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PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The regular Session of the 101st General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor Keith Thomas, Mt. Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Champaign, Illinois. Pastor.

PASTOR KEITH THOMAS:

(Prayer by Pastor Keith Thomas)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Pledge of Allegiance, Senator Cunningham.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Cunningham)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Richard Millard, Bluestream.com (sic) (Blueroomstream.com) requests permission to videotape. There being no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Secretary, Reading and the Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Journal of Tuesday, April 30th, 2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President, I move to postpone the -- the reading and approval of the Journal just read by the Secretary, pending the arrival of the printed transcript.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 369, offered by Senator Barickman and all Members.
It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Secretary, Resolutions Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution 41, offered by Senator McGuire.
It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 471, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 664, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 687, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 689, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 690 Recommend Do Adopt; House Bills 348, 1552, 1554, 2040, 2577, 2625, 2675, 3604, and 3610 Do Pass.

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, (Vice) Chairperson of the Committee on Licensed Activities, reports Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 171, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 651, Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 651, and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1839 Recommend Do Adopt; and House Bills 2613, 2811, 2957, and 3468 Do Pass.

Senator McGuire, (Vice) Chairperson of the Committee on State Government, reports Senate Resolutions 277 and 351 Be Adopted; House Bills 210, 313, 816, 854, 2028, 2074, 2086, 2639, 2652, 2800, 2836, 2924, 2936, 2937, 2940, 2941, 2983, 3014, 3217, and 3249 Do Pass.
Senator Harris, Chairperson of the Committee on Insurance, reports Senate Resolution 264 Be Adopted; and House Bills 1639, 2160, 2847, 3320, and 3435 Do Pass.

Senator Hutchinson, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports House Bills 925, 2209, 2243, 2931, 3096, and 3590 Do Pass.

Senator Holmes, Chairperson of the Committee on Local Government, reports House Bills 105, 271, 303, 814, 910, 1659, 2073, 2081, 2103, 2129, 2252, 2473, 2489, 2499, 2591, 2993, 3141, and 3369 Do Pass; and House Bills 2215 and 2854 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Link, (Vice) Chairperson of the Committee on Financial Institutions, reports House Bills 1581, 2238, and 2961 Do Pass; and House Bills 2460 and 2685 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Aquino, Chairperson of the Committee on Government Accountability and Pensions, reports House Bills 1472, 1580, 2617, 2662, 2824, 3082, 3213, 3446 Do Pass; and House Bill 2029 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Cullerton, Chairperson of the Committee on Labor, reports Senate Resolution 250 Be Adopted; and House Bills 1918, 2557, 2830, and 3405 Do Pass.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Mr. Secretary, Appointment Messages.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Appointment Message 1010175
Governor's salaried appointment
To be the Director of the Illinois Department of Employment Security, Thomas Chan
Appointment Message 1010176
Governor's non-salaried appointment
To be a Member of the Health Facilities and Services Review
Board, Michael Gelder
Appointment Message 1010177
Governor's non-salaried appointment
To be a Member of the Health Facilities and Services Review Board, Julie Hamos

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Will all members of the Committee on Assignments please come to the President's Anteroom immediately? All members of Committee on Assignments. Senator Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR ROSE:
Point of personal privilege, if I may, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR ROSE:
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm honored today. In the gallery behind me - if the students would stand up - these are students from my hometown of Mahomet. They're Mahomet-Seymour High School and Junior High schoolers. They are the -- members of the jazz band in both the junior high and the high school, who both received Grand Champion at the EIU University Jazz Festival this year -- as First Place in Middle School Class A. So if we could give a big round of applause to the Mahomet-Seymour High School Jazz Band/Mahomet-Seymour Junior High School Jazz Band, who are conducted by Michael Stevens and Assistant Band Director Philip Meyer. Welcome to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Welcome to the Senate. Senator Schimpf, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR SCHIMPF:  
Point of personal privilege.  
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)  
Please proceed, Senator.  

SENATOR SCHIMPF:  
Yes, thank -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate.  
I just would like to take a moment to introduce my two honorary Pages for today.  I'm -- I'm fortunate to have with me two seniors from Trico High School, which is in the middle of my district.  I have Jacob Lodge to my left and Kelly Bunselmeyer to my right.  Jacob is planning on attending Lindenwood University in St. Charles, Missouri, to study premed, but he assures me we are going to get him back to Illinois after he's done with his studies.  And then Kelly is planning on attending SIU Edwardsville to study dentistry.  So I would just ask that you give me -- join me in giving them a warm Springfield welcome.  
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)  
Welcome to the Senate.  Senator Cunningham, for what purpose do you seek recognition?  
SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:  
For an introduction, Mr. President.  
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)  
Please proceed, Senator.  

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:  
Thank you, Mr. President.  I, too, have an honorary Page who has joined us here today in the Senate Chamber.  His name is Ryan McGee.  Ryan is a -- is from Orland Park.  He's a freshman at Carl Sandburg High School.  He's spending the day shadowing me through the Capitol.  He tells me he's interested in both a career
potentially in politics or comedy. So there's some pretty good synergy there. I think they complement each other. And hopefully he's going to learn a lot today. Please welcome him to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I, too, have a Page today and I'm really excited to have with me Stephen Rodney. He's a graduate at DePaul University, pursuing his Master's in Public Policy. He's also a research scholar and just -- at the DePaul's Chadwick {sic} (Chaddick) Institute of Metropolitan Development. He's currently an intern at the Regional Transportation Authority. He aspires to have a career in public service. It's been a pleasure to have him here today and -- to see what we do. But, most importantly, Stephen is from California and he has moved his residency to Illinois. So there are people moving into Illinois. Thanks for being here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Morrison, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MORRISON:

Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR MORRISON:
Today my guest is Kimberly Mua from Chicago. She is a first-generation Hmong daughter of refugee parents from Laos and is fluent in both English and Hmong. She majored in Global Studies at the University of Wisconsin and is pursuing her master's degree at DePaul University in Public Administration. She has lived in China, Taiwan, and South Korea and spent the last two years serving as an AmeriCorps VISTA in a Korean immigrant community in Chicago. She now helps people who are in the Undocumented Student Support -- she serves as the Undocumented Student Support Graduate Assistant at DePaul University. She's here to see how we work. Please help me in welcoming Kimberly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Fine, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR FINE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to invite everybody to the annual Yom HaShoah, the Holocaust Remembrance Day, event that takes place at the Old State Capitol. It will be held tomorrow at 11 o'clock and will be over by 11:45. And everybody is welcome. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Wilcox, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR WILCOX:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR WILCOX:

Today, I have a few constituents - if you'd like to stand. To my right is Alex Karda from Crystal Lake and she has her service
dog, Bailey, a two-year-old yellow lab, with her, and in the middle is MaKayla Wiseman from Lakemoor, members of my district, but they attend, in Jacksonville, the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired and have their principal today, Aimee Veith, with them. And Alex likes drama and not so much the math, but MaKayla enjoys the math and is attending community college now. So I'd appreciate a warm welcome for them. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Gillespie, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR GILLESPIE:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...proceed, Senator.

SENATOR GILLESPIE:

I too am very fortunate to have a student from DePaul here today, studying public policy, Gabrielle Howard. She's been very interested. She's hoping to get a job in public policy, so I've been introducing her to policy staff around the Capitol. And like Senator Murphy's, she moved here from Texas. So we have another one moving into Illinois. Welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Castro, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR CASTRO:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.
Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to introduce my student to the Senate, Markus Beyer. He's also a DePaul University student, studying political science. He's also studying languages, writing, reading, and he likes to make -- you know, he's been following us today and yesterday. He wants to make government more accessible, understands (sic) and interesting for people of underrepresented communities. So I'd like to give him a warm Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Weaver, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR WEAVER:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Great. Thank you. I've got two interns with me. One that's going to be this summer and the other one's been this semester. Both really smart young people. First, next to me, Sarah McCoy. Originally from upstate New York, 2017 graduate of Peoria Notre Dame, currently a student at Illinois Central College and working on her psychology degree and wants to pursue a career in occupational therapy. Also, Christian Palaez. Originally from Chicago, now in Houston, but tells me he wants to end up in Illinois - we love that - a sophomore at Bradley, majoring in political science and public policy, minoring in criminal justice, and says - I haven't talked to him on this yet - wants to run for office. We're going to have a long talk on that, Christian. But both really good young people that have good hearts and good heads.
And would you welcome them to the Illinois Senate?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate.  Senator Hunter in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HUNTER)

Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Commerce and Economic Development Committee - Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 2156; refer to Education Committee - Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 2084 and Committee Amendment 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 36; refer to Higher Education Committee - Senate Joint Resolution 41; refer to Human Services Committee - Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 2154, Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 2723, and Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 3101; refer to Insurance Committee - House Bill 471; refer to Local Government Committee - Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 2124 and Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 2862; refer to State Government Committee - Senate Resolution 363; Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 687, Senate Resolution 282, and Senate Bill 1240.  Signed -- Pursuant to Senate Rule 3-8 (b-1), the following amendments will remain in the Committee on Assignments:  Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 650.

Signed, Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Revenue Committee - Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1240.
Signed, Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HUNTER)

Senator Muñoz, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HUNTER)

State your point.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, have a DePaul student with me. She also lives in my district. She's going to be graduating in two months with her master's degree in Nonprofit Management. If we can welcome her to the Senate, I would appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HUNTER)

Welcome to the Senate. Supplemental Calendar No. 1 has been distributed. Mr. Secretary, read the... On the Order of the Secretary's Desk, Resolutions is Senate Resolution 282. Muñoz. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 282, offered by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HUNTER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Madam President. The resolution declares January 1, 2019, as United States of America and China Diplomacy Day in the State of Illinois in honor of the forty-year anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and China. The resolution supports continued diplomatic, economic, and people-to-people cooperation between State of
Illinois and China. And I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HUNTER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say Aye. All Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution has been adopted. President Cullerton in the Chair.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Members of the Senate, can I have your attention, please? Can I have your attention, please? Members of the Senate, today we have the honor of welcoming Zhao Jian, the Consul General of the People's Republic of China in Chicago. Mr. Jian worked for the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for more than twenty years. Among other positions, he served as Director of the Department of North American and Oceanian Affairs. Before accepting his current position this year, Mr. Jian served as Consul General of the People's Republic of China in Melbourne, Australia. As Consul General, Mr. Jian covers nine states in the Midwest and works to promote mutual cooperation and developing China-U.S. relations. So please welcome me -- please join me in welcoming Zhao Jian to the Illinois Senate.

CONSUL GENERAL ZHAO JIAN:

(Remarks by Consul General of the People's Republic of China in Chicago Zhao Jian)

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Senator Muñoz in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mark Maxwell, WCIA, requests permission to record video. Being no objection, leave is granted. Senator DeWitte, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR DeWITTE:
Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm very pleased to have some special guests in the gallery this afternoon, Ms. Cheri Moore and members of her nursing staff from Advocate Sherman Hospital in Elgin, Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't think there's any of us that health care doesn't touch, either us individually or members of our family, on a daily basis, and having grown up in a household with a trained nurse as my mother, I've always had a soft spot in my heart. So it is my distinct pleasure to introduce Cheri Moore and members of the nursing staff at Advocate Sherman Hospital in Elgin, Illinois, off to my right. Please join me in giving them an Illinois Senate welcome. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome to the Senate. Senator Tracy, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR TRACY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR TRACY:

Yes, today I would like to welcome a group in the gallery above the Democratic side of the aisle. They are distinguished women of the Republican Party from McDonough and Mason County. And I would -- they come every year and enjoy it very much, so I'd ask you to help me welcome them. Thank you.
Welcome to the Senate.  Senator Jones, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President.  Purpose of an introduction. Purpose of an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR JONES:

I have a special guest with me today from the City -- the great City of Alsip, Illinois.  That's no other than Mayor John Ryan.  So could you please join me and give him a good Senate welcoming.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate.  Senator Harmon, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR HARMON:

For the purposes of an introduction, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have a special guest with me on the Floor today. It's Tommy Williams. He's eight years old and in the third grade here at -- at Butler Elementary School in Springfield. He is a fan of Harry Potter, Star Wars, and likes reading about the Civil War. His -- his -- he's joined by his mom, Kate Dunne, in the gallery and his grandfather, Tom Dunne. Tom and Linda Dunne, his grandparents, are constituents of mine in Oak Park and, through their generous support of Ascension School and Church in Oak Park, earned Tommy
the opportunity to come and spend the day with us here on the
Floor. So please join me in welcoming Tommy. Stand up.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Welcome to the Senate. Senator Van Pelt, for what purpose
you seek recognition?
SENATOR VAN PELT:
For purpose of an introduction.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Please proceed, Senator.
SENATOR VAN PELT:
I would like all my Senate peers to welcome my guest, Dr.
Versie Dugger, all the way from Houston, Texas. Come down here to
check out and see what we're doing here in Illinois. Dr. Versie
Dugger. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Welcome to the Senate. Senator Koehler in the Chair.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we will be going to Senate
Bills 3rd Reading. We will be taking up a constitutional
amendment. This will all be final action and we will be doing
this nonstop. We'll be moving around the Calendar a little bit,
so... Let's go to page 3, up towards the top of the page. We'll be
doing Senate Bill 171. Senator Martinez. Senator Martinez, on
171. Senator Martinez seeks leave of the Body to return Senate
Bill 171 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on
the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill -- 171. Mr. Secretary,
are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Martinez.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President.  I ask for its adoption.  And I will be happy to discuss it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion?  All those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed, Nay.  The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted.  Are there any other -- further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading.  Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 171.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 171.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.  With the amendment, it transfers the Drycleaning (sic) (Drycleaner) Environmental Response Trust Fund program to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency on July 1st, 2020.  It dissolves the Trust Fund Council.  The program administrative costs shall be capped at -- six hundred thousand per fiscal year and the current license fees and solvent taxes shall be set in statute rather than
administrative rules. Finally, the program's sunset date shall be extended from January 1st, 2020 to January 1st, 2030. Let me just say that this bill has been worked on for the last two years. These past few months, we've been actually -- finally, were able to get everyone to sit at the table and continue to negotiate this bill. And everyone was able to get what they needed, but more important was that we were able to finally be able to take this bill, put it into the IEPA, who will oversee the -- the -- the Fund. And I -- I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Bush, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BUSH:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

I'd just like to thank Leader Martinez for amazing work on this. There are some bills that are easy to just kind of keep passing along because they're difficult to get done and -- and maybe doesn't seem like something really large and -- but I just want to thank you for your tenacity, your amazing work on this, and congratulations, and just really excited that this is going to be done and we're not going to kick the can down the road any longer on this. Thank you so much, Leader Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

To the bill, Mr. President.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

I rise in support of this legislation. I appreciate the work - a lot of work - that's been done by Senator Martinez. And to our side of the aisle, I -- I -- I voted Present in committee on this, not because of the bill but rather the process in which it was -- was brought. But that's not -- not -- neither here nor there. I think this is a good bill. I think our Members on this side of the aisle should take a look at it and -- and make sure it's right for you, but, for my district and the State of Illinois, I believe this is a good bill. So thank you, Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez. Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. Question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. Senator Martinez does this bill put a cap on what can be paid to the executive director?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

After -- after July of 2020, the IEPA will take it over completely. I know that there was a lot of problems in the past with the mismanagement of the funds. The contract was a very, very big contract. And now, putting it into the Department of Professional -- I mean of the -- of the environment -- I mean of
the -- yeah, the IEPA, I think we will see more cost savings, more than ever, because they already have programs that they can actually do some of these cleanups. And this is the best place that we can put this at. We want to make sure that every dry cleaner has a place where they can go and continue to work on this. But I think this is the best that we can do right now and it's a -- it's cost savings. And, right now, we still have a lot of cleanup that needs to be done and this will take care of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

To the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...bill.

SENATOR REZIN:

I do commend the sponsor for working on this bill. This is an issue that was brought to my attention as well in the past regarding some of the funds being -- paid an exorbitant salary. So I appreciate that you're taking and moving the responsibility to the Department that will oversee it. So I do ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez, to close.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I also want to thank Senator McGuire and Senator Bush, Senator Murphy. I think they were all -- they've all been part of this in the past. But I knew that we had to get somewhere to where we can do some real responsible, you know, financing here and I think this is the best place that we can actually put a fund like this
in and make sure that we continue to -- to treat our environment with more respect and I think this is the right place for it. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 171 pass. All those vote -- in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 47 voting Yea, 3 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 171, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll go to page 4. We'll go to Senate Bill 664. Senator Mulroe. Senator Mulroe seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 664 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 664. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Mulroe, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I'd ask that Senate Floor Amendment number be withdrawn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Oh. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Mulroe.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Mulroe, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I'd ask that Senate Floor Amendment No. 2 be adopted. I'd be happy to explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? Is there any discussion? All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 664. Senator, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Mulroe, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you again, Mr. President. Senate Bill 664 requires any person located or doing business in Illinois who manufactures, fabricates, assembles, possesses (sic) (processes), or labels a tobacco product or -- or imports a finished tobacco product for sale or distribution in the United States to provide documentation
of its compliance with labeling provisions of the federal Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act of 2009 to the Department of Public Health. It also provides for a private right of action to enforce against a violation of the Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 664 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 664, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 6. In the middle of the page is Senate Bill 1839. Senator Tom Cullerton. We'll hold on that one. We'll stand at ease. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Rise for a point of personal privilege, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, before we start hauling the mail here, I think I want to make an announcement. It is one of our colleague's birthdays. Now, some of us look younger than others and some of us are younger than others and then there are some of us who don't even look like we're old enough to actually drive ourselves to the Capitol so that we can have our birthday announced. One of the people that falls in that latter category
is Senator Jason Barickman. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's Senator Jason Barickman's birthday. If we could have a round of applause for him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Happy birthday, Senator. Senator Sims, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SIMS:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. -- Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR SIMS:

Mr. President, I've been joined by a very special guest here on the Floor with me. She's -- she's down from DePaul University. Her name is Jaemie Neely. She's an -- a Master's in Public Administration candidate for -- in 2020, but she's also the Director of the Illinois Procurement Technical and -- Assistance Center. So please join me in welcoming Jaemie to Springfield. And she's sat in with -- meetings with me over the last couple days, seeing how we do our work here in Springfield. So please join me in welcoming her.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Hastings, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

State your point.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have the distinct
pleasure of having one of my local mayors here as a member of the South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association. He is the President of the South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association, which is the leader of one of the largest COGs or local areas of government that we have in the State of Illinois, Mayor Vernard Alsberry. He also serves as a physical therapist at one of our local hospitals. His family is extremely engaged in the community. And what's most important, I'm proud to call him my friend. I would hope that we can give him a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Muñoz in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:
Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:
Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I have the distinct pleasure of introducing some wonderful people who are sitting up in the gallery in front of us today, the Democratic Women of the South Suburbs, whose mission is to unite, promote, and encourage, and recruit Illinois women of the Democratic Party. They have sponsored twenty students today for their annual Lobby Day for the fifth year from Bloom High School, Bloom Trail, Crete-Monee, Homewood-Flossmoor, Rich South, Rich East, Thorntonwood, Thornton, Lindblom, and Chicago High School for Agricultural Sciences. Please join me in welcoming these amazing students to
the Capitol. This is their fifth year visiting and I'm so happy to receive them today. Hey, everybody.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome to the Senate. We'll now be going to Senate Bills 3rd Reading, page 6 of the Calendar. Be advised, Senators, we will have the timer on today. We have quite a bit of legislation to do this afternoon. We want to give everybody the opportunity to speak, so, therefore, the timer will be put on. Don't take it personal if I cut the mic off. I'm just letting you know now. Senate Bill 1839. Senator Tom Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1839 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1839. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Tom Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Tom Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLEARTON:

Move to adopt Amendment 2. I'll explain on...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 1839.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President.  Senate Bill 1839, as amended, allows third-party logistics providers to be licensed under the Wholesale Drug Distribution (Licensing) Act.  We negotiated out this bill with the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation, UPS, so there is no opposition.  And it came out of committee a hundred percent.  I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion?  There being none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1839 pass.  All those in favor will vote Aye.  Opposed, Nay.  The voting is open.  Have all voted who wish?  Have all voted who wish?  Have all voted who wish?  Take the record.  On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present.  Senate Bill 1839, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  On page 7 of the Calendar is the Constitution Amendments 3rd Reading.  This is final action, Ladies and Gentlemen.  Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1.  Senator Harmon, do you wish to proceed?  Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1 had its 1st Reading on April 10th, 2019, its 2nd Reading on April 11th, 2019, and its 3rd Reading on April 12th, 2019.  Senator Harmon wishes to proceed on final action.  Mr. Secretary, read the resolution in full.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1, as amended by Senate Amendment No. 1.

(Secretary reads SJRCA No. 1)

Read in full for a third time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Today I present Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 1. This amendment, when adopted by the Senate, begins the process of presenting to the voters the question of whether or not we, as a State, should amend our State Constitution to eliminate the archaic requirement that the income tax be a flat tax and allow Illinois to join thirty-three other states with a modern tax code that allows us to implement a fair tax, where lower rates apply to lower income levels and higher rates apply to higher income levels. This is the next step in a more than decades-long effort to modernize our tax code. So many of you have been part of that effort. I thank you for all of your work along the way. I ask for your support today in adopting the resolution. And I'd be happy to answer any of your questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Leader Brady, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the resolution, Leader.
SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, as we said in the Executive Committee when this resolution came through, we stand in opposition to this initiative. We believe our current Constitution, crafted by the '70 Constitutional Convention, wisely decided that Illinois taxpayers needed protections against politicians. The fact that our Constitution currently calls for a flat tax has given various protections to those individuals and protected, we believe, the middle class. The elimination of this flat tax provision, we believe severely puts at risk raising taxes higher, particularly on the middle class, middle-income families. The last income tax increase showed, and was reported, that it caused the exodus of middle-income families from Illinois. To solve our problems, we don't need to raise tax rates. What we need to do is create jobs. To create jobs, we need to keep people in this State - middle-income individuals in this State producing for their family and paying taxes that they can afford. State after state has seen this fail and the ending result is they end up imposing higher tax rates on middle-income families and they end up leaving. This is not something that's good for us. This is something I think we will defeat at the citizens' initiative, but the damage that I'm concerned about between now and then is that every state will use the uncertainty in the fact that this holds over our head between now and the November election. In order to compete to recruit and retain jobs, we need to have stability, not uncertainty. This not only eliminates the protections for middle-income, but creates more uncertainty, I believe, and will hurt our ability to attract and retain jobs in this State, which we desperately need. So we stand in opposition of the gentleman's initiative.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McConchie, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator. Can you just, for -- mainly for those people who are watching, just explain what is the vote threshold necessary in order to put this system into place, both here as well as through the process, or in the ballot box next fall?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator, for the question. I will do my best. It's relatively easy to explain the process in the General Assembly. Both Chambers need to approve the resolution with a supermajority vote, a three-fifths vote. Then it goes immediately to the ballot with some -- some more legislative work designed to produce the ballot question and the arguments for and against the amendment. It, coincidentally, does not require the signature of the Governor. It is a legislative resolution. Once all of those pieces are in place, it's presented to the voters at the next general election, which would be in the fall of 2020. At that point, it needs to be approved either by sixty percent of the voters choosing to vote on that question or fifty percent of all of the voters participating in the election.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Thank you. So what is the -- so this -- that would -- the supermajority and -- and -- and such to put that into place, this new structure into place. What is the threshold requirement for essentially setting the rates, the brackets, and the rules that will fit within that structure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

There are no rates embedded in the constitutional amendment. It allows the General Assembly to set the rate or rates of a tax measured on or by income. That's a legislative action, just like any other bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

So, to the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the resolution, Senator.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you to the sponsor for outlining that. This is something I think is very important for the public to understand. They're being -- they have been told -- and my understanding is we're also going to vote today on a series of rates. Changing of the rates, the setting of brackets requires a simple majority of the Legislature and the Governor to sign off on changing that at any point. Okay? So the Governor's been very forthright, very -- and I commend him for --
for doing so, by saying here are the rates in which he proposes and that there has been a commitment to -- to put those rates forward with that super -- you know, that new structure that requires a supermajority to put the new structure in place. My big concern, a big concern for -- for many of us on this side of the aisle and I would say many a concern to people in the public, has been the fact that once -- there's been protection that's been in place with a flat tax; when you're raising rates, you end up raising rates on everybody. So, naturally, the changing of rates becomes not an issue of first resort, but an issue of last resort, because we're essentially offending everybody -- right? -- whenever we raise those rates. As soon as we implement a graduated tax system, we actually make it structurally, both politically, easier to change those rates and brackets going forward. And we have seen in other states across the country a -- once a graduated income tax has been in place, the number of tax increases that are put forward rises. So, in -- in -- in response to that, I put forward a constitutional amendment that I believe is -- is still sitting in Assignments, to require a supermajority to raise taxes, 'cause I do believe that there needs to be protections in place so that when people are sold something, when there's a supermajority requirement to -- to change the system that there is then -- also becomes some break, if you will; that raising taxes should not become an issue of first resort. The Governor's tax hike requires a supermajority for both Chambers and the voters to put in place, but only a simple majority for those rates going forward. What the -- the -- the refusal to consider supermajority requirement to raise taxes going forward, I think tells taxpayers all they need to know and that these rates are temporary. And that's something
that essentially the Governor alluded to when he was asked about that a few weeks ago. Given that, I encourage a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon, to close.

SENATOR HARMON:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to close by responding to some of those points made and by putting to rest the canard that the flat tax somehow protects the middle class. It does exactly the opposite. It subjects the middle class to the same tax treatment as the highest-earning individuals in this State. If you're saying the flat tax is a good idea, you are protecting the -- the uber-rich, not the middle class, because we can't raise taxes on anyone without raising taxes on everyone, and that's a protection for the richest among us. But to say that this is somehow a protection of the middle class is just false. I said something in committee I will say again slightly more politely. Any Member of this Body who's voted for an income tax increase knows just how extraordinarily difficult that is to do. And you know who it's hardest to raise taxes on? Middle class families. They work hard; they earn a living; they don't get benefits for being at the lowest end of the spectrum, like the earned income tax credit; and they aren't making so much money that the income tax doesn't really matter to them. Those are the people that is -- are hardest hit by any flat tax increase. And if we don't adopt the fair tax, the only alternatives we have are to raise taxes on everybody by twenty percent, to cut services like schools and -- and health care services by fifteen percent, or adopting this amendment in conjunction with the tax rates that
Senator Hutchinson is sponsoring, ask the people at the very highest end of the earning scale to pay a little bit more so that ninety-seven percent of Illinoisans - and ninety-seven percent includes all the middle class, by the way - they would pay less. So please don't pretend that you're protecting the middle class by opposing the fair tax. The fair tax is the way that we do protect the middle class and that's why I'm so proud to stand with so many of my colleagues in supporting this for so long. Please vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1, having received the required three-fifths constitutional majority, is adopted and declared passed. Back to Senate Bills 3rd Reading, page 4 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 687. Mr. Secretary...

Correction. Senator Hutchinson seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 687 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 687. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Hutchinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to adopt Amendment 1 and explain it further on 3rd.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Hutchinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator, on your -- Senator Hutchinson, on your amendment.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment -- or Floor Amendment No. 2 will also be explained within the body of the bill and I'd do that on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 687.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
Senate. Senate Amendment No. 1 sets a graduated rate structure for the State's individual income tax. The rate structure will not be enacted unless a constitutional amendment is approved by the voters of Illinois. If the amendment is approved by the voters, a new rate structure will go into effect on January 1st, 2021. In addition to a graduated rate structure for the individual income tax, the bill also increases the corporate income tax rate to 7.99 percent; provides a child tax credit of one hundred dollars per child; increases revenue sharing with local governments by approximately one hundred million dollars; increases the property tax credit by twenty percent, from five percent to six percent. Senate Floor Amendment No. 2 was actually raised very well in committee yesterday by Senator Righter and Senator Oberweis, as we noted that it was not our intent to tax income on -- on -- spousal income or when you file jointly for income that is not derived from the State of Illinois. So I'd like to thank them for raising that. I'm... Mr. President, I can't hear myself.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Can we have some quiet in the Chamber, please?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you. I just wanted to say thank you to my colleagues for raising that in Executive Committee, because it was a point that we wanted to make sure we -- that was not our intent and we drafted this Floor amendment to answer that question so we can clarify that we are not intending to go into income that's derived not in the -- within the State of Illinois. Beyond that, the reason for this was made clear actually during the constitutional amendment discussion. I'm happy to answer any questions as to the rate structure of this thing. This bill actually raises 3.325, so
three billion dollars to handle our structural deficit. We've discussed this ad nauseam. Happy to answer any questions, but looking forward to your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. To the bill, if I might?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber. The vote that we just took and the vote that is before us right now are two of the most important systemic policy changes that most of us, if not all of us, will take in our time here in the Illinois Senate. First of all, I do want to thank Senator Hutchinson for her conversation yesterday in the Senate Executive Committee and for Amendment 2, which removes the unnecessarily punitive prohibition against filing separately on the State -- I'm sorry, separately on the State level and jointly on the federal level. I do appreciate that very much. The issue before us is this, is do we want to switch from a flat tax system in Illinois to a graduated tax in Illinois? Now there's a lot that goes into policymaking. I've been here for a little while and one of the things that I've learned is that there's two -- two parts to making -- policymaking. And one is perhaps doing good things and the other one is not doing things that won't be good. And I would strongly suggest that this issue lands in the latter category and here's why. Since the Governor put out his proposal
for the fair tax to what we have here today, which has been three or four weeks or so, the top rate -- the top marginal rate on this proposal has already gone up and the income to which the top rate is subject for those filing separately has already come down by two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The argument made by many opponents to this and many states who keep a flat tax is that going to a graduated tax makes tax increases more likely. It makes it more likely that a government is going to say, "You know what, let's just ask the people who have a lot of money to give a little more money", which makes it easier not to do the other things. You don't have to believe me when I say that. Look at what's happened the last three or four weeks. The top rate has already gone up. The income threshold to which the maximum rate applies has already come down. But don't just look here, 'cause I can understand we can dismiss that and say, "Well, that's just the Senate", or "that's just negotiations", or "the Governor didn't introduce a bill". Fine. Let's look at what's happened across the country in the last twenty years. For those states that have a flat tax system, they have reduced taxes, cut taxes, twenty-one times in the last twenty years, and on four occasions, the taxes have gone up, and fifty percent of those were done right here. In graduated tax systems, over the same twenty-year period, twenty-four occasions -- on twenty-four occasions the brackets have been expanded, which is another way of saying taxes have gone up, and the income threshold to which the maximum rate, the highest tax rate, applies has been dropped to under one hundred thousand dollars. So, for those of you who have looked at the Governor's proposal and now this proposal and say, "Well, went from a million to seven fifty for those filing separately", you're -- you're on
an elevator. The national experience teaches us you are on an
elevator on the way down. That's why this proposal is so
dangerous. Some believe -- there are a handful who believe that
the answer to government's problems is simply to raise taxes. This
will make it easier for those who believe that to reach into your
constituents' pockets and get more money. We should not make it
easier to raise taxes. The national experience, comparing flat
tax rates and graduated tax rates, teaches us this will make it
easier to do just that. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator -- Senator Hutchinson, to close.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:
Did you say -- did you say close?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Close.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:
Oh, we're going to close. Okay. I thought that was going to
be a little longer debate. Thank you for what I thought was going
to be a dispirited debate. We did this -- we've actually done
this over years, but I will say this, when we look historically at
what has happened across the country, we can't leave Illinois out
of what has happened across the country. And what happened
historically in Illinois is that we destroyed our higher education
system, we have decimated our social service safety net, and we
stopped investing in all the things that every single one of us
that comes to this Chamber decides to run on to protect. We have
-- we have hollowed out State government in a way that makes it
heartbreaking to have a conversation about taxes without talking
about what taxes pay for. Because, at the end of the day, not any
single one of us can do any of the things we care about by ourselves. Not one of us. So when I look at communities across the State and I see what could potentially happen to, oh, a place like Eastern Illinois University and its impact then on Charleston, and what I saw happened to Carbondale and Effingham as SIU struggled, when I see disinvestment in the areas that need it the most and I understand its unique relationship to how we pay for those things, where we put investments, then I look at the tax code in the State of Illinois is based on 1969 - 1969. And in 2019, it's absolutely amazing to me that we would argue to keep things exactly the way they are right now. So I would submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that people who argue to keep things exactly the way they are right now are those folks for whom "way it is right now" is working just fine for them. But it's not working fine for our students. It's not working just fine for our working poor. It's not working just fine for people who wake up in the morning and it's dark and go to sleep in the morning -- and go to sleep at night when it's dark and then wake up and do the exact same thing all over again because we're not making the proper investments in what we said we would invest in to bolster and grow this State. I also wanted to point out, when COGFA did these estimates and the projections - this was another thing that came up in committee yesterday - that we see the most growth in our higher brackets of income. We see the least amount of growth in our lower brackets of income. It was stated earlier today that the last tax increase made middle-class and lower-class folks move out of the State. Actually -- or -- or, actually, we were worried about higher-income folks moving out of the State, and actually what happened is that the lower-income folks left for lack of
opportunity. We had hundreds of thousands of students who decided not to go to school in Illinois because we're arguing that the investment there doesn't matter. It doesn't come from nowhere; it comes from the taxes we pay. A graduated income tax that allows ninety-seven percent of people in this State to pay the same or less, I find it absolutely amazing that you would argue against that - ninety-seven percent of the people. So I would say that people who have been hit the most and the hardest with lack of opportunity and the -- the loss of the services we all rely on are the folks that everyone keeps saying we need to stand up and protect, and so far this is the only plan that does that. There is no other plan on the table to deal with 3.4 billion dollars in a structural deficit that we all know we have. There's no other plan on the table to deal with a fifteen-billion-dollar backlog of bills. And there's no other plan on the table to deal with the fact that we went through four years of the wholesale destruction of all the things that we call dear in this State because of lack of investment, gimmicks, political gamesmanship, not being open and transparent about the financial situation and the situation we find ourselves in right now. We did not do that. So, today, we're going to do that. We're going to say that the people that we have continually tried to balance the budget on the backs of can no longer afford that. They can no longer afford it. Their backs can't bear that anymore. So, for those parents who are trying to figure out how to keep the pieces together, for those folks that are stringing together two and three different jobs but they pay taxes coming and going every which way they can, for those people who know that they're in the middle, the thing that Senator Harmon just notated, they don't make -- they don't make enough to get the
breaks at the lower income levels and the income tax rate spread at that stage actually matter to how they -- how they balance the books. It actually matters to them. These people is what a fair tax actually protects. So I just want you to keep in mind that when we leave here and the natural rhetoric starts again that people who argue for this to stay the same are the very people for whom this situation is working just fine for them. I'm going to stand here and speak for the ninety-seven percent of the people in this State for whom it's not. And we need to be brave enough to do something about it. This isn't about the next election. This is about the next generation. And it's time to do something. I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 687 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 voting Aye, 22 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 687, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. President Cullerton, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Put the...

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have an announcement. I'd like to make some introductions. We have three distinguished guests here today. First of all, I'd like to introduce the Chairman of the Chicago White Sox and the Chicago Bulls, Jerry Reinsdorf. Like to welcome him to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:
Also with us is the Manager of the 2005 World Series Champion Chicago White Sox, Ozzie Guillén.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate, Coach.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

And, finally, a man who is taller than the State Treasurer, three-time World Champion Chicago Bulls' Horace Grant.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

I'd like to welcome them to Springfield and I think we just raised your income taxes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Continuing on page 4. Senate Bill 690. Senator Manar seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 690 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 690. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar, on your amendment.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment becomes the bill. I would ask for its adoption and be happy to answer questions on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted.
Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 690.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is a third in our series of bills today. This one specifically...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Let's get some quiet in the Chamber, please.

SENATOR MANAR:

This bill deals with an issue that I believe affects all of our constituents in our varying districts and that is the rate of property tax growth in the State. So this bill puts forward a fairly simple concept. It says that beginning in fiscal year 2022 that if the Legislature and the Governor fully fund the evidence-based formula, along with the mandated categorical programs that we require of school districts, then school districts would be denied the ability to raise their property tax rate for that year. We had a good debate on the bill in the Senate Executive Committee and I'd be happy to take any questions here on the Floor.
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, before we can proceed, we need to get some quiet in the Chamber. Thank you. Senator Barickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know, we have just returned from what is characteristically called the two-week spring break that this Legislature is afforded around Easter. I use that two weeks to conduct a series of town halls and relevant to this question of property taxes was an issue that came up in every single one of my town halls. The question, of course, is, "What is Illinois going to do about property taxes?" And "when are we going to be serious about the devastating effect that property taxes are having on our State?" Of course, the real test for any property tax relief is whether it's real or not. And I think what we heard in the -- in committee yesterday, we heard from the sponsor here again on the Floor, is that this property tax relief is not, in fact, real. Now this bill is attached to the prior proposal that would increase taxes by three and a half billion dollars. And so I take you to those town hall meetings, where the question was asked of me, what -- "What is property tax relief in this State?" "How do we define property tax relief?" And all of us who are going to go home this summer, this fall, we're going to meet with our constituents, are going to be asked the question of, from our constituents, "How did you deliver meaningful property tax to me?" Interestingly, right now, May,
the month of May, many counties around the State are issuing their property tax bills. Each of our -- each of our constituents is going to open that piece of mail and they're going to know one thing with certainty, which is their bill, this year, is higher than last year's. The proposal before us today does nothing to stem that problem. What -- the only issue that we know with certainty that is in front of us now is that if you vote for this proposal, it only goes into effect if a number of contingencies are satisfied. Some of those contingencies lie with this General Assembly and future General Assemblies. Some of those contingencies lie with the decisions your school districts will make. But the one thing that is certain in this proposal, the one guarantee that exists with this proposal, is that if this goes into effect all of the people of this State will see a 3.4-billion-dollar tax increase. That's the only guarantee that exists here. Everything else -- we heard it in committee yesterday, just heard it on the Floor now -- everything else that purports to potentially happen in property taxes is conditional. It's conditional property tax relief. It relies on a series of ifs and contingencies for which our constituents know are too unlikely never to occur. Now, if the Body was serious about property tax relief, we'd do a property tax relief bill, and it wouldn't be attached to a graduated -- a tax increase proposal that amounts to 3.4 billion dollars. So I urge the Body to get serious about this issue. Property taxes are crushing the people of this State. If we want to get serious about it, let's work together to do that. This side of the -- this side of aisle stands ready to address meaningful property tax relief, but anything that is attached to a 3.4-billion-dollar tax increase is not designed to generate the
relief that Illinoisans deserve. I urge a No vote on this measure. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Any other Members seeking recognition? Last speaker, President Cullerton.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the bill. We seem to be still debating the bill that just passed, where ninety-seven percent of Illinoisans will get a tax break and the upper three percent will have to finally help us close our structural deficit. So that's one part of the debate. The second part of the debate is the merits of this particular bill. Now when you talk about property taxes, there's much confusion in the State. A lot of people in this State think that the State of Illinois gets property taxes. We don't get a penny. A lot of people say they want their property taxes to go down, but when two-thirds of it goes to their schools, they don't really want the schools to get less money. So it's a very complicated and contentious issue. So this is a real attempt - a real attempt - to finally do something in a straightforward way to freeze property tax rates and incentivize the General Assembly to fully fund education. That's what this bill does. It's a very straightforward bill. If we -- after all our bipartisan work to get a good school aid formula, if we fully fund it, the property tax rates will be frozen on a yearly basis. And we then decide in the appropriation process whether we want that freeze or not. So the school districts, the teachers' unions, anybody who's interested in education, anybody who wants to make sure there's a property tax freeze for two-thirds of their school of their property taxes should be supportive of this bill.
And I commend the sponsor, Senator Manar, for his work on the formula that this is tied to and for his innovative idea in making sure that we have freezes of property taxes going forward. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar, to close.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the remarks of both of the speakers. I would just close by saying this, when -- when our caucus sat down and continued the discussions about the burden of property taxes in this State, that didn't happen with this bill. If you recall, we -- we've had several votes on attempts to limit the growth of property taxes in this State that go back to, I think it was under former Senator Meeks, who had a bill that would institute a -- a swap, income taxes for property tax relief. I don't know how many Members of the Republican side of the aisle voted for that. My guess is zero. Maybe I'm wrong, but my guess is zero. During the "grand bargain" debate, we had a couple of votes on a tax freeze and my recollection there is fairly clear. There were zero votes from the Republican side of the aisle. Sounds like, on this one, there's going to be zero again, which brings me to my point, that the question I have is, "Are you serious about property tax relief?" Because this is the way to do it. This is putting our shoulders into it. This doesn't do it immediately. No one claims that it does. We didn't have that debate in committee. I acknowledge this is effective on January 1 of 2021, but that's because it's the responsible thing to do. The previous two measures set up the ability to do this, to fund schools responsibly, to stay on the path toward greater equity,
and to reasonably say to school districts, "If we do our job, then you need to do your job." And if we can thread that needle, then we might get to a place to where we are seriously addressing what I think we all know is a big problem for our State. This is an incremental step. This is not going to solve the problem, but it is the most serious step, I would say, we can take at this time, coupled with tax reform. That's what this bill does. To the Senate President's point – it needs to be made one more time – the question about property tax rates will be part of a budget conversation under this bill. So, FY'22 forward, a vote on the budget will either keep the tax rate cap in place or lift it. I think that's something that we ought to welcome here on the Floor of the Senate. We should loop in the direct conversation about tax rates to the State budget, because we all know that they have a direct impact on what school districts do. So, in the future, under this measure, a vote on a budget would also be a vote on a very significant piece of everyone's property tax bill in this State. That is a good step in the right direction. It's a good step for good public policy in the State of Illinois. I appreciate the debate. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 690 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 voting Aye, 18 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 690, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll be going to Senate Bill 689. President Cullerton. Correction. Senator -- President Cullerton seeks leave
of the Body to return Senate Bill 689 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 689. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Move for the adoption of the amendment. Debate the bill on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 689.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. We just passed, a few minutes ago, Senate Joint Resolution Constitution
Amendment No. 1. If it should pass the House and go on the ballot and be approved, it goes into effect in January of 2021. This bill is tied to that constitutional amendment. This bill would repeal the estate tax in Illinois, assuming the constitutional amendment passes. It's estimated that in Senate -- fiscal year '20, Illinois will bring in approximately three hundred and five million dollars in estate tax revenue. The reason why it's tied to the constitutional amendment is because the constitutional amendment, if passed, and the accompanying rates bill will bring in over three billion dollars. We can't afford to lose this three hundred and five million until that happens. That's why it's tied. But the fact is, this would eliminate the estate tax. It's a major issue for people of wealth and farmers and, of course, people who -- who have a perception that they're going to pay this tax. And I feel that it's irresponsible to eliminate it now, but if this constitutional amendment and the tax rates that we passed would become law, it is something which would be responsible in light of the fact that we're asking wealthier folks to pay more in taxes. So, for that reason, I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There any discussion? Senator McConchie, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR McCONCHIE:  

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:  

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President, for bringing this forward. I -- I'm -- just to say, generally speaking, I support
a repeal of the estate tax. You know, the thing is, is that we've done this before. We repealed the estate tax in 2009 just to promptly put it back into place in 2010. And without any sort of limitations, if you will, on how we're going to put these things back in the future, given our history, given the fact that we repealed it, realized, oh, we'd rather have that money coming in and spend it on other things, there is no protections to ensure that the estate tax goes away forever. And -- so this is set to sunset in 2021. There's actually no limitations for the majority, since it's a simple majority to change this, along with the Governor, to go even next year, maybe in Veto Session of 2020 after this constitutional amendment's put in place, and remove this provision. I -- it's -- this is something that needs to be done. It needs to be done with -- fairly and it needs to be done -- the issue here is the fact that we still do not have any sort of guarantees that this would stay in place. I would encourage a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Further discussion? President Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 689 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 voting Aye, 24 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 689, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will now be going to Senate Bill 651.
Majority Leader Lightford. Majority Leader Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 651 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 651. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Majority Leader Lightford, on your amendment.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 651 prevents alternative...

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

On the amendment, Senator.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

On the amendment. The amendment is just technical in nature. I'd be happy to discuss it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Majority Leader Lightford, on Amendment 3.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

This is another amendment that added some additional technical languages {sic}, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 651.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Majority Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 51 -- 651 prevents alternative electric and gas suppliers from converting participants in both the LIHEAP and the PIPP programs from their current public utility provider to the alternative supplier unless done so in accordance with an approved program. Pretty much, this is an issue that's been floating around for a couple years. Our previous Attorney General was working on this initiative. I'm glad to know that our current Attorney General, Kwame Raoul, who was a former Member, also worked on this. His staff has been in a number of negotiations with the industry partners. What we're hoping from this is to still allow the industry to provide services but to also protect the customers. There's a lot of consumer opportunities here where they're just being gouged. The rates are unbelievable. I'm actually a victim
of one of the utility companies. I'm always giving my personal story because I was running through the airport and I was offered some miles, and we all know we want those extra AAdvantage miles. But my electric bill remained the same for a couple of months. It went up slightly the second month. By the third or four month, it ballooned to an eight-hundred-dollar electric bill for one month. And we all know that that's way too expensive for a single family home with only two people in the household. What this bill also does is it makes sure that the automatic contract renewal is in place, which would stop the rollover cycle. So if your contract is coming up for renewal, you should be notified to have an opportunity to stay on that plan or to rollover. We see an -- a significant amount of low-income communities who are all participants in this plan, more so than any other communities in the City of Chicago and around the State. This Act is called HEAT Act, which is our Home Energy Affordability and Transparency. And I'd be happy to go into more details if Members have questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There any discussion? Seeing none, Majority Leader Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you very much. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 651 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 43 voting Aye, 10 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 651, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With
leave of the Body, we'll be going to page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 104. Senator Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, today I have a special guest with me, one of my mayors from my district, from the Village of Dolton, the Honorable Riley Rogers. Just want to give him a-- a nice Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Senate Bill 104. Senator Villivalam seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 104 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 104. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Sandoval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Sandoval, on your amendment.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to adopt Amendment No. 2 and to be explained on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Sandoval.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Sandoval, on Floor Amendment 3.
SENATOR SANDOVAL:
   Thank you, Mr. President. I ask to adopt Amendment No. 3, to be explained on 3rd Reading by the great Senator Villivalam.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)
   Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   No further amendments reported.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)
   3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   Senate Bill 104.
   (Secretary reads title of bill)
3rd Reading of the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Villivalam.
SENATOR VILLIVALAM:
   Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 104, as amended, requires that each subcontract {sic} (subcontractor) must be paid within seven business day -- seven business days of their prime contract {sic} (contractor) receiving payment. This legislation also enacts a few transparency measures as it relates to subcontracts. This was a compromise. As it stands right now,
prime -- prime contractors have fifteen calendar days to remit payment to subcontractors. This bill initially would have made it so that IDOT pays subcontractors promptly and directly, especially given that payments are done electronically. Again, it's -- it's making it so that it's seven business days. IDOT is neutral on this legislation. Organizations that support are the Mechanical Contractors Association of Chicago, the Illinois Mechanical & Specialty Contractors Association, the Hispanic American Construction Industry Association, and the Federation of Women Contractors. I would respectfully ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There any discussion? Senator DeWitte, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR DeWITTE:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to this legislation. There are still some significant opponents to this bill, including some of our roadbuilding organizations and general contractors. Contractors don't submit invoices to IDOT. IDOT makes periodic contractual payments pursuant to contractual obligations. Most prime contractors are small business owners. This would create an additional burden that they would have problems handling. They simply don't have the personnel to confirm that invoices are proper, work is completed, and then can process in seven days. Prime contractors are not receiving payments from the State for their work every two weeks. And I would add that
State law currently provides for penalties if a contractor does not pay within the fifteen-day time period. I urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

No other speakers, Senator Villivalam, to close.

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, this is -- this is pro-business legislation that would help grow tens of thousands of small businesses in the State of Illinois without any costs to the State. Some may ask, "Will this" -- "will a week really make a difference?" And to these subcontractors who have to deal with cash flow issues on a daily/weekly basis the answer is yes. So I would -- I would respectfully ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 104 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 voting Aye, 17 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 104, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Sims, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SIMS:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR SIMS:

Mr. President, we've been joined today with -- by some individuals who are joining us in the President's Gallery, the 100 Black Men of Chicago, who are here advocating on behalf of the
communities that we serve. So we want to welcome them to Springfield. Give them a warm -- warm welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome to the Senate. With leave of the Body, we'll be in the middle of page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 471. Senator Hutchinson seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 471 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 471. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Hutchinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hutchinson, on your amendment.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Floor Amendment No. 2 deletes all, becomes the bill, but it retains the language to address one typographical error, which we're going to fix, and I can talk about on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 471.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Body. Senate Floor -- or Senate -- let me -- let me go back. As amended, Senate Bill 471 creates the Healthy Workplace Act. It'll require all employers with more than one employee to provide paid sick time to full- and part-time employees. Employees would earn up to forty hours paid sick time per year at a rate of one hour for every forty hours worked. Employees would not be able to take sick time for the first hundred eighty days of employment. Leave could be used for illness of the employee or a family member, to care for children in the event of a school closure, for the need related to domestic or sexual violence, or to visit family in prison and attend related court proceedings. Employers are not required to pay for unused sick time when the employee leaves the employer. This is a bill that has passed out of the Senate, I believe twice. There is -- I wanted to note for the Body, there were some suggestions in the Executive Committee that I have every intention of helping to work out when it gets over to the House. Due to the timeline of the schedule though, we're not going to be able to do that unless we can get this bill over to the House. And I think people who have been working for so long without benefits deserve us to try this one more time to get that over there and get a product that would be good for all workers once this is done. So I wanted to give my commitment that this is -- there's going to be
some changes when this goes over there and I would never presume to say that we do all the work in the Senate and there's nothing else to do in the other Chamber. So, with your indulgence, I would appreciate Aye votes, but I'm happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber. Senator Hutchinson is exactly right when she says that this legislation has passed the Senate before, I think on two occasions. On neither one of those occasions has the bill advanced out of the House of Representatives. There's a reason for that. It is because the bill isn't right the way it is now. I appreciate the comments that we're up against some deadline, but the 3rd Reading deadline off the Senate Floor passed some time ago. There isn't any reason that we can't get an extension here to make sure that this bill is right here. And why that's so important is because you are going to be asked to vote for a bill that, yes, says the Healthy Workplace bill; there's a provision in the bill that would allow the employee to take paid sick time in order to go to their own sentencing hearing after they've been convicted of or pled guilty to a crime. That question was asked and answered yesterday in the Executive Committee as to whether or not such a hypothetical fits within the provisions of the bill. The answer from the bill's
proponents was yes. The individual who works for the small employer in your district who pleads guilty or is convicted at trial of burglary or domestic battery or something like that and has to attend their sentencing hearing, if this is the law, would be allowed paid sick time in order to go to the hearing to find out whether they're going to go to jail. Now we can all have reasonable differences of opinion on what exactly employers should and should not pay for. A parent, a father or a mother, who needs to spend time with a sick child or an ill -- or an ill parent, that's one thing, Mr. President, but surely, surely, we can all get on board with the notion that a small business owner should not be required to pay an employee whose pled guilty to or been convicted of a horrible crime to go to their own sentencing hearing. I'll guarantee you, particularly for the people who have not been in this Chamber very long, this is one of those bills you will go home, if you vote for this, and at some point, one of your constituents, probably a small business owner who is just getting by, struggling to afford, let's say, health care benefits for their employees, is going to look you in the eye and say, "Did you really vote for that?" This is one of those bills. There's a reason it doesn't move in the House. Let's fix it here before we move it out of the Chamber. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There being no other speakers, Senator Hutchinson, to close.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, it's interesting, 'cause even in that -- in that hypothetical situation, that person, if they were truly convicted, wouldn't be coming back to work. So that's interesting. I have been passionately in support of this
issue because we are one of the only countries in the world that does not have a federal policy across the country for how we handle sick leave. And the reason you see a number of different bills that -- that go between Chambers all the time for -- whether we're talking about parents or whether we're talking about how you take time off if you've been the victim of a crime or if you are a grandparent raising children or your grandchildren or any of those other scenarios is because we have a workforce for whom there are millions of people who do not have access to FMLA, do not have access to a nice office job, where everyone comes in and gives them a baby shower when they're ready to have a baby. We have people who string together hourly jobs all the time. We're talking about millions of people who have no access to a day off. Forget the -- the fact that we've talked ad nauseam as we've debated this, because this is like -- it's true, it's passed out of here twice. That -- people come to work sick and handle all kinds of responsibilities sick because they are worried to death about caring for their responsibilities that we all have to care for when we're trying to do that balance. So I have -- I have worked on this and worked on this and worked on this. And I think there were some good suggestions that came up in Exec yesterday that could maybe add some flexibility. Somethings went, I thought, a little bit too far, but that's what a negotiated process is between the Chambers. And I respect all of my colleagues who sometimes will come to pieces of legislation with all kinds of reasons to want to pause. And I'm asking the Body to keep working - not to pause - to keep working. We offer this to each other as colleagues all the time. And if it doesn't come out of the House, then you got your wish, it didn't come out of the House. But, today, in the
Illinois State Senate, I want us to keep working. And the one thing that I've always prided myself on is that when I give my word to keep working, I keep working. So people ask me all the time whether or not I'm going to keep filing this bill. I'm going to keep filing this bill until it becomes law. So if you don't see me now, you're going to see me when it comes back. I'm going to keep working. And I ask you to think about all the people in your districts who have to choose between stringing together their hourly jobs and paying the bills and paying the rent and worrying that, when school is closed, they'll lose their job; when somebody gets sick in their family, they'll lose their job; if you're taking care of parents and children at the same time, you will lose your job - all of those insecurities that happen to all those people who live in your districts. Please think about them and let us keep working. I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 471 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 34 voting Aye, 15 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 471, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, please be advised, committee -- yeah, deadline this Friday by the close of business on the amendments for House bills. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of noon on the 2nd day of May 2019. The Senate stands adjourned. Senate stands adjourned.