? And are you not going to answer that question either?"

Chesney: "I'll have to get back to you on that."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "I... I would prefer you use your time for questions that...

that you can back up with evidence."

Chesney: "Representative, are you aware the General Assembly is currently considering a gas tax on every citizen in the State of Illinois? Are you aware of that?"

Zalewski: "Yes. Yes."

Chesney: "Okay. To the Bill. Illinois has the twenty-third largest budget in the entire world, and we have yet to see the budget proposed by the General Assembly Leadership in both the House and the Senate. But we keep going back to this April surprise, Representative, that you have alluded to many times. Let me decode that for those on the other side of the aisle. Those are Trump's tax cuts. The \$1.4 billion April surprise is because of Donald Trump and Republican led tax cuts. But this \$3.4 billion tax does not address roads, property taxes, or the job climate. The taxpayers, Representative, in my view, are just tired of being tired. I would just simply ask during the course of this debate that we just simply refer to all of the citizens in the State of Illinois as simply ATM machines because they are being taxed in every way possible. I've been in the Assembly now for five months, and in five months we've never passed one Bill or taken one vote to cut anything. According to you, Representative, and many Members on the other side of the aisle, we are the most efficient government in the United States. I respectfully ask a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Morrison."

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

Speaker Burke: "He will."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Morrison: "Representative Zalewski, there have been a lot of good points made, I think, from our side. But I want to ask you, since Representative Chesney does brought up the topic of property taxes, it's very important that we... and, yes, this is an income tax Bill. But we make a mistake, a grave mistake, when we look at these issues in silos, just an income tax, a property tax over here, a gas tax over here. We all know that property taxes in Illinois are one of the biggest issues we face, both for individuals and for businesses. So, Representative Zalewski, if my home drops in value am I necessarily going to see a reduction in my property tax? If my home drops in value am I necessarily going to see a reduction in the amount I pay?"

Zalewski: "No. No."

Morrison: "No. Why not?"

Zalewski: "Because it depends on the comparative nature of the homes around you. It depends on the local government's levy, local school district's levy."

Morrison: "Thank you. That's..."

Zalewski: "It depends on any number of factors."

Morrison: "...that's what I was hoping you would say. It depends upon what those local governments levy. What they determine they're going to spend. They will tax whomever they need to, whatever kind of properties, whatever those properties look like, commercial, residential, what have you, to get the revenue number they need. So, even if your home value drops, the value of your business property drops, you're going to have to pay more. They're going to have to find the revenue somewhere. And I think that's what our side is trying to argue

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

and get the public to understand, that this notion that it's only going to be the very, very upper echelons of income payers who are going to pay more, there isn't enough. And as we lose population, if those individuals choose to leave ... we live in a very mobile economy. I have an older brother that trades commodities. He can trade anywhere in the world that has a fast internet connection. And there are many others that have same ability. And those are some of our... many of them pay high... they earn high incomes. They pay a lot of taxes to the State of Illinois. And if they change their residency, Illinois will see none of that income tax revenue, as well as serious reduction in whatever they're spending as consumers, whatever their participation is in... in the economy. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. It is easy to spend other people's money and that's what this State Government does. That's what our local governments do. Of course, State Government spends tax dollars on good and necessary things. Of course our local governments do. But it is very easy... it's easier, as many of my colleagues have brought up, to divide and conquer. And that's really what's going to happen. I've talked to a lot of my residences, as I'm sure many of you have. Some of them said, yes, I could afford to pay more, but I have no confidence that the state isn't going to keep coming back for more. Several weeks ago, I introduced a Constitutional Amendment, a House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 34 that would raise the threshold for approving a tax increase. If the other side... if your side of the aisle would introduce this, would put this on the ballot for the people to decide, I think it would give people a lot greater

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

confidence that the Legislature will not keep coming back and asking for more. And for those who say, well you know, that's a radical notion, we shouldn't have to tie the hands of Legislature. California has a protection like this. Wisconsin has a protection. It is a good and necessary taxpayer... taxpayer protection plan and it's absolutely necessary. I came into this Legislature 8 years ago, just as Governor Quinn was proposing a 1 percent education surcharge. It wasn't going to be a tax, it was going to be a surcharge. It ended up becoming 2 percent and it was promised to be temporary. Now it's permanent, or near... or it's very close to being permanent. A couple other points, one of the Members over on that side said, we're cutting spending in areas like higher education. Actually, what we're doing is we're reallocating revenues. The state's collecting a lot of money. We're reallocating it because of our entitlement spending on things that this Legislature has approved and continue to expand. The last thing I want to say is, you know a lot of people have said, well you know, if you're making a lot of money, you're not going to move out of the State of Illinois to save a few thousand dollars. That's just ridiculous. But you know... my district is right on the border of Lake County. And I talk to countless people who will go out of their way, 5 minutes out of the way, or 10 minutes out of their way, to save..."

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

Morrison: "Could I get a Member to yield time? Madam Speaker." Speaker Burke: "Representative Weber."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Weber: "I yield my time to Member Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you. I just need another minute. I'm right on the border of Cook and Lake County. People will drive 5 or 10 minutes to save on gasoline taxes, on sales taxes. When we had a beverage tax in Cook County, they went up to shop for their groceries and other items up in Lake County. They did that to save \$5, \$10, \$20. So tax... tax rates absolutely do change behavior. Illinois needs to be a welcoming state to every individual, every business at every income level. And we have great assets, it's true. We live next to O'Hare. We live... or for many of us, O'Hare is a great asset. The City of Chicago is a great asset. Lake Michigan is a great asset. The state has wonderful assets. Another asset is our flat income tax and we would be foolish to get rid of that. All those factors I just mentioned have prevented us from an economic collapse. If we implement these tax rates, we're going to be less able to grow with the rest of the country. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Leader Durkin is recognized as the last speaker."

Durkin: "Thank you. First, I'd like to comment briefly about a statement that was made by a Member of the other side of the aisle from Chicago. When he went back in history and talked about the Republican Party being a bunch of old guys in blue pinstriped suits who used to be the party of... not the party of 'no', but the party of austerity, the party that would be fiscally responsible. So, let remind you all of what my blue pinstriped suit did a few years ago and what your... and whatever you're wearing on those days were, I don't know. But just remember this, this is the party of 'no'. And I'm glad

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

to tell you why I'm proud to be the party of 'no' on these particular issues. Remember, this back in 2016, when you passed a budget, you passed an appropriation budget, that was \$4 billion out of balance. I'm glad to have said 'no'. The following year 2017, the Illinois House of Representatives Democrat Party, again, passed a Budget that was \$7 billion out of balance. And I'm proud to have said 'no'. So, let's cut this whole nonsense about what happened to you guys? You guys are worth nothing. You guys can't... you're not about finding solutions. It's just not true. Sometimes saying 'no' is the right thing. And also saying 'yes' to everything is not the right thing also. So, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Yes."

Durkin: "Okay. We've had a lot of discussions about rates. I don't want to get too deep into that, but I just want to ask you, personally, if this does pass and the Constitutional Amendment does pass, what types of jobs will we retain or create?"

Zalewski: "I think there will be jobs fundamentally to the core nature of this state in terms of... of education, higher education, making sure families stay in Illinois because they can go to a good school, they can go to a good college, and they can raise their families here after graduation."

Durkin: "I haven't heard you say anything about it creating a private sector job. We're just going to expand public sector jobs? That's what I heard from you, Representative Zalewski."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Zalewski: "Leader... Leader, in the next 18 months there is going to be a great debate in this state between those that are opposed to this measure and those that are in favor of it. And I think everyone is going to get to make their record on what's the most important thing for this state and I think then we'll decide who is for this proposal and who is against it."

Durkin: "Well, that wasn't necessarily responsive to my question. But, Representative Zalewski, all I heard from you is that we will create more public jobs. I have not heard one thing from you about this is going to boost up the private sector, the backbone of our economy, and that's the small business men and women. All right. I made my point. Now, I want to go back, and I'm not sure if you are familiar with this situation, but this was in the State Journal Register. At the end of April, headline, 'Marquis ends plans for a \$500 million ethanol plant in central Illinois'. Marquis Energy has shelved plans for an ethanol plant in Scott County, the company announced Monday. Here is what the CEO said, 'Illinois Government's antibusiness and high tax policies will require us to pursue company expansions in surrounding states.' How does this Bill help Marquis... Marquis Energy stay here in Illinois? Did you hear that, the tax policies? Mike..."

Zalewski: "I think that the… without knowing the specific instance there, that Marquis' employees, if they come to this state and they enjoy our schools and they enjoy our… educations of Higher Ed, and they find this place with its access to commercial ports, access to good global markets, and a

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

fundamentally strong state, will want to grow jobs here. Is what I think. And I think we're about to have that debate." Durkin: "Well here is what that company said again, let me emphasize, 'Illinois Government's anti-business and high tax policies will require us to pursue company expansion in surrounding states.' They picked up and they said we're not doing business here because we are being attacked. The tax policies have driven us away from a great business plan. That's unfortunate. All right. You know what? We are finally at that point in Session and also, I would say first time in many years where I can say with a straight face that the Illinois House and the Illinois Senate have won or achieved the Triple Crown. And you finally have beaten the taxpayers and also the small business in Illinois. It started in January with that... I will say it, I'm glad to say it ... an unfair and unreasonable minimum wage Bill rushed through for no good reason. And it's one that does cripple the small businesses and non-profits and we've heard from all of them. I have them in my town. They are devastated by it. It's a bakery, and you know that bakery. And, Representative, you also know that hardware store too. They are devastated by that. And what are non-profits and also nursing homes and other people involved in the health care industry doing? They're looking to us to bail them out for the minimum wage that they're going to have to absorb. How is that fair? That is not fair. Opening up the Constitution to raise taxes, not opening up the Constitution to help taxpayers. There's nothing in there that helps taxpayers. We have not opened up the Constitution to help taxpayers. Such as ... as we've said over and over, ad nauseam,

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

something that really will help the taxpayers, something that will have a meaningful effect, and it is called the Pension Clause. But nobody wants to talk about it and nobody wants to do anything about it. That's fine. And last but not least, this Bill. And I believe that this Bill, if the Constitution is passed, and this Bill does go in effect, it'll be the final stake in the heart of our small businesses. So when I said the Triple Crown, you just did it this Session, folks. And it's unfortunate. You know, we look back at history of what we have done. We like to be proud. We like to think that we've made the right decision. But I am going to tell you, that what has happened with our Tax Code and the anti-business attitude that I've seen over the past four months, history will not look kind upon us."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I respect the Leader, but I disagree with him. I love this state. I will raise my family here. And in the next 18 months, we are going to have a great debate about what the state's future holds. And we put pen to paper because we're the party that respects and honors and makes the middle class want to thrive. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Batinick has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 687 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 question, there are 67 voting in 'favor', 48 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- received a Constitutional Majority, excuse me, I got ahead of myself. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this... I'm sorry. Please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."
- Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative.

 Representative Ammons. Representative Andrade.

 Representative Arroyo. Representative Buckner.

 Representative Burke. Representative Cassidy. Representative

 Connor. Representative Conroy. Representative Crespo.

 Representative D'Amico."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick, do you withdraw your... okay. On this question, there are 67 voting in 'favor', 48 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, introduction of Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Joint Resolution 9 is referred to the Rules Committee. It's offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Burke: "Members, turning to page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 39, offered by Representative Didech. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Didech."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech on the Amendment."
- Didech: "Thank you. This... do we have to adopt the Amendment first?"
- Speaker Burke: "We need to adopt the Amendment."
- Didech: "So, this Amendment creates the Illinois Property Tax Relief Fund. I'd be happy to debate it on Third Reading."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech moves for the adoption of House Floor... House Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 39. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech."

Didech: "Thank you. Senate Bill 39 creates the Illinois Property Tax Relief Fund. This Bill will create a mechanism that will allow the General Assembly to provide direct property tax relief to every single homeowner in the State of Illinois and lower property tax bills across the state. You know, we have been debating a number of very contentious and divisive issues over the past week. I think if there's one issue that should be able to bring both sides of the aisle together, it's to create a mechanism that can move us forward in a way that will lower property tax bills for every single homeowner in the State of Illinois. You know, when I am back in my district, when I ask people in my community what is the one thing about Illinois you could change, if you could change one thing? What more people tell me than anything else is to lower my property tax bill. This Bill will create a mechanism that will allow us to do that and end one of the most regressive tax systems in the entire country. I would ask for an 'aye' vote and I am happy to take any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I stand proudly in support and I thank Representative Didech for all the work. This came as a result of a lot of individuals with high... coming from high taxed areas, such as mine, and other areas in Lake and DuPage County. We all came together and we looked for a resource. How can we address what was going on in our districts? How can we address the concerns of our home owners? And as Representative Didech stated, the number one complaint that we get is high property taxes. It's nothing else but high property taxes. And the question continues to be, what are you, as my State Representative, doing to lower my property taxes? This Bill answers that question. This is a great Bill. What this Bill does... and it just creates a fund. Individuals will actually be able to see something tangible, something on their property tax bill that says state tax relief. How many individuals in here, that own a home, would like to see a credit on their tax bill? I'm pretty sure everyone in here will... would. And this is exactly what that does. We're going to do what we promised. We are going to give back to our taxpayers, not continually to take. So, thank you so much and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. We had a very detailed discussion about this in Revenue Committee and this is not property tax reduction, as much as I respect the Gentleman. This is fake property tax reform. All that this will do is tie in with the progressive tax increase, the massive tax increase, that will eventually hit the middle class. And the ultimate plan, I'm confident, would be to just simply raise

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

taxes even more and give more fake property tax relief. This is not property tax relief. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I think I heard a bold statement from you. You said, we pass this, property taxes will be lowered.

Can you explain that?"

Didech: "No, I said that this Bill will give us a mechanism to allow the General Assembly to lower property taxes across the state."

Batinick: "Are you telling me we don't have a mechanism to lower the property taxes across the state now?"

Didech: "Well, right now, as you may know, property taxes are levied by our local taxing bodies, our school districts, our villages, our townships, our park districts, our libraries. The State of Illinois doesn't get any money at all from property taxes. This will give us a mechanism to put a line item on every single property tax bill that will lower property tax bills."

Batinick: "Okay. We do have a mechanism. It's called, you could...
you could change mandates. You could fund schools differently
and require a swap. There's a whole bunch of mechanisms that
you could do. I'm reading a line of this, 'cause I think this
was dropped today. It says, I just want to make sure I got
this right, that the... provide that the fund may accept monies
from any lawful source. What are the lawful sources that you
expect the Relief Fund to be funded by?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Didech: "That is... my understanding is that's form language that we use for all of our funds in the State of Illinois. The money that will go to this fund, my expectation, will be decided this summer by the Governor's Property Tax Task Force. I don't want to preempt some of the very good ideas that my colleagues have on both sides of the aisles on how we should provide property tax relief."
- Batinick: "Okay. My understanding is, is that usually there is designated funds that... designated monies that lead into a fund. I will let that go. Do you guys have an amount and from where? Like what amount do you think needs to go into this fund to be meaningful property tax relief?"
- Didech: "Well, like I said, I think that's a decision that, us as a General Assembly, need to decide. I think that's something that the Governor's Task Force is going to weigh in on. It's going to be a bipartisan, bicameral tax force. I would encourage you and your colleagues to participate. I think we should provide as much property tax relief as we possibly can."
- Batinick: "I agree. We should provide as much property tax as we can. And frankly, Representative, I wish that's what we were doing the last five months. And we haven't done that. And that's the frustrating part. Because when I was a freshman... You are a freshman, I believe, right? When I was a freshman, I served on a property tax task force and we had all kinds of great ideas and none of those things are law. So, I am skeptical. I am going to support your measure. It seems like a little smoke and mirrors. Good luck."

Speaker Burke: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur is Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 2625."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "I must say I... I read the Bill, as written, the full text, and I really like it because it... it is conceptually correct.

Of course, the problem it has no real detail. The question I have for you is where is the money coming from?"

Didech: "Yes, and like I said, I think that should be a collaborative process. I think there's a lot of people in this Body who have good ideas about how we should provide property tax relief. And my expectation is that's something we are going to be working on this summer with the Governor's Property Tax Task Force."

Walker: "So, the task force is going to decide how the funding goes into this Property Tax Relief Fund?"

Didech: "Well, my understanding is the task force is going to make a lot of recommendations, not only with how to best fund this fund but a lot of other initiatives that will reduce property taxes. Government consolidate..."

Walker: "Wait..."

Didech: "I'm sorry."

Walker: "I understand that but are they going to decide how to fund this Property Tax Relief Fund?"

Didech: "My hope and expectation is that they will make a recommendation. Ultimately, the General Assembly will make that decision."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Walker: "My... let's just do it right. Because, as you said, there are a lot of good ideas. I've also heard a lot of bad ideas, informally. Some rise to the level, if I may be so bold, as Blagojevich quality flimflam. So we're going to be very careful what we approve on how this thing is funded."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Costa Howard."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will yield."

Costa Howard: "Representative Didech, is this a first step in property tax reform in our state?"

Didech: "I don't think it's the first step. Actually, I think earlier this week, when we gave the voters of our state the opportunity to approve a fair tax, income tax structure was the first step. I think this is the next step and I don't think it's going to be the last step. I think this Body has failed to provide property tax relief for the people of our state for way too long. If it was going to be easy, we would have done it already. We always know that this was going to take more than one vote. If it was only going to take one Bill, one vote, and people's property tax bills were magically going to go down, I think this General Assembly would have done that already. So, to answer your question, no. I think this is one step of many steps to get the property tax crisis in our state under control"

Costa Howard: "Thank you. To the Bill. Representative Didech and the group of individuals who've been working on this, property tax relief is something that we in the State of Illinois have to address. And it's very easy for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to say 'no' to things without reform, but

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

we do need to do this. This is not an increase. This is a... this is a step in the right direction. This is something that is going to enable us to start addressing these issues. And I appreciate the work that Representative Didech and the others have done on this and I look forward to working for you... with you, excuse me, on this issue. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Burke: "He will."

McDermed: "In Revenue Committee, we discussed a little bit about how you see this fund as working. So, my understanding is money will be deposited from any legal source into the fund. And based on reports from each one of our 102 counties reporting the number of taxpayers with a homestead exemption, indicating that they are property taxpayers, pro rata, money will be sent from the State of Illinois to each county to be shown as a credit on each homestead exemption taxpayer's next property tax bill. Is that... am I understanding that correctly?"

Didech: "Yes, that's a fair representation of the process."

McDermed: "And then, my... I was asking some questions in committee about what is any lawful source of the money. And I heard some things in committee. Can you refresh my recollection of what some of the sources that you and your cosponsor that appeared there with you suggested might be fruitful?"

Didech: "Well I think what I said in committee is the same thing
I have been saying on the floor, is that this is something
that is going to be one of the several topics of conversation

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

of the task force. And I don't want to preempt my colleagues, who I think have some very good ideas about that."

McDermed: "Okay. So... and I... I'll just refresh your recollection and bring to the attention of everybody here in the chamber what I said in response to that, which is that I've been involved in capital negotiations since the beginning of Session. And I think it is fair to say, and I can speak for other people that are in the Capitol Appropriations discussions and you can correct me if I am wrong, that we've looked under every rock in the State of Illinois for as much as a penny, okay? And all those pennies that we can find out there in the State of Illinois actually came from a taxpayer or perhaps someone who is engaged in an activity that we've chosen to assign a tax to. For example, some sort of gaming, video gaming, horse racing, motor fuel taxes. Any one of the many charges that we exercise under citizens or people that come to this state and spend money on activities, a cigarette tax, a liquor tax, whatever that may be. All the money that we have in the State of Illinois comes from a person or a business that happened to either be located in our borders or pass through our borders. So, what I don't understand, and I am absolutely baffled that now we are going to take this money that we collected from people, whether through a progressive income tax or some other kind of charge on their activity, and we're going to redistribute this money to property tax owners? What on earth is this? We're going to take money on the income tax and redistribute it to people who own property? We're going to take money from gamblers and redistribute it to people that own property? We're going to take money from

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

people that buy alcohol or perhaps cannabis and redistribute it to people who own property? Really? Really? This is the craziest income redistribution that I've ever heard. If we're going to talk about lawful sources of income, let's talk about MacKenzie Bezos. Here's a woman who took half her divorced settlement from her multi-billionaire husband and decided to give it to charity. Why don't we take our multi-billionaire Governor and he can give half of his income to this Property Tax Relief Fund? Maybe that's a good source. It's just as crazy as the rest of them."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Spain is recognized.

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will yield."

Spain: "Representative, thank you for bringing forward this Bill.

I know that it's a very serious Bill looking to address a very serious problem in the State of Illinois. Certainly, I hope... or I'll ask you as a question, are you aware of Illinois status as the highest overall tax burdened of all 50 states in the country?"

Didech: "I know we have, I believe, the second highest property taxes in the entire country."

Spain: "We certainly do have high property taxes. Second highest, maybe trading back and forth with New Jersey. You are correct about that, and I appreciate your interest in this issue. And then when you add all of our taxes together, when you think about property taxes, sales taxes, and income taxes, we've become the state with the overall highest tax burden in the country. So, now here we are increasing income taxes. So, I appreciate your idea of providing relief on the property tax

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

side. It certainly won't make up for the income tax increases that we're moving forward but this is an important issue, none the less. My question to you is, I have never, at least in my life personally... having experiencing opening a bank account, for example, I have not been able to open a bank account with no money in it. Is there a reason that you're opening this bank account without making that initial deposit within it?"

- Didech: "Well, like I said, I don't want to preempt the work that the Governor's Property Tax Relief Task Force is going to do this summer. And this Bill does not begin this new fund until fiscal year 2021. So, to answer your question, this... my expectation is this fund will not be open until there is a source of funds identified."
- Spain: "So we'll go through the motions here to establish the bank account and have it ready. And then, I presume, that the next Bill we'll hear in this chamber is for the Property Tax Task Force then. Is that the right place to direct my questions about how we'll actually populate this fund with money?"
- Didech: "Well, you can certainly direct any questions you want.

 The next Sponsor's answer may be the same as my own, that I am not the only person in this chamber. I don't think Representative Carroll is the only person in this chamber who has good ideas about how to reduce property taxes, and I think we need to collaborate on that from both sides of the aisle."
- Spain: "And when the fund is established and it is seeded with funding that is... the previous speaker mentioned, also will come from taxpayers from one pocket, maybe moved into another.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

What is... explain your intention of how the fund will work as a line on the tax bill? I know that you mentioned that."

Didech: "Yes. So, the Bill provides that every homeowner's property tax bill will have a new line item. The rebate received from the Illinois Property Tax Relief Fund, indicating the size of that year's property tax rebates. And it will reduce the bottom line of everybody's property tax bill."

Spain: "Thank you. And when I look at my tax bill, Representative, one of the most staggering lines that continues to jump out and become larger and larger is the share of the overall tax bill every year, is the pension line. Will your Bill make an impact to reduce the pension line item that I see on my tax bill that is increased every year?"

Didech: "No, it won't. I've introduced a number of Bills this year. I know we've acted on Bills that reduce those pension line items, eliminating double dipping. I know there's been proposals for pension fund consolidation. We need to do an all of the above approach. And I think you are absolutely right that, that line item is something we need to be looking at, as well, to find ways that we can save money without being unfair to our teachers and police officers and firefighters."

Spain: "Thank you, Representative. I look forward to reviewing my tax bill for those benefits."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wehrli, for our final speaker."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Wehrli: "Thank you. So, I... we were just reviewing this Bill that literally was just dropped on us. And I just want to reiterate

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

that you're... what this Bill does is it creates a fund that has no funding source. Is that correct?"

Didech: "Correct. It creates the mechanism that can provide property tax relief and my expectation..."

Wehrli: "Okay. Creates a mechanism to allocate money that we don't have or is not even in the account. I mean, I thought the previous Representative brought a good point. You can't even open up a checking account without an initial deposit, except in Illinois. We can open up... open up a fund because it makes it feel... makes us feel good that we're actually going to do something. So, let's say, that by some grace of God, money makes it into this account. How is it allocated? How is it disbursed in an equitable fashion?"

Didech: "Right. So, this Bill provides that the money in this fund will be distributed to every property in the state who claims a general homestead exemption. And each of those properties will receive the rebates."

Wehrli: "Do we... so the cynic in me actually wants to ask is... you voted for a graduated tax increase, is this the best offer you could get for your vote? I mean, this is... this is much ado about nothing. This is window dressing. We... we are talking about reforms after we've already removed the... one of the impediments to those reforms, is actually applying the pressure on this General Assembly to do that. Instead, you raise taxes and now you're going to come by with this type of legislation that may work, probably won't. I'll be shocked if I ever see a dime allocated into this fund. But it's... we're doing it backwards which is why people don't trust us in this General Assembly. We do the hard work first, and then if you

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

make your case, you can go ask the taxpayers to... for more of their money. We don't do the hard work. We do the easy work and then it just get wasted down here. This is... it's window dressing. I hope you got what you were asking for but this is certainly not enough."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Didech to close."

"Thank you. We heard a lot from the other side of the aisle today that we shouldn't even try to cut property taxes 'cause it's too hard, because we can't do it in one step. Well, I think we all know that it's going to be a lot of hard work to cut property taxes but that's what people sent us here to do, because it's important and it affects every single homeowner across the state. This isn't a rich district issue or a poor district issue. This affects absolutely everybody. We have districts across our state, we have communities, places like Waukegan, and Park City, and North Chicago, and in the south suburbs, that have some of the most underfunded schools in the entire country. And yet, they pay some of the highest property tax rates in the entire country. We have families in our communities across the state who are losing their homes. Senior citizens who paid off their mortgage and they are being forced out of their home because their property taxes keep going up and up and up every single year. We need to take a step forward. We need to create a mechanism that will reduce the property tax bill of every single person in the state. And I would strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 39 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

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 96 voting in 'favor', 18 'against', and 1 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 8 of the Calendar. On Senate Bill 1932, Representative Carroll. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Carroll."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll on the Amendment."

Carroll: "Thank you very much. Are we talking about Amendment 3 or Amendment 2? I'm sorry."

Speaker Burke: "Amendment #2 is your first one."

Carroll: "Okay. Amendment #2 is creating the Property... the Property Tax Relief Task Force. This is something that's the initiative of the Governor's Office where he wants us to come together and create solutions on the biggest issue facing our state, property taxes. He has told... he has promised me that he will take our suggestions very seriously and apply them, so moving forward, we can start finding real property tax relief. So, I'm hoping for... for everyone's support on this and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1932. All those in favor vote 'aye'. I'm sorry, Representative. I thought you wanted to speak on the Bill? All those in favor vote... say 'aye'; all

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Carroll."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll on the Amendment."

Carroll: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The Floor Amendment contains language that clarifies that the Governor shall make appointments to the task force, as well as the Speaker of the House and the Senate President as well."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no discussion, Representative... Oh, excuse me. Representative Wehrli. We're on the Amendment. We're on Amendment #3. Seeing no discussion, Representative Carroll moves to adopt Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1932. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate the Members of the House, seems we had some heated conversations today. But this is, to me, is probably the most important thing that I... I've been... that I'm going to work on as a Member of the Illinois House of Representatives. We have to do something about property taxes and this is something that... that I believe starts with putting some great minds in a room and

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

coming up with a lot of different ideas. And I'll tell you what makes me really excited about this, is I've already started receiving letters from different municipalities. Like, the Illinois Municipal League sent me a letter demanding to be a part of this process 'cause they want to make sure that people... that they are at the table with this. I've also heard from some of the educational... from some of the educational organizations that are saying the same thing. So, we're putting them on notice that we're starting to come after them and we're going to look at how they tax and ways that we can tax better. And I'm happy to answer any questions that the other side will have, which I'm sure they are chomping at the bit to do."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wehrli, did you wish to speak?

Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative, this Bill in its amended form, as I read it, it states that... let's see... that this creates a task force consisting of at least two Members appointed by the... by Governor Pritzker and Members appointed by each... no, no, hold on. Hold on. Let me ask you real quick. Floor Amendment 3."

Carroll: "Yes, Sir."

Durkin: "I don't have the ability to make an appointment. I have been stripped and so has... Leader Brady have been stripped of appointments to make to this task force. Do you know that?"

Carroll: "I... that's how the Amendment reads to me as well, Sir."

Durkin: "Is that a good thing?"

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Carroll: "I would hope that you would have a strong enough relationship with the Speaker of the House to come together and find some ideas."
- Durkin: "You can do better than that, come on. You can do better than that. I'm serious. Why have I been taken out of the ability, for the first time in all the years that I've been down here..."
- Carroll: "Would you like me to answer the question or are you going to keep interrupting?"
- Durkin: "Well I'm going to finish right now. Why... the first time in the 20 some odd years I have been down here we have creates task force. At least the Minority Party has had the ability in each one of these to make an appointment. Why are you doing this right now, at this time, in this state? When you want to create diversity... which it says right here that we want to have a diverse group of people on this task force. I guess the Republicans in this state don't qualify for diversity."
- Carroll: "I... like I said, I would hope that you'd be able to collaborate with the Speaker of the House and identify some appointments that he can do as well."
- Durkin: "You're the Sponsor of this Bill. Take it out of the record, remove that Floor Amendment 3, give me the ability to make appointments to this task force if you think this thing is a worthwhile venture for Illinois citizens."

Carroll: "Is that a question, Sir?"

Durkin: "No, it's a request."

Carroll: "Well I'm not going to take it out of the record."

Durkin: "That's really... that's really sad."

Carroll: "I'm sorry you feel that way."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Durkin: "No, it's too bad. I mean, you're going to regret this, Sir. But I tell what, this is... as I said, this is the first time in my time down here where the rights of the Minority Party have been completed trampled on, on an issue which you claim is important, which is about property tax relief in the State of Illinois. But you're saying in here that Republicans don't matter. We have no voice in this committee. Shame on you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn."

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

Speaker Burke: "He will."

Skillicorn: "Hello, Jonathan. Very, very quick. So, this creates

a task force, right? Just a task force?"

Carroll: "Yes, Sir."

Skillicorn: "So, to the Bill. I'll tell you what a task force can do that wants to lower property taxes. It's going to do three things. Recommend changing the pension clause, recommend changing prevailing wage, and getting rid of unfunded mandates. If it doesn't do those three things, property taxes are still going up every single year. You address those three things, property taxes go down. Three things, people. We don't need a task force. We can do it. I have Bills that are stuck in Rules that would do this. I have Constitutional Amendments that are stuck in Rules that do this. These three things will lower property taxes. Anything else will not raise property taxes and false. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I want to elaborate on what my colleague just said. For the... the Body

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

might be interested to know that there have been property tax task forces coming out of the Illinois General Assembly in 1975, 1982, 1998, 2009, and 2018. And what has happened? Our property tax bills have gone up every year. In all 118 districts, not just those represented by Democrats which, apparently, will have the opportunity to discuss property tax relief this year. So, here are some of the things, as my colleagues so ably pointed out, that drive property taxes in State of Illinois. Staffing mandates, pensions, prevailing wage, worker's comp, and minimum wage. So, what else do you expect to find in your Property Tax Task Force? Are you listening to me, Representative? Thank you. So, if ... if we know that you will not be able to change staffing mandates, pensions, prevailing wage, work comp, or minimum wage, because those are political issues upon which your base relies to... for you to deliver to them, what exactly are you intending to look at to reduce property taxes for the 74 districts represented by your Members?"

Carroll: "Thank you for such a great question, Representative. A couple of things that I'm looking at that we're going to look at consolidation. We had some legislation done here earlier this year that was looking at consolidation of townships. I want to continue on that path. I also want to continue with looking at how school districts are run and some of the expenses they have. Schools are our most expense line on our property taxes. And maybe there's ways we can streamline the process. I'm not disagreeing with anything you're saying but what I am saying to you, Ma'am, is that we have to continue

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- to work to make sure that we're finding the best solutions for this state. And again, I understand..."
- McDermed: "How can the best solution for this state involve only 74 districts?"
- Carroll: "Are you going to let me finish? Are you going to let me finish? Are you going to let me finish? Because you talk about procedure all the time but yet you are interrupting me. Let me finish. So, I'm looking... I'm talking about finding solutions. You bring up the past to me all the time. I can only move from 2019 moving forward. I can't move back in the past. I came up with this concept. I talked to the Governor's Office about it and I am trying to find solutions and you're sitting back there telling me this isn't going to work, this isn't going to work, this isn't going to work. And if they don't work fine, you can call me out for it, but at least give it the opportunity of this to work."
- McDermed: "How is it going to work when it's only going to consider one side of the aisle, 74 districts? How can that possibly be in the best interest of the State of Illinois?"
- Carroll: "Like I told the previous... like I told the Leader from your side of the aisle, I would hope that he would work with the Speaker of the House to find the best Members for this process."
- McDermed: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not like to be negative. I try to look on the bright side and try to think about things in a positive way. However, when there have been not one, not two, not three, not four, but five task forces in the past, which have delivered absolutely no property tax relief, what do we expect to be different in the future?

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Particularly when the following sacred cows will not be considered; staffing mandates, pension, prevailing wage, worker's comp, and minimum wage. How do we expect to have a different outcome if we do not have a different process? And in this case, the process is beyond flawed because it will not be a bipartisan, bicameral process, but some sort of secret cabal involving only Members of the Democrat Party to force their secret process on an unwilling populous. This is one of... I don't even know... less..."

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

McDermed: "...least well-conceived ideas I've seen in five years.

Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, we've... I think I said yesterday to the freshmen, welcome to the last week of May in Springfield. And it... it kind of... we've had a pretty good Session in terms of... not in terms of legislation that we're all that happy about, but in terms of collegiality. And I'm not a wordsmith, so I hope you use that word properly. Where did the idea come from to make this the task force that the Republicans didn't have input? I mean, this is your Bill. Did you literally... that's your Bill. Did you write that Bill?"

Carroll: "I had a conversation with the Governor's Office and this was the recommendation through how we're going assign Members to this committee."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Batinick: "So, the recommendation from the Governor was to exclude... and by the way, this is an individual with their track record... this is an individual of somebody I don't believe has had elected office before. So the recommendation of the Governor was to ace the Republicans out of having the authority that they've had as long as, I think, anybody has been here."
- Carroll: "Well, I want to answer that in a couple different ways. And again, you and I have had great conversations about this and you know I respect your opinions very much. Republicans are not excluded from this... from this task force at all. It's just how the appointment process goes. And again, I want to be very clear that... that ideas are very important for us to work on, and ideas are very important to come forward. And I would hope that even if people aren't Members of the task force, they would be open to discussing with us ideas on property tax relief and how we can do that."
- Batinick: "I am... this really seems like... so, you're okay with this? You're okay... this... I didn't hear about this until I was literally going to go to the Bill and point out some things. You are okay with changing the process for this Bill that you fought so hard to have?"
- Carroll: "I... I'm comfortable with it right now and we'll see where it goes. And if I don't feel that the appointments are right,
 I'm happy to have further conversations with the Speaker and the President of the Senate and the Governor. Sure."
- Batinick: "How many people are allowed on this task force?"
- Carroll: "There is not a number... specific number, assigned to that."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

- Batinick: "Is this just Members or is this individuals of the public?"
- Carroll: "It could be anybody. The Governor can appoint people from the private sector as well."
- Batinick: "I... as a friend, I really would appreciate it if you would commit to making the one change of going back to the normal process of appointing Members to a task force."
- Carroll: "I understand what you're saying but I'm going to stick with what we have."
- Batinick: "Okay. To the Bill. Part of the frustrating part... I don't think the frustrating part is so much... well, maybe it is for some of us over here. The frustrating part for me is that, we've had a task force, I was on one of them. We've introduced lots... you know, the previous... thank you very much, Representative."
- Speaker Burke: "Out of the record. The... I'm sorry, Representative Carroll, did you want to speak?"
- Carroll: "I'd say I... you know what? We all got emotional here. I want to apologize to the Leader. I'm happy to pull it from the record. We're happy to make that change."
- Speaker Burke: "The Bill... Sponsor has indicated he will pull the Bill from the record. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Resolution. Leader Manley on the Motion."
- Manley: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that SJR9 can be heard in the Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee tonight."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

And the posting requirements are waived. Representative

Ammons is recognized."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I request that House Bill 97, Motion to Reconsider, be heard at this time."

Speaker Burke: "The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 97 passed.

Representative Butler."

Butler: "Inquiry of the Chair, Ma'am."

Speaker Burke: "State your inquiry."

Butler: "Is this a debatable Motion?"

Speaker Burke: "Yes, it is."

Butler: "Okay. So, just as a reminder... I am going to ask for a Roll Call vote on this Motion... what Representative Ammons would like to do is create a circuit in Champaign County for the 6th Circuit. It's my understanding that Champaign County has about 209 thousand residents. And if this was a circuit on its own, it would be the smallest circuit by far in the State of Illinois. In fact, the next smallest circuit would be McHenry County. It's... excuse me, single... single county circuit. The next smallest single county circuit would be in McHenry County at 50 percent larger than Champaign County. As I... unfortunately, my computer is not working right now ... as I looked at the reports on the caseloads for the circuit court districts, currently, I noticed that the 6th district currently has one of the lowest caseloads per judge actually State of Illinois. I can understand the Representative's desire to do this. I can. She's a Democrat, she wants to elect a Democrat judge. I get it. But this is

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

not the way to do it. I think if we want to have an overall approach at how we look our... our circuit court districts and how they're divided up, and the fact that we have tremendous population disparities in our... in our circuits. I mean, I would really question whether or not a circuit at 200 thousand people would have, according to the 1 person, 1 vote principle, would have a lot more power than the district that I live in here in Sangamon County. Is that a Voting Rights Act violation? I don't know. I'm not an attorney. I'm just asking the question. So, Madam Speaker, I request a Roll Call vote on this Motion. I would urge everyone to vote 'aye' on the Motion."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins on the Motion."

Caulkins: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Motion. We... we talked about this yesterday. There is a process for creating a new circuit. That process is to work within the circuit to get the people in that circuit together, get the judges involved, get the Supreme Court involved, to get the administrative part of the system involved, and allow the system to work. Allow the people in that circuit to do the job, to put this together in an orderly fashion, to make this happen. For us to sit here today and pass this Bill that says that there will be a new circuit created without the advice and the consent of the judges in the judiciary is overreaching. It's ill-advised and it's going to create more problems when other counties decide, well if Champaign County can do it, so can we. I, please, urge you... don't let this happen. Make it a... yeah, I guess it's an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Willis."

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Willis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Motion. I have spoken with the Sponsor of this Bill and I think we all heard her reasoning yesterday when the Bill came forward. There's a problem in the area. There's not enough diversity, according to her, and this is the reason she brought this Bill forward, to make sure that we address that. And that is one of the reason that we are working on this, that we want to make sure that we address that. She has also assured this chamber that the reasoning behind asking for this Bill to be passed out of the House is to force people to come to the table and talk about the problem. That is exactly what she wants to see happening. And for the other side to put this Motion to Reconsider the Vote is ridiculous because all we're doing is saying, take this vote, make everybody come to the table and do it. With that in mind, I am requesting all of my fellow Democrats to vote 'no' on this Motion to reconsider so that we can allow the vote to stand as it was yesterday, after a very long and very robust debate. I totally support my fellow Member. And I ask everyone to vote 'no' on this Motion to reconsider."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler has moved to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 97 passed. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those against vote 'no'. 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. Forty-one voting 'yes', seventy voting 'against', and zero voting 'present', the Motion fails. On page twenty of the Calendar, under Order of Resolution, we have Senate Joint Resolution 41, offered by

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Representative Ammons. Representative... there is a... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ammons, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons on the Amendment."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Floor Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment that keeps the original intent of the Resolution but provides technical cleanup for the process of appointing Members to the advisory council for the Community College Board and its designees. And I move adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 41."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Joint Resolution 41. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Representative Ammons on Senate Joint Resolution 41."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Resolution of... this is Illinois Community College Board. It will authorize the appointing of a commission to study the use of credits at the community college level so students can get full credit on... classes that they've taken, as well as to get additional credits for learning experience that's at the community college level. This is a commission to study this process and it has appointments from both the Majority and the Minority committee... I mean... caucuses as well as ICCB, IBHE, and the Governor's Office. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 41. This is a Roll Call vote.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Those... all those voting 'yes'... 'aye'... vote 'yes'; 'no'... I'm so sorry, I've lost my train of thought. All those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the Resolution, there are 104 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having achieved a Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 294, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 432, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 434, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 435, offered by Representative Ford. And House Resolution 436, offered by Representative Harris."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. My button seemed to malfunction and on House Bill 97, I meant to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Burke: "The record will so reflect. Representative Morrison."
- Morrison: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Also, on House Bill 3606, it was my intention to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Burke: "The record will reflect it. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Personnel & Pensions will meet in Room 122.

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools in Room 413. Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies in C-1. The Executive Committee in Room 118. Judiciary - Criminal in D-1. Labor & Commerce in Room 114. Transportation: Regulations, Roads & Bridges in Room 115. Meeting at 8:30 is Higher Education in C-1, Revenue & Finance in Room 122."

Speaker Burke: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Friday, May 31, at the hour of 9 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all 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 and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3848, offered by Representative Carroll, a Bill for an Act concerning persons who are deaf, hard of hearing, or Deaf Blind. First Reading of this House Bill. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 431, offered by Representative Marron. And House Resolution 433, offered by Representative Lisa Hernandez. This is referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 262; recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur is Senate Amendments 2 and 4 to House Bill 3222; Motion to Concur is Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3610. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Senate Bill 1300. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from Secondary Education: Elementary & Committee on Administration, Licensing & Charter School reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur to is Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2078, House Resolution 416. Representative Ammons, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur is Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2719. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 4 and 5 to House Bill 3501. Representative Moylan, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolutions 81, and Senate Joint Resolution 9. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 36. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 731, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Committee Reports. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce, reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur with Senate

61st Legislative Day

5/30/2019

Amendment #1 to House Bill 854, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1784, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2140. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal, reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2019: recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1438. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."