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The regular Session of the 99th 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 Father Dan Smilanic, Vicar of Canonical Services, Archdiocese of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

FATHER DAN SMILANIC:

(Prayer by Father Dan Smilanic)

Please remain standing for the Pledge Allegiance. Senator Cunningham.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Cunningham)

Mr. Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:


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

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcript. There being no objection, so ordered. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Education,
reports Motion to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2393, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2823 Recommend Do Adopt; House Joint Resolution 127 Be Adopted.

Senator Mulroe, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Health, reports Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 550, Motions to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2300, House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2929, and House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3335 Recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Forby, Chairperson of the Committee on Labor, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 {sic} (4) to Senate Bill 3163 Recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Will all Members at the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? Just a friendly reminder, today is May 31st, final action. Please come to the Senate Floor immediately. With leave of the Body, we'll turn to page 20 of the printed Calendar, House Bills 2nd Reading. House Bill 4532. Senator Biss. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4532.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

3rd Reading. John Marschitz, WBBM-TV, seeks permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Lisa Yuscius, Blueroomstream.com, seeks permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission granted. With leave of the Body, we'll turn to page 17 of the printed Calendar, House Bill 3126. Senator
Forby. Senator Forby seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3126 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3126. Mr. Secretary, have there been any -- amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby, on your amendment.

SENATOR FORBY:

I'd like to put it on 3rd -- explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, 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 -- no further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 3126. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3126.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby, on your bill.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. This bill comes back up. Senator Raoul run a
bill on 5/15/15 {sic}, and in negotiations that Farm Bureau and the Truckers wasn't involved, so they agreed to go ahead and run the bill and they'd come back and work -- work this bill out. So this year they got together and worked the bill out. And I didn't think there's any opposition. I'm not sure they still are. But what this bill does, on speeding tickets -- this is for cameras that goes to the police department. The first three hundred and thirty dollars, every forty dollars, there's a surcharge from the farmers, and after the three hundred and thirty dollars, that fifteen-dollar fee goes down to ten dollars from there on. So, that's -- that's a pretty good compromise. So I just ask for you to look at this bill and I'd have an Aye vote or any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3126 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 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 3126, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 3760. Senator Biss. House Bill 4259. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. House Bill 4326. Senator Forby. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4326.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby, on your bill.

SENATOR FORBY:
Thank you. This bill is -- when you look at it, you might think it's a little tough bill, but when you think about it -- the more you think about it, the more it becomes a good bill. This bill is about -- when I get done explaining, you'll understand. This bill's about education, it's about jobs, and it's about our correction system. What I'd like to do is see in Hardin County, we got a work camp down there and I'd like to see what -- Hardin County Work opened back up. In the Governor proposal this year, he put in a hundred million dollars more, so all I'm asking for is about one percent of that money to go back into my district, so we can open it up. And really, if everybody would -- could've walked through this place before it closed down, I don't think I'd have any opposition in this room. These are the people that goes out and cleans the streets up. A city has -- have a problem, a tornado, they're the first one there and the last one to leave. And all these -- all these prisoners, too, is not forced to go. They can -- they can raise their hand and say, I want to go or I don't, want to stay. And they -- and they -- and they put out a garden like you wouldn't believe, six hundred tomato plants. Some of these people that's in this -- in prisons never seen a tomato plant, never seen a garden. They didn't have a clue what they done. They got into it, they loved it. They had arts and crafts, where they done arts and crafts. And one of the big things they done, even, they had bee hives at a prison. And in the daytime, there was no fence down there; you could walk through all the prison all -- everybody and everybody -- it was no issue, no problems. But even -- when -- when we had the flood down there, they were the first people there putting sandbags out. So these people, they give back to the State. Most of our other prisons
don't give back to the State and COGFA was -- went down and looked at it. They voted two to seven to keep it open. And one of the prisoners - I was there - one of the prisoners said, "You know what? When I get out, I never want to go back into jail again, but if I ever had to go back in, I'd want to go to Hardin County."

So it's a good mental -- it's good education, it's a good job, and I -- I'm just asking for about one percent of the money that the Governor proposal {sic}.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Forby, I listened carefully to your opening and some of the great things that have gone on at the Hardin Work Camp. But just to step back a step or two and I think we're going -- this is going to be a -- a topic of discussion, I would assume, this entire day, and that is how would you propose to pay for the operations of the work camp? In other words, you mentioned some extra money that the Governor had proposed to put into the Department of Corrections' budget. I'm not intimately familiar with that, but I know that that hundred million dollars is spoken for. So where are you going to take the money that you want to run the Hardin Work Camp with? Who is going to lose that money? Is it going to be DOC employees, who are members of AFSCME, and say you're not getting your overtime or your salary? Is it
going to be food service at DOC? I mean, give me -- give me an idea of where that money's coming from.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR FORBY:

You know, the figures I've seen is a hundred million dollars. I haven't seen any place where it's line itemed, where it's supposed to go and what it's supposed to do. You know, I -- I work my district. I got thirteen counties in my district, so out of that hundred million dollars, I'm not asking too much from my State. It's all tax people's money that's paying in there, so I think since we've had prisons shut down and work camps shut down, I think it's only -- only fair that I'm asking for -- for a certain percent, that it should be looked at.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, I'm going to ask you again, where you going to take it from in the DOC budget? Where are you going to take it from? Food service? AFSCME members? Inmate safety? Installation of new cameras for security that we're not going to do? Where are you going to take that money from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR FORBY:

Well, I think that could be in the -- in the negotiations and we see -- we got to know -- we got to see where this money is going -- and so far we do not see and I think there'll be an appropriation bill out there down the road that will -- will -- when people look
at this, I think they're going to say this is the way we need to go.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
    Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
    To the bill, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
    To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
    Ladies and Gentlemen, we've gone now another step down this road to where, first, you are on the edge of calling for a vote a budget that spends a mind-boggling seven billion dollars more than our anticipated revenue, but that's not enough. Now you want to say that the things that the Governor is wanting to do to manage this State because we're in such a critical fiscal position, that you don't want him to do. So you want to spend the money, although you don't have the money, and then you want to say this is what I want to spend the money on even though I don't have it. I don't blame Senator Forby for advocating for his district at all, but I do have a problem with us not being honest with the -- whether it's the people who work at the Hardin Work Camp or the people in his district or anyone else. We do not have the money. Stop acting like it grows on trees. This is not the right path. You continue down this path, at some point you have to stop saying let's spend money on this and this and this and set some priorities, and if you don't, this State will continue the downward spiral fiscally and therefore economically. The middle class that you preach so much about will continue to get squeezed if we continue to do things like this, Mr. President. I urge a No vote.
Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is -- this is important to me, because I've got two corrections facilities in my district. One is in Vandalia, where we had a work camp. We had a complete farm, where offenders learned how to work. And, you know, I -- I was fortunate growing up, I -- I had a dad who taught me how to work. I mean, he literally -- I laid underneath the car with him and hand -- you know, he told me what wrench to hand -- hand him and laughed at me when it was the wrong one and -- and I learned. But a lot of offenders don't have that opportunity and so one of the best things we can give them is the opportunity to learn how to work. Now, I don't believe that this should have been a mandate, and I told the sponsor this, I don't think this should have been us mandating to put this in the budget. I, too, agree that we need to find other things. If we're going -- if we're going to add two million here, we need to cut two million somewhere else, and I've got plenty of cuts to make up for two million. You may not all like them, as in shifting pension costs down to local districts for universities and K through twelve in trade for unfunded mandates. You didn't like the one that was a two-hundred-million-dollar savings to lower our Community Care Program from three times the national average to 2.2. There are places to find
two million dollars. And this, work camps, perhaps not in Hardin because of the cost of the facility -- that it's going to take to transform it, maybe it's not the right place here, but as far as our corrections facilities, this has to become a priority. If you really want to do something good for these people, you really want to invest in their future, you teach them how to work. It's not that they don't want to. Most of the time they've just never been taught how to. And so in light of the budget situation, we need to make this a priority at Vandalia, if it's at Hardin or somewhere else, this has to be a priority. I'm -- I'm not going to vote in favor of the bill, I'm going to be Present, but I -- I -- I'm telling you, this needs to be something we seriously consider. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Forby, to close.

SENATOR FORBY:

I just want to thank -- you know, on the money, again, you know, the Governor talked about appropriation, he put up a hundred million, I figure he'll figure out a way to appropriate this money and that's why it's come to a budget. And if you want to help your prisoners, everybody talks in here about helping prisoners, these guys they get GED, they learn how -- they learn how to -- to farm. They don't -- a lot of 'em didn't even know how to start a lawnmower, they didn't know how to start a lawnmower. It was exciting for them to learn how to take a spark plug out, how to start a mower, and they pushed it. So, I think this -- I think this is a good bill and I think it's good for corrections and I think it's good for the State. I ask for an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall House Bill 4326 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's 36 Ayes, 14 Nays, 3 voting Present. House Bill 4326, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 4423. Senator Harris. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4423.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 4423 is a TIF extension for the City of Oak Forest, a city which I represent. There's no opposition. I respectfully ask an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4423 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 55 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. House Bill 4423, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 4589. Leader Muñoz. House Bill 4675. Senator McGuire. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4675.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McGuire, on your bill.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 4675 is an initiative of the Illinois Community College Board. It reclassifies the ICCB Adult Education and Career and Technical Education Fund from special funds to federal funds. I know of no opposition. Ask for an Aye vote, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4675 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 4675, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Nybo, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR NYBO:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the purpose of two introductions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your introductions.

SENATOR NYBO:

Can I ask my guests here on our Floor to please stand? Everybody, I -- you know, I -- I came here, what in -- August, but
really in January of '15 and shortly thereafter I was joined by a wonderful and extremely helpful Legislative Assistant, Mitch Behna, who I think many of you have gotten to know. Mitch is actually down here as well with his mother, Carol Behna, and I just wanted to take an opportunity to introduce them. I want to thank Mitch for all his help; he's doing a wonderful job. And -- and I can see he's doing a wonderful job because he was raised by a wonderful mother, who used to be a resident of Elmhurst and Lombard. She's a mother of five. And now, unfortunately, Elmhurst and Lombard couldn't keep her. She moved to, Senator Connelly, Naperville. But she's a nurse at the -- in the Advocate Health System, which is a wonderful health system. It's a delight to have her down here today, and so I want to thank Mitch for the hard work that he's doing and, perhaps more importantly, I want to thank his mother for raising such a wonderful young man and for lending him to us in the work that we do down here, so, thank you. Can we all extend them a very warm welcome and -- and show appreciation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome to Springfield. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR REZIN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I, too, have a very special guest here today. His name is Jon Scholtes. He is my neighbor from Morris. He graduated Morris High School,
valedictorian. Went to the University of Illinois and recently graduated with a political science major. He is a member of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity. Last year, Senator Rose, my colleague, had the opportunity -- Jon had the opportunity to work with Senator Rose and I'm proud to say that Jon will be working in my office this summer as well. I'd like a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome to Springfield. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WEAVER:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Yeah. Thank you very much. I'm honored to have with me Becca Alcenius and I met this young lady three years ago. She had the opportunity to job shadow me through the program her high school has, and when she called this summer, asking about being an intern, it was an easy decision, jumped on it immediately, 'cause she's an intelligent young lady who's wanting to make her impact in the world. She's currently at George Washington University as a sophomore and studying international affairs and possibly international law. So I want you to welcome Becca to the Senate Floor. Thank you for your help.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome to Springfield. Senator Rose, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSE:
Mr. President, I would like the record to reflect my intention to vote Yes on House Bill 3126. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Your intentions will be reflected. Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I, too, have a unique experience here to share with the Body. Next to me stands Madison Cowell. I'm not introducing her to you today, because I've done that before. She literally had such a wonderful time being here a couple weeks ago, she chose to come back on our last day of Session and once again seep herself into the political arena. Just graduated from Beardstown High School, very interested in politics and law. So, please, if you have time, come over, introduce yourself and maybe share a little bit more of your experience, so she really does understand how this place works. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Madison Cowell.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome back. Senator Rose, do you seek permission? Okay. Senator Noland, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR NOLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, for about the last ten years, I've been coming down here to annoy most of you. Today is a very -- well, it's a bittersweet day. This is the last day that I'll have my family down here to introduce to all of you. If
any of you want to see what ten years looks like when you -- when you blink your eyes, I have these pictures of my -- my daughter, Claire, who's here tonight, my -- today, and my son, Lucien, and I kept telling myself I'm going to change these pictures, I'm going to change these pictures. These are the pictures that we took when we first came down here in -- in 2007 and here they are today ten years later, and, of course, time flies when you're having fun. So, just wanted to introduce to you the only people that have endured my annoying entreaties over the last ten years more, the three blessings in my life, my lovely wife, Veronica, who is a member of our local school board U46; my daughter, Claire, who's now a second baseman and on her tournament-winning softball team, the Elgin Heat; and that rascal of rascals, that soothsayer beyond his years, Lucien, the light of our life, Lucien Laude Noland. I ask you to give them all a warm Springfield welcome for perhaps our last time. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome back and it's always a pleasure seeing you. With leave of the Body, we'll turn back to page 17 of the printed Calendar, House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 3760. Senator Biss. Senator Biss seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3760 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3760. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Biss.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss, on your amendment.

SENATOR BISS:
Thank you, Mr. President. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 3760. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3760.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss, on your bill.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 3760 is a transparency initiative that simply obligates local governments to make a report to the Department of Revenue of property tax abatements that they grant in the -- in -- with the goal of economic development. Happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Will the sponsor yield?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. Senator Biss, you and I had somewhat of a robust discussion during committee about this legislation, and while I'm extraordinarily supportive of the concept of what it is you're trying to do, I had some significant questions about how this was going to work. So, with regards specifically to TIF districts, which are incentives to businesses to locate within a TIF area, how do you anticipate that incentive being reported? Do each of the individual taxing bodies need to make that report to -- to us, to the General Assembly and to the Governor on an annual basis, or do you anticipate that it would only be the municipality that would have initiated that TIF?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you for that question. As I -- as I read this bill, I think the crucial word is in the definition of "tax incentive", it's a property tax abatement or property tax rebate granted by a governmental entity, not simply affecting a governmental entity. So specifically in your example, it would be the municipality that grants the TIF that would be obligated to report it, not every other local body that might be affected by it, for instance, a school district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. That's good for that clarification. Thank you.
And then can you also elaborate for me how you actually envision the entities reporting the incentives? Do they need to list each individual entity that receives the incentives? Do they do it in an aggregate amount? How -- how do you anticipate that being handled?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you for that question, too. To -- in order to ensure the administrative functionality of this reporting process, the bill grants what you might characterize as extremely broad rulemaking authority to the Department of Revenue. Here it says, "The report shall be made on a form to be supplied by the Department of Revenue and shall have attached to it an executed copy of the agreement." So, specifically, Department of Revenue would have the authority to promulgate rules to address each one of those questions and I would simply defer to their judgement, and I think as a Body, we would do well to watch that process closely and I would -- would certainly expect we'd be satisfied with the outcome, but if for some reason we weren't, we might be able next year to enact further legislation to further refine the process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. My last question, Senator. The intent, though, is not to -- to broaden regulatory processes for our local units of government; the idea is to be more transparent, have that information available to the taxpayer, but not to make this more of an onerous process on our units of local government?
I'm -- I'm looking for a yes or no to that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Yes, that's exactly right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Biss. The question is, shall House Bill 3760 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 is 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 3760, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 4259. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4259.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, on your bill.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 4259 prohibits members of certain organizations from being considered an employee for purposes of collecting a pension benefit through IMRF, SURS, or TRS. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4259 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 4259, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On page 18 of the printed Calendar, House Bill 5009. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5009.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans, on your bill.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is an agreed-to bill that is amending the Specialized Mental Health Rehabilitation Act to provide provisional licenses for facilities expires at the end of the three-year period, would start at the date of the provisional license getting issued. I would urge an Aye vote. I don't know of any opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5009 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 5009, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5104. Senator Manar. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
House Bill 5104.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Manar, on your bill.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill came out of the Labor Committee. It would simply say that the Department of Corrections shall not enter into contracts that would reduce the number of medical or mental health employees of the Department lower than any number employed on January 1st of 2016. I'd be happy to take any questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, it -- let me tell you what it simply says. What it simply says is, on or after the effective date of this amendatory Act, the -- the Department of Corrections may not let bids for contracts that would have the -- the effect of reducing the number of Department employees, meaning those hired directly by the State, whose employment is related to the provision of medical and mental health services, lower than the number of Department employees as of January the 1st, 2016. That's what it says. That number was a hundred and fifty, which includes nurses
and techs. Now, many of our services are contracted out to a company named Wexford, who hires, as needed, those professionals to take care of those in Corrections. What we're doing here and -- and -- what we're doing is saying to the Executive Branch, we're not going to give you the ability to go up or downwards as to who we hire, when we hire them, where we hire them. And there's nowhere else in State government where we put a floor on the number of employees on any class or type of employee within any other department. Yet, what we're doing here is saying, we're going to put handcuffs on you and you've got to have a hundred and fifty. Now, I admitted in the committee that, you know, if -- if we are understaffed in Corrections, because we have had forty million dollars in overtime over the last ten years, on average, this may not be a big deal, because we may need to hire more people to eliminate the overtime. But I find it really interesting that now we -- when -- when somebody else is in charge of the Executive Branch, we don't trust how they're going to do it. Although, for the last, you know, six -- the six years before that, that I was here, we thought they could do it just fine and we'd just leave it up to them. Now we don't want to leave it up the Executive. We're going to tell them how many people they can hire. Wexford has been in there a long time and it's part of how we handle the ups and downs in Corrections. And with this push -- and I think it's a good push -- to reduce the number of those that are incarcerated in this State, why would you want to set a floor? Wouldn't it be great if you only needed a hundred? What if you -- what if you were really successful and you lowered the number of people that are incarcerated in the State and you only needed a hundred? This doesn't make sense. I would -- I would urge a No vote on this.
It takes away the flexibility and the rights of management to do the right thing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Manar, to close?

SENATOR MANAR:

I would just ask for an Aye vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Question is, shall House Bill 5104 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 Ayes, 18 Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 5104, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5710. Senator Syverson. House Bill 5901. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5901.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 5901 requires every public school, beginning with the 2016-17 school year, to report information to the State Board of Education on all of its assessments it administers. It also will require both ISBE and school districts to make information on assessments available to the public. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5901 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?  Have all voted who wish?  Take the record.  On that question, there are 54 Ayes, 4 Nays, none voting Present.  House Bill 5901, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  House Bill 5931.  Senator Steans.  House Bill 6021.  Senator Biss.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6021.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss, on your bill.

BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate.  House Bill 6021 makes a small change to the IMRF, SURS, and TRS Articles of the Pension Code to open up a window allowing certain individuals to purchase eligibility in the survivor benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6021 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?  Have all voted who wish?  Take the record.  On that question, there are 50 -- 49 Ayes, 3 Nays, none voting Present.  House Bill 6021, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  House Bill
6037. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6037.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler, on your bill.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Current law provides a list of fifteen factors the courts shall consider in weighing in favor of withholding or minimizing a sentence of imprisonment. This bill adds that the courts shall also consider as a mitigating factor for sentencing whether the defendant was suffering from a serious mental illness which substantially affected his or her ability to understand the nature of his or her acts or ability to conform with the law. This is done in -- in many other states. This was not part of our law. This seek -- would seek to make it as such. So, happy to answer any questions. Appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6037 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 6037, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6069. Senator McGuire. House Bill 6162. Senator Collins. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6162.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 6162 -- excuse me, creates the Employee Sick Leave Act. It provides that employees may use up to half of their previously granted personal sick time to attend to the medical needs of their family members. And I'm open for any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President.  Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

She indicates she will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Collins, I'm sorry, I just -- I didn't hear the -- can you walk through what the bill does again, please, briefly for me?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, I'll be glad to, Senator Righter.  Basically what it says is that employees will be able to use up to half of their previously granted personal sick time to attend to the medical
needs of family members. In other words, usually you accrue sick leave on a yearly basis, on a twelve-month basis, so we're saying basically here -- right now, the law says you can use your own sick leave for your own personal needs. We're saying that because many individuals have family members that need caregiving, that now you can have the employee use that time also to care for a mother, a father, a sick child, using that same time that is already allotted by the policy of whatever business or employer has set in place. So we do not change in any way, expand sick leave, we just allow the availability to use that accrued sick time for the care of a loved one or a family member.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator -- Senator Nybo, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR NYBO:

    Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    She indicates she will.

SENATOR NYBO:

    Senator Collins, did you know that I am an employment lawyer? Did you know that I'm an...(microphone cutoff)...lawyer? Jacqui, I practice...

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

    No, I wasn't aware of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

    Senator Collins, were you not listening to the interesting
exchange that Senator Hutchinson and I had yesterday afternoon?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins. Please wait until I announce you.

SENATOR COLLINS:

I think I missed the exchange, but I did hear the laughter at
the conclusion of the discourse.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR NYBO:

Senator Collins, I have a lot of respect for you. What Senator Hutchinson did yesterday really will not impact employers. There will not be financial significance. It will not make us a less competitive State. What you are trying to do on the other hand is something that will really hurt the business community. And -- and it's -- it's an expansion of an area that's -- I know a lot of states are trying to do this, but -- but in my experience - and we can only speak from our experience - employees really do abuse sick leave policies and it is a significant financial consideration to businesses, and the more that we expand sick leave availability, as well intentioned as it is, it does create problems for employers. So with all due respect and as much respect as I have for you, I would ask everybody to vote No on this, because this is one of those bills that does hurt business and -- and I -- I -- I would -- I would hope that we wouldn't do anything more than we've already done in this State over the last ten years to
make ourselves a -- a less competitive State. But this is something that does hurt people -- businesses.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK) 

Senator Koehler, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR KOEHLER: 

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK) 

To the bill.

SENATOR KOEHLER: 

Yeah, I just want to commend the sponsor for this legislation, because I think that it's important to understand that this is pro-family and it helps really create a more stable and a better employee. And what -- what the previous speaker talked about was when there are abuses to the sick leave system. Well, this is not an abuse. We're talking about something that is very -- legitimately needs to be available to families to use. And so I just want to commend the sponsor and encourage everyone to vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK) 

Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER: 

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK) 

To the bill.

SENATOR McCARTER: 

You know, I -- Senator, I know you're doing this because you care and you -- and -- and I -- the previous speaker said because this is pro-family. That's great. That's great. I -- I believe my companies are pro-family. In -- in fact, in my policy manual,
this is not written, but it's allowed, and it's on a case-by-case basis, and we've had other discussions in other bills and I've always said, if your employer treats you like that, you should go find another place to work. Well, I just don't think it's our business to be telling business in this State what to put in their employee manual. Again, any company can do this today; in fact, many do already. They do it whether it's written in that policy manual, and as in my case, even though that's not written in the manual, we allow it, because we want employees to stay. We had this discussion yesterday about turnover and how expensive it is and I think it was -- one of the Senators talked about the cost of hiring a new employee. I -- I got it, I understand. I mean, there's people that have -- that have been in -- with me and my company for eighteen years and I've done everything I can to keep 'em there, and some of 'em have gone without working for a long time because they've been sick and I -- and I do everything I can to get them back, because I want to be as loyal to them as they've been to me. But I just don't believe it's our duty to be imposing this compassionate act on all businesses in this State. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bush, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BUSH:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR BUSH:

So I just want to make sure for clarification, are we asking employers to add any additional days of sick time?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

No, we're not. That's why I'm confused about the -- the conversation coming from the other side of the aisle. These are sick days that people have already gained or earned or accrued. All we're saying -- this really stops abuse, because instead of calling in when your child is sick to say, well, I can't come into work, because I'm sick. In reality, this stops that abuse. It's not expanding the time that the employers are offering or being mandated, you're just using the sick time that you already have accrued. But you can use it now not just for yourself, but if need be for a sick a child. So this really stops the abuse and stops the lying -- the lying when people call in and say, well, I can't come in today, because I'm sick, when really it's their child that's sick.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you. Thank you for the answer. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

You know, I -- I -- I appreciate what Senator McCarter had to say and -- and truly he is an exemplary employer and -- and I thank him for that. I can tell you I have a personal story where I was an exemplary employee and I called in one day to say my son was sick and my company chose not to pay me. I was fortunate, I lived in a family where my husband had a decent job and I went back in
and told them I don't want to work for a company that doesn't understand that and doesn't pay me, that I could've called in and lied and said I was sick, but I chose to be honest. That's what this is really about, allowing people to use their sick time if their child is ill, if their elderly parent is sick. This isn't adding any additional cost to the employers and, frankly, there are times that government does need to tell business what to do, because, clearly, if everyone was like you, Senator McCarter, we wouldn't need to, but the truth is they're not. So I would urge an Aye vote. This causes no additional cost to any business and, frankly, it's absolutely the right thing to do. So I hope we're going to have good bipartisan support. It's a bill that should have bipartisan support and thank you for bringing it here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Oberweis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

To the bill, Mr. Speaker (sic).

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

I believe that Senator Collins has good intentions, but I believe that the previous speaker just made the point that several of us have been trying to make. This creates, again, more opportunity for fraud. If you've got a bad company with bad policies, leave the company, just like Senator Bush did. That's what makes sense. If you've got a good company with good policies, that's the company that will want to attract employees. This is Illinois and, in Illinois, the policy is, make things worse for business every chance we get. Drive those businesses to Indiana.
We want to open ice cream stores. Why should we open 'em in Illinois when it's much more favorable to open them in Indiana, in Wisconsin, in Missouri, in Michigan, in Florida, in North Carolina, everywhere else in the United States - almost, not quite, there are a few other bad ones, no question about it? But let's stop making this an unfavorable environment for business. Good businesses treat employees well. Bad businesses might not, but you aren't going to change that by law. Let's change this by creating an environment where we want good companies to come to Illinois and open businesses, hire people, grow the State economy again, so we don't have to have these fights over raising taxes, because we'll have more revenue because we have more jobs in this State. Stop killing the environment. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Collins, to close.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Just let me just say that I can't see why the Illinois Chamber of Commerce would be neutral on this bill if it was negatively impacting businesses. I just ask for an Aye vote. I think that discussion and that debate is for another bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall House Bill 6162 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 38 Ayes, 19 Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 6162, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Koehler, for what purpose do you rise?
For a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

State your point.

I have a group of students here that I want to introduce to the Senate. Superintendent John Asplund and the students from Farmington High School are here with us today. This is an impressive group of students. First of all, let me just say, Farmington High School at one point in time, I think they've been upstaged by a high school in North Carolina now, but had the largest solar application of any high school in the country. They -- they have done just a phenomenal job. But you know why they're here today? We usually don't have a lot of visitors on the last day of Session. This is a group of students who have formed a group called the Fair Budget or Bust group. And they came down here to talk about equity in funding education. I met with them outside. They're an impressive group of students. They're -- they're here to have their voices heard and we need to listen. Let me introduce to do you the students from Farmington High School. Please stand.


A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.
Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 730.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 730.


A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 746.


PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Mr. Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 746, offered by Senator Bush.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Well, with leave of the Body, we'll go to page 23 of the printed Calendar, motions for Concurrences. House -- Senate Bill 42. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 42.
Signed by Senator Martinez.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez, on your concurrence.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I motion to concur on the amendments. And Floor Amendment No. 1, which it actually -- it -- it is -- is -- amends the Civil Administrative Code and the Amendment 2 actually guts and replace the bill, but it also reinserts the bill back to original, but there's a few changes on this bill. This bill has been around for almost two and a half years. It's been being worked on in the House and this is the -- the -- the most improved bill. I think it makes it stronger. It actually reinserts the past -- the Senate {sic} with the following changes: It allows health care professionals who have had their license revoked or denied due to a past criminal conviction for a forcible felony, other than those requiring {sic} as a sex offender, to petition the Department of Professional Regulations {sic} (Department of Financial and Professional Regulation) to restore or issue the license if it's been -- more than five years have passed since the conviction or more than three years have passed since the health care worker's release from the confinement for that conviction. And it also extends the time certain applicants must wait to petition the IDFPR. As engrossed, provided that these applicants may petition the -- the Department to restore or issue his or her license as long as the conviction occurred more than five years ago. It has fifteen factors, as passed, the Department has to consider when it comes to restoring someone's
license. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

To the motion. Thank you, sir. I concur with Senator Martinez. This has been a bipartisan effort on this piece of legislation for over two years. The House actually addressed some of the concerns that the Department has expressed. This is an excellent bill made better, surprisingly, by the House and I would urge an Aye vote. And thank you, Senator, for working as hard as you did.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez, to close.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

It's a -- I think this bill makes it stronger. It's a good vote and I ask for a -- for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 42. 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 48 Ayes, 3 Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to
Senate Bill 42, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Bennett, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BENNETT:

For the purpose of an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your introduction.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, if you'll look to the rear gallery on the Republican side, we are joined today by the girls track team from Salt Fork. They are just coming off their Class 1A Girls Track and Field State Championships. We are very proud of 'em. And they include many accolades for the year, but I be -- would be remiss not to point out a few of them. Jenny Kimbro, I believe, was the State Champion in three different sports -- three different events and will head off to the University of Iowa to take her talents there. Abby Nicholson and Katie Witte, both placed in discus, and Abby, again, placed in shot put. They are joined by their Head Coach Gail Biggerstaff as well as Coach Andrea Palmer. Would you please give a warm Senate welcome to the Salt Fork Storm?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Congratulations on your victories. Senator Harris, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HARRIS:

I meant -- I -- I would like to be recorded as a Aye for the last -- for the concurrence of Senate Bill 42.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Your intention will reflect on the record. Senate Bill 140. Leader Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 140.
Signed by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Leader Harmon, on your motion.

SENATOR HARMON:
Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 140 has come back to us from the House in a very different form than it left, but the amendments I believe are noncontroversial and I'll explain them and ask for your support. This is an amendment to the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. The General Assembly amended that Act in 2009 to extend certain protections -- consumer protections and dealership protections to manufacturers of truck engines. We inadvertently also extended the prohibition on franchise ownership for those manufacturers. So this is important to Cummins, an Illinois company. I am not aware of any opposition and I'd ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in the House Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill -- or Senate Bill 140. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 140, and the bill is declared passed. Ed Cross of WAND-TV seeks permission to video. Seeing no
objection, permission granted. Senate Bill 320. Leader Trotter. Senate Bill 420. Senator Steans. Senate Bill 440. Senator Mulroe. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 440. Signed by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Mulroe, on your motion.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This is a gut-and-replace amendment by the House. The -- there's a couple parts in the bill. The first part: Currently, there's the minimum widow's annuity - and this is regarding Chicago police officers and Chicago firemen - currently, there's -- the minimum widow's annuity is one thousand dollars. This bill would modify it so that would -- that annuity would never be less than a hundred twenty-five percent of the Federal Poverty Level. In today's dollars, it's about twelve thirty-eight per month. There's some current -- there's some fixes to the Tier 2 pension system and another part of the bill deals with a born before date. In 1982, a born before date of 1930 was instituted for a three percent simple COLA. The renewal practice of extending the term every five years has been ongoing since 1982 but has not been adjusted since 2004. So this bill simply moves the born before date to January 1, 1966, which is consistent with renewal and extension practices since 1982.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing
none, the question is, shall the -- shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 440. 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 39 Ayes, 15 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 440, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 462. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 462. Signed by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez, on your motion.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I motion to concur with the House. Senate Bill 462, as engrossed, would allow a person to receive a license to dispense, test, recommend, fit, or service hearing instruments while completing the current education requirements if he or she has completed an equivalent program as determined by the Department of (Public) Health. And it also clarifies that the -- the equivalent program selected by the Department must be consistent with the hearing instrument dispenser's scope of practice under current law and allows hearing instruments dispensers to certify a person has a hearing or -- or a speech disability. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing
none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 462. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 462, and is declared passed. Sherrie Philips (sic) (Phipps) of WICS seeks -- permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Hector Betancourt of WGN-TV seeks permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission's granted. Senate Bill 571. Senator Koehler. Senate Bill 574. Senator Collins, on... Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 574.

Signed by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins, on your motion.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Basically what -- I move to concur, based on the changes made to the bill. It just basically reinserts the original bill -- or the provisions of the original bill, as engrossed. It just changes the referencing the number of members constituting a majority of a quorum. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment
3 to Senate Bill 574. 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 50 Ayes, 4 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 574, and is declared passed. House Bill 805. Senator Harris. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 805. Signed by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LINK)

Senator Harris, on your motion.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 805. It's an agreement with the Capitol Police and the Secretary of State and I favorably request an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 805. All those in favor will say -- 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 805, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 1564.
Senator Biss. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1564.
Signed by Senator Biss.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss, on your motion.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. We debated this bill at significant length over a year ago. Amendment 1 - given that we debated it over a year ago - Amendment 1 simply removes the effective date, so it's not retroactively effective. Happy to take any questions and I would appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator McConchie, for what purpose do you seek permission?

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Senator Biss, since it's been so long ago since the bill left the Chamber, can you refresh everyone's memory as to what this legislation would do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Yes, I'd be very pleased to. The bill amends the Health Care Right of Conscience Act. Illinois currently has one of the most
extraordinarily broad Health Care Right of Conscience Acts in the country. This Act, as I believe it should do, makes clear that no health care provider is obligated to provide any health care service that is inconsistent with their religious values or conscience, but it goes much, much further than that, and under current law, health care providers are entitled to decline to provide basic information about health options to patients. What this bill does is correct that so it retains the right of a provider to -- to refuse to provide any service, but makes clear that providers must provide information about all the available health care options and some information about where they can be obtained. It was meticulously negotiated so that the Catholic hospitals and the Catholic Conference removed their opposition and I think it's a commonsense, very, very moderate solution to a real health care problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Thank you, Senator Biss. Is there anything that happened since the bill left here and went to the House, any new information that came to light in regards to who all this would affect or in what way it would affect that may be deemed as new information to people over here?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

I don't think so.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.
SENATOR McCONCHIE:

So, Senator Biss, so according to my understanding of the definition of "health care provider", it would cover hospitals, all physicians. It would -- it talks about dispensaries, so it'd even cover pharmacists, as well as any other institution that in any way does any sort -- anything that's kind of broadly considered medical or health care. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

I -- I don't know if I would necessarily agree with the use of the word "broadly", but it certainly includes the list that you mentioned, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

So would this also then cover the so-called crisis pregnancy centers that perform ultrasounds on women since they -- since there's a -- they -- that has a medical component? Would they fall under this definition?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Well, to the extent that such center is providing medical care, then of course they'd be covered.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Okay. And then what -- what would those institutions have to
do? If -- if a pregnancy center or, let's say, a religiously affiliated or a pro-life pregnancy center has a woman, comes in who's pregnant, and then because they provide a free ultrasound, what is it that they would have to provide to the woman if, at the end of the visit, she says, I want to go and get an abortion?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR BISS:

Well, they would have a few options under the bill. They could provide a referral. They could provide the service or they could simply say, yes, this is the kind of service that exists; here is a list of places that might potentially provide it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Okay, so my understanding was, during the debate in committee in the House, the proponents of this legislation actually testified that they would have to give a list and -- and the list, for example, like a page out of the Yellow Pages, I think was an example that was brought up, was actually determined to be insufficient; that they said you would actually -- these like pro-life pregnancy centers would actually have to go through and check a box or check next to each of the providers that they believe -- according to the legislation and the definition in here, they reasonably believe provide the service requested. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR BISS:

No. I think a page out of the Yellow Pages would be absolutely
consistent with what the bill says. There's nothing in the bill about checking additional boxes. There's nothing in the bill that fleshes out in detail what -- what reasonably believe construes. I -- I simply don't think that's accurate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

So are you asserting then that -- that there's not a clear enough definition as to what these providers would have to have as far as to be able to comply with the law under what reasonably -- "reasonably believes provides the service" means? And the reason I ask this is because I actually serve on the board of one of these pregnancy centers and these ladies have looked at this legislation and said, I believe, according to the way it's written, that I would have to provide a list of, say, Planned Parenthood or other abortion providers in the area and that would violate my conscience and the -- and the exact reason why I'm in the work that I'm doing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

No -- no, I -- I would strenuously disagree with that claim. On the contrary, the word reasonably believe -- the words "reasonably believe" aren't in here because they're too vague, they're in here as an outcome of a negotiation that enables the provider, like the one you're talking about, with adequate flexibility to not go do the research and say, hey, here's a phone number you can call and, if you call this number, you will definitely have access to an abortion. On the -- on the contrary, it says, hey, you may reasonably believe, for instance, by looking
at a page in the Yellow Pages and concluding that's a list of
providers that might likely provide such a service. That I
would...(microphone cutoff)...To the extent that there's concern
about the vagueness, I would say that would result in the bill
being better from your point of view, not worse.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Well, I -- I -- we'll -- we'll agree to disagree on this
question and I'll get to why here in a moment. But let me get the
-- the -- let me go to one other -- two other questions that I
have. One is, this -- this -- since this appears to require all
medical providers to refer, which -- to use your language, for a
medical service that -- or -- or for -- or provide a list of which
they reasonably believe that they're -- are going to be able to
obtain this service and it would appear that it's under -- and --
and using, again, the -- the terms from the bill -- any legal
treatment options, let me ask this question: If a woman was to go
into a health care provider and she gets an ultrasound and that
ultrasound shows that she's pregnant with a -- a -- a female fetus,
for example, and she tells the provider, you know, I am -- I want
to have an abortion because I really wanted to have a boy, doesn't
your legislation require that that provider would have to provide
a list of places -- because sex selection abortions are not illegal
in our State -- she would have to provide a list of places in which
the provider reasonably believes that she would be able to go and
get such an abortion?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.
SENATOR BISS:

Well, there's two separate questions. One is about the legality of sex-selective abortion and one is about what this bill does. What this bill does, is it says that if a provider is unwilling to provide a legal service, they're not obligated to refer anyone, they're not obligated to do it, they're just obligated to provide a list, for example, a page out of the Yellow Pages, that gives a list of places where it might be reasonably believed to be provided. That's it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Thank you. I'll take that as a yes. And last question, I'm not -- are you aware that there was, in the House, a fiscal note filed on this that has raised questions as to whether or not the State's passage of this law might jeopardize Illinois' federal funding because of certain rights of conscience protections requirements from the federal level - Coats-Snow Amendment, for example, is one; there's several others - that it indicates could jeopardize our State's access to federal funding, including the federal share of Medicaid?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Well, again, there's two questions here. One is what happened in the House, and I find what happens in the House almost invariably confusing, but regarding the underlying question, there is absolutely nothing in this bill that comes anywhere remotely close to violating any of the various federal provisions around
Medicaid and abortion and, of course, it would not endanger our access to federal Medicaid dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

   Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

   To the -- to the bill, Mr. President. I'm very...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

   To the bill.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

   I'm very grateful that we've had the opportunity to revisit this legislation, given the fact that during the -- the -- the process over the last year, there's been a number of new facts that have come to light, some of which have -- have been revealed in this debate. Let me say first, what we're talking about here is forced speech from a broadly defined group of health care providers in both emergency and nonemergency situations, such as elective abortion, and has seemingly been indicated by the sponsor, this would cover things that I think many of us find objectionable, such as gender-selection abortion. And to the contention as to whether or not this violates federal law, it's very interesting that we've had -- there has been a bipartisan letter from our members of Congress written that indicates their concern about this. The fiscal note attached from one of the departments -- and I -- forgive me for not knowing which one -- has indicated their concern that this may risk federal funding under multiple provisions. And another thing that I would point out, in this being a forced speech law, there have been similar types of these laws passed in other localities around the country -- some examples: Austin, Texas; Baltimore County, Maryland; even New York City --
and a hundred percent of the time that similar legislation like this has been enacted elsewhere and there's been a challenge in federal court on First Amendment grounds, these have been struck down. So given all of these situations, and I -- I -- we already have provisions in the law requiring that if someone is in an emergency that there has to be certain provisions that are provided for the care, whether it's for life or health - I believe there's no demonstrated need for this bill. I believe that the downsides of enacting this bill are significant and I would urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Mary Ann Ahern of NBC Chicago seeks permission to film. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Sarah Mueller, WPR (sic) (NPR) Illinois seeks permission to photograph. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Senator Rose, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSE:

To the bill, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR ROSE:

Ladies and Gentlemen, William Shakespeare had this great play called _Julius Caesar_ in which there was a soothsayer named -- who said "Beware of {sic} the Ides of March", and many of you have probably seen the more modern movies under that title, but essentially the -- March 15th was the day that Caesar was killed by fellow Senators. I would posit that we should all beware the last day of Session and we should all beware those who would describe bills as commonsense and moderate on the last day of
Session. The First Amendment of the United States does not say freedom from religion. It actually says that Congress shall make no law impeding the free exercise of religion. Okay? The free exercise of religion. Now when you go back to the foundational points of our entire democracy, the reason that's in there is because an entire group of people fled the tyranny of a government that persecuted them to come to the new land, the new world. The founding fathers knew darn good and well that government has no business deciding what issues of theocracy are correct and what issues of theocracy are incorrect. When governments get in the business of deciding who's right and who's wrong in a religious conflict, people suffer - people suffer. Now I am surprised at some level that my friend, the sponsor, who I have joined on numerous, numerous other bills that many conservatives would think I wouldn't necessarily be on, in defense of many other principles that are also contained in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights, many other ones -- but I'm quite sure -- by the way, the -- the right to petition one's government is also contained in there. I'm quite sure that if there was a bill -- if -- if someone in this Chamber brought a bill to say that pro-choice groups couldn't petition their government, that that would be anathema, that cries would ring out, and that would immediately be voted down. And you know what? I'd actually vote that down, because government has no business getting involved in these kinds of decisions. There's a very, very, very good reason why this is in the Bill of Rights, because we're not good -- we are not good at deciding who's right and wrong. It is plain as day, it is clear, there is no other way to interpret the phrase "free exercise" - free exercise of religion. This whole debate is ludicrous, to
pretend that somehow we -- we, as a government, can decide who's right and who's wrong in a right of conscience decision. In a right of conscience decision, really? We know -- we know what that right of conscience decision is? It's up to the individual. It's up to the individual to exercise their right of conscience in however they see it and however they, as an individual, not a governmental body, see it. You cannot get into picking right and wrong in these kinds of debates. This bill needs to fail on its merits, with all due respect to my friend. I have joined you on many other bills in defense of the First Amendment and other tenets. I'm not going to stand down now simply because it's politically expedient for some group to pretend they're doing something. You cannot pick who's right and wrong and you cannot abridge, impede, or otherwise stop people from exercising their beliefs, whatever those beliefs are. Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

Indicates he will.

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Biss, I was paying close attention to the exchange between you and Senator McConchie and toward the latter end of that exchange, when he was asking you about what would qualify as the information that the volunteer at the crisis pregnancy center would have to provide to the individual who was seeking an abortion, one of the statements you made was that there would be no referral, as in no mandated referral. I
want to refer you to page 5 of the bill, beginning with line 5, Section (sic) (paragraph) (2). It basically talks about when a health care provider -- and, clearly, as you've discussed, a crisis pregnancy center that does ultrasounds would certainly qualify under the definition that you have in the bill. This section says that if that provider cannot provide that service based on a -- a right of conscience objection, that they will either have -- the service will be provided by someone else in the facility - and this is the patient - or be notified that the health care will not be provided and be referred, transferred, or given information in accordance with paragraph (3). I mean, it says referral. I mean, you would agree with that and I guess -- I hope, and given that language, I -- I'm interested in your explanation about your response to Senator McConchie that it doesn't require a referral.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Senator, with -- with all due respect, I think you answered your own question with the use of the word "or" - will be referred, transferred, "or" given information in accordance with paragraph (3). A provider that declines to provide a service because of a reason of conscience has three options - referral, transfer or giving of information, for instance, handing somebody a sheet out of the Yellow Pages.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, what if the clinic doesn't have information? They don't have any information with regards to who provides abortions
in the area. Now you're down to two options and that is, refer or transfer. What does the abortion clinic -- I mean, what does -- excuse me -- what does the crisis pregnancy center volunteer do then?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

   Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

   The core need of this bill, I would say, is for the facility that intends to refuse the provision of legal services for reasons of conscience to have in place protocols and the bill lays out a way that that protocol can involve no referrals. That's -- that's the point of this. If they just cannot go to the trouble of making a protocol and producing that information, then -- then they're in trouble, but the bill says here's how you do that and that's -- that's why this is a, in my opinion, reasonable set of requirements and, frankly, that's why the Catholic hospitals signed off on the bill back in 2015.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

   Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

   To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

   Ladies and Gentlemen, there is -- vague language in this bill, I mean, and that's been -- that was talked about a year ago and it's been pointed out here again today. But there is a measure of this that absolutely is crystal clear and Senator McConchie touched on it and that is, even though someone's beliefs may be that upon
conception a life exists and so it is wrong to take that life and even though they may so deeply hold that belief that they choose to spend their time in a crisis pregnancy center to avoid that taking of the life, they are nevertheless going to be required — and it is crystal clear under Senate Bill 1564 in the gentleman's motion — they will be required to provide information contrary to those deeply held beliefs. I want to go back just a moment to the example that Senator McConchie raised about gender selection. I would guess that personally most people in this Chamber, even most people in this General Assembly, would personally object to an abortion just because they wanted a boy or they wanted a girl. Most people in this Chamber and this General Assembly would probably object to that. If you would object to that personally, if you would, how is it right that you are going to tell the volunteer at the crisis pregnancy center that that's exactly what they have to help get accomplished, even if it's simply giving the person a piece of paper? If you would object to it personally, why are you prepared to tell someone else who has beliefs like yours that they have to do it under the law? That is not right. I urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Chicago Tribune seeks permission to -- for photographs. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

To -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR HAINE:
Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this is a profound act we are taking, no doubt about that. When the bill was first filed last spring, it was a direct assault on the provisions in the Illinois Right of Conscience Act. Senator Biss, to his great credit and statesmanship, changed that direction. So there's no doubt about the fact that this is a much better structure for dealing with the issue. And I have a profound respect for him and for his commitment to equal justice and his sensitivity to all of these issues. What we have here is a supreme irony. The focus of the original bill and the spirit, which remains in this bill, is directed at these beliefs that these procedures are violative of human dignity, and these are beliefs held by women, women, the women who built and have supported and staffed countless hospitals throughout the United States and the Western World. These women are tough. They were tough. They defied segregationist state governments in the '20s and '30s, who passed laws to have hospitals segregate. They said they weren't going to do that because it violated their perceptions of human dignity. The people who came here with that ethic included Mother Cabrini; the Daughters of Charity, who came to Alton, my hometown, at the request of President Lincoln, because there was a typhoid outbreak at the prison in Alton. They were the only ones who would go in. That was their ethic of life. They hold it to this day and that is the collision. They're neutral on the bill because they consider it to be less destructive of their ethos than the original bill. A lady from the Office of Human Dignity of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Joliet actually stated this. The neutral position on Senate Bill 1564 does not indicate support for the bill. We cannot support it. The law being considered is not
morally acceptable. It isn't illogical to claim that one does not have to be involved in immoral services and at the same time demand that they supply a list of providers that may provide these same services. Now people can disagree with this. Obviously, it's the law of the land. But again, Ladies and Gentlemen, this belief system is part of their ethic of living, of working, of providing medical care. They would never harm a soul or a body placed in their care. This is a fundamental disagreement with an ethic of life. And as I say, they don't -- do not share the beliefs that are expressed in the Alan Guttmacher Institute. They look to the beliefs as expressed by Mother Teresa of Calcutta, who treated life, all life, as a gift, who picked up babies from trash piles, saved the -- the elderly from dying in gutters. That's their ethic. And the spirit of this bill -- and I emphasize that is not the case with this sponsor. Senator Biss is one of the kindest, gentlest Members of this Chamber, but the ethic expressed in the spirit of the original bill remains a stark shadow in what remains before us. I encourage a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Anderson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ANDERSON:

A question to the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Senator, could you just go over for us what -- what the reason for the bill is? I mean, all of the bills that -- that come through this Chamber usually they're -- because they're righting a wrong or -- or fixing an issue. Could you explain to us what
the reason for this legislation is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you for that question. I'll give a theoretical answer and then a practical answer. The theoretical answer or the philosophical answer is that, in my view, patients have a right to know. They have a right to know what medical science says about the various options. They have the right to know about what the law says about the various options, and they have the right to have enough information to then act on that knowledge. I'll be much more specific now and I -- I recognize it's been a long time. The House -- the House is an inscrutable Body and they took their time with this one. But last year, probably fourteen months or so, a woman by the name of Mindy Swank came and testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee and she told a harrowing story of arriving in a hospital with a pregnancy that was already very complicated, that was likely -- that -- by that point no longer viable, in significant physical pain, and then going through a period of a number of weeks during which she was simply not given information about what her options were and she was not -- and her record was not transferred to the relevant hospital that was prepared to treat her, and that time resulted in enormous physical pain and bleeding and tremendous emotional anguish and very realistically risked endangering her future fertility. And that was because the hospital in question was unwilling to provide her with basic information, not because they weren't willing to provide her with the service - that's a right that I cherish. That's -- that is the religious freedom that we ought to be seeking to
protect. But because, in addition to that, they weren't willing to give her this information, she went through unbelievable anguish and physical pain and danger of worse than that. And when we sat at that table in the Judiciary Committee in Room 400, initially the take of the Catholic Conference was, "Oh, come on, of course we give information. We wouldn't let that happen", and then they talked with Ms. Swank and talked to the proponents of the bill and realized that there was a gap and this outcome was negotiated, an outcome that those entities could remove their opposition to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON:
To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
To the bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:
Senator, to your comments, you're suggesting that in -- in the world we live in today, and I find it -- I find it hard to believe, that everybody doesn't know all the options out there. The problem that I have with this legislation is that by the logic of the legislation and -- and to one of the previous speaker's points, you know, this is -- this is a violation of our Bill of Rights. I mean, with this logic, that's like somebody going into a Christian church and saying, you know, I -- I -- I really want to start going to church and this is what I believe and it's not what the Christian church believes and then that church having to provide a list of other churches that do believe in that, rather than sitting down and talk to 'em about what they believe. I want to share with you a quick story. My son is eleven years old. When
my wife was six months pregnant with our son, they did an ultrasound and they said "We're seeing something abnormal. We want to send you for a 3D ultrasound." So we did, and during that ultrasound, they didn't say a word and they put us into a counseling room afterwards and we sat there for an hour and waited for the doctor to come in. The doctor came in and he said, "There's this spot on the -- the baby's cerebellum and we've seen this before", and he said, "Your son is going to be deaf, dumb, and blind. You should probably terminate the pregnancy right now." Thank God, we didn't. My son -- my son is going into sixth grade. Gets straight A's and he teaches me a lot. If we start stomping on the right of some of these groups to give options that they don't believe in in their heart, we are making a grave mistake - right of conscience. The previous Senator is right. We should not legislate right and wrong. Right of conscience - hell, half of us in here don't vote our conscience. We're constantly looking at our screen, saying, oh, what group is for this and what group is against this? This is not a good bill. I'd urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I have listened to my colleagues discuss this bill that's already passed the Senate and is now before us again simply to change the effective date. I just want to make sure I said that in the record. This is simply to change the effective date of a
bill that has already passed the Senate. It has already passed the House. It is coming back here now to simply concur with the change of effective date. I want to make clear at the outset of my comments that I respect every single person in this room, but as a person with a uterus, I'm going to stand up and talk about what it's like to give birth and have all the information you need to have in the moment that you're making very critical decisions. Now I am a woman who had two home births and there are plenty of people who look at me like I am absolutely out of my mind. It was the most beautiful thing I could have done when my two children were born, my two youngest children, in this circle of love exactly where they were created. It was amazing. I had a doctor and two home -- two nurse midwives. And each one -- actually, all three of them -- one in the hospital and two at home, each time, I don't have horror stories about how I delivered my children. They were three amazingly beautiful, loving, welcoming into the world of these wanted children -- wanted, prayed for children. And I love telling their birth stories. So when I met Mindy Swank when she came to testify in front of the Judiciary Committee and I heard about her five-week miscarriage -- five weeks. This woman was bleeding, and I know we don't like to talk about what happens to women -- happens to women every month by the way, we bleed. And when you're in the middle of a pregnancy that is ending in a very complicated way, and she was bleeding and she kept going back to the hospital and they would not do anything or tell her where she could go get the medical care she could use to protect her future fertility, that to me was heartbreaking. Because in this whole discussion, what I have not heard is the discussion of her life, her ability to bring a child into the world in the future, since
she was losing the one that she prayed for and that she wanted. And then she sat in a hearing room full of people who -- while we were arguing with the hospital ethicists and while we were arguing with the hospitals and the Catholic bishops and all the people who were talking about what best to do for Mindy, Mindy told her story and it was about another hour before we could say we are so sorry for your loss. I find myself agreeing with Members on the other side of the aisle when they say government should get out of the way of this, because we cannot legislate for a woman what she should do or what any of us would do in a circumstance like that. You are absolutely right - government should get out of the way. And there is nowhere in the Constitution where it says that our freedom to exercise our religion gives us the freedom to impose it on someone else. That is the balance we strike every time we sit down here in this General Assembly. You do not have the right to impose your religious beliefs on me, because I have rights as well. And in the course of my medical care, I have a right to make my own decisions about how I will proceed next. Between me, my husband, my doctor, and my God. And when I leave this world, when I go meet my God, you won't be there either. That'll be between me and Him. This right of conscience - conscience is exactly that. I have one, too. So for everyone that has strongly held beliefs about what you believe that you would do in a situation like that, you have every right to hold them near and dear. I will stand here and fight, though, for you to stop when you try to impose them on me. My right to all my full health care information so that I can make a decision is not where your opinion is supposed to be. And there is no other instance - there is no other instance in a man's medical care where my opinion gets to be there. So in
this 2016, for this bill that has already passed the Senate and has already passed the House and is now back in here for a change of effective date that was negotiated, where the -- the issue where the -- our witness's pregnancy took place - a Catholic hospital - signed off as neutral as a result of some absolutely outstanding negotiations about a very, very difficult and heartfelt issue to people who believe it. But the one thing I will say is that in your strident belief in your opinions, please do not discount mine. The delegitimization of the opposition on this thing is what makes us fight about this. That's what makes us fight. I will not convince you, and I understand that, and you will not convince me that anyone other than advisors that I choose - the people that I love, the doctors that I trust - should be anywhere near me when I'm making a decision about my medical well-being for the rest of my life, especially when it impacts my ability to have any future children beyond this. We're talking about full comprehensive health care for women, absent unnecessary government intrusion or religious dictates that impose those -- those faiths and beliefs on someone else. That is where it ends. That is where your freedom -- that's how far your freedom goes and that's where it stops. It is yours. It is not yours to berate me with. I urge an Aye vote on this effective date change and I salute the sponsor for bringing this measure, as always.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator Holmes, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HOLMES:

    To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    To the bill.
SENATOR HOLMES:

Actually, the previous speaker said it so eloquently, but that really is the full point of this. I, as a patient, have the right to the best medical care. I have the right to all of the information that a trained licensed medical professional has. It is their job to provide my medical care. It is not their job to impose their religious beliefs on my medical care. It is a very, very simple matter we're talking about. And that is, that as a -- physician, give me access to what I need to know so that I can make the decisions for my life, my body. Those are the only pieces of information it is imperative that you give to me, not your religious beliefs. Please keep this very, very separate. I am not a trained medical professional, so I do not have access to know every single option or every single location where I may go so I can discover what all those options are. We are not imposing our belief on you. We are not saying you have to perform a medical procedure that you find goes against your moral or religious beliefs. You do not need to do that. You are protected from doing that, but please offer me the same protection and respect to take the best medical care of myself and make the best decisions by having access to that information. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Biss, to close.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I am -- after the last two speakers, I probably should just put my microphone down, but I -- I can't stop myself from making a few comments in response to some portions of the debate that happened earlier on. And I want to thank everyone in the Chamber for this -- this robust debate.
First of all, I just have to say, it was suggested that because here we are on May 31st, this must have been somehow snuck on you guys or -- or it must be hastily done. This bill was a commonsense and moderate bill when it passed this Chamber well over a year ago. It's a commonsense, moderate bill that we've had a lot of time to think about now and hopefully it'll be signed into law in the next few months and then it will be a commonsense, moderate law. Next, there's been some assertion that this bill violates the First Amendment. Look, if you don't believe in this, don't vote for it, but this bill doesn't violate the First Amendment. In fact, this bill amends a law, the Health Care Right of Conscience law that provides broad, broad, broad protections for health care providers who don't want to do certain things because of reasons of conscience. Those protections aren't -- don't come from the First Amendment. The protection not to do certain things as a health care provider isn't a First Amendment protection, it's a legal protection in Illinois. And if it were a First Amendment protection, we wouldn't need that law, but we have it, because the provision of health care is not done by one person, a provider in a vacuum. It's a relationship between two people - a provider and a patient - and each of them has rights and those rights need to be balanced against each other. That's what the current Health Care Right of Conscience law that we have in Illinois tries to do, and the reason we're here, having this conversation, is because I believe that it does a bad job of striking that balance and this bill makes it do a better job. It was said that, oh, well, it's not our job to get involved in these kind of moral questions. Of course it is. That's what we're here for. That's what we're here to do. We're here to make sure that crucial, difficult balance
between two important priorities is struck in the way that's most reflective of the principles of our country and the will of the people of Illinois. This is exactly the kind of question we need to get involved in and the purpose of this bill is to move us toward the middle from the fringe. And how do we know we're on the fringe? We know that we're on the fringe because, in 2015, Mindy Swank came and testified to the Senate Judiciary Committee about the fact that she was sent home to bleed for weeks by a provider that just didn't feel like telling her the truth about what her options were. That's wrong. This bill fixes that.

Please vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1564. 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 Ayes, 19 Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1564, and is declared passed. Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ask for a roll call verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCarter has requested a verification. Will all Members please be in their seat? Mr. Secretary, will you read the affirmative votes?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Those voting in the affirmative: Bennett, Biss, Bush, Clayborne, Collins, Tom Cullerton, Delgado, Harmon, Harris,
Hastings, Holmes, Hunter, Hutchinson, Jones, Koehler, Lightford, Link, Manar, Martinez, McGuire, Morrison, Mulroe, Muñoz, Laura Murphy, Noland, Raoul, Sandoval, Silverstein, Stadelman, Steans, Sullivan, Trotter, Van Pelt, President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCarter, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR McCARTER:

No, I don't. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

On a verified roll call, there are 34 Ayes, 19 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate -- having received the required constitutional majority on Senate -- the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1564, and is declared passed. Seth Perlman, Associated Press, seeks permission to take photos. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Senate Bill 2138. Senator Nybo. Senate Bill 2155. Senator Cunningham. Mr. Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2155.

Signed by Senator Cunningham.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cunningham, on your motion.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur that -- the House amendment removes a provision of the bill regarding -- peer review during the community college recognition process. The change was adopted at the request of the Community College Board. I would
like to state for legislative intent that this legislation is only intended to provide oversight of employment contracts as defined under Public Act 99-482. I ask that the Senate concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2155. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2155, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2156. Senator Cunningham. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2156. Signed by Senator Cunningham.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cunningham, on your motions.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. The House Amendment No. 2 makes a very minor change in some wording regarding our effort to make sure university presidents do not get pension credit for club dues. And Senate Amendment 3 is a much more substantive change to the bill. It does not change the intent of the bill. It actually adds a provision in which we seek to correct for the furloughs that a number of university employees are being forced to take right now. That's had the effect of reducing their salary, which
-- and then in turn, when the furloughs go away, due to the financial crisis right now, it'll appear that their salaries have increased. That could unintentionally kick in the six percent spiking penalty that we currently have in place. This amendment would remove that problem. I'd ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2156. 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2156, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2186. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2086 (sic). Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Althoff, on your motion.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. House Amendment 1 provided that the application fees for school zoning requests shall be reflective of actual cost, as opposed to reasonable costs. We thought it was clearer, made better accommodation. And I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2186. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2186, and has been declared passed. Senate Bill -- 2241. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2241.
Signed by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine, on your motion.

SENATOR HAINÉ:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2241 is merely a technical amendment that corrects a drafting error in the provision regarding rail carriers being reimbursed for flagging expenses. That's all it does. The -- the person who drafted this in error in the Legislative Reference Bureau will be shot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is -- is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2241. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take
the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2241, and is declared passed. Emilee Fannon of WCIA seeks permission to audio and video. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Senate Bill 2306. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2306.

Signed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans, on your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The underlying bill requires the Department of Healthcare and Family -- excuse me, yeah, Healthcare and Family Services to create an algorithm based on quality scores to enroll people in the MCOs. This amendment that I suggest we concur with just requires them to include input from the MCOs and other stakeholders in the development of the -- the way of doing this. I'd urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2306. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having
received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2306, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2410. Senator Anderson. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2410.
Signed by Senator Anderson.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Anderson, on your motion.
SENATOR ANDERSON:
Thank you, Mr. President. The House Floor amendment, it retains the bill. Provides that beginning January 1 of 2016, any -- any person born on or after January 1 of 1998 cannot obtain a trapping license unless they provide proof that they have a -- a certificate of competency provided for in the Section regarding trapping. There -- there is no opposition. Like I said, this is just a change in date. I would ask for an Aye vote, especially from Senator Holmes.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2410. 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 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2410, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2532. Senator Hastings. Mr. Secretary,
please read the motion.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2532.
Signed by Senator Hastings.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings, on your motions.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2532, as amended by the House, makes changes to the appointment of delegates and alternate delegates to local county Veterans Assistance Commissions. And for the spirit of the day, I want to declare to Senator Nybo that I'm an attorney and I'm a veteran and I ask for your Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Nybo, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR NYBO:

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

To the bill.

SENATOR NYBO:

I believe my name was used in debate. But I support this bill. I think it's a good bill. Senator Hastings, you're doing a great job down here. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2532. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2532, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2585. Senator Laura Murphy. Senate Bill 2610. Senator Mulroe. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2610.
Offered by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Mulroe, on your motion.

SENATOR MULROE:
Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This amendment addresses the concerns raised by the Department of Human Services, Healthcare and Family Services, and Public Health Department. The amendment removes their opposition. And I just want to make -- ease concerns that were raised in committee yesterday, to make it clear that the intent of the bill is to maintain the due process rights of CILA residents and the maintenance of those rights is -- is addressed in Section 30 of the bill. I'd ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2610. 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. That's --
there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2610, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2734. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2734. Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Althoff, on your motion.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe I told this Body when Senate Bill 2734 passed from this Chamber to the House that there would be additional work done on this bill. It was done. Amendment 1 proofs that up. And what it does, is it shows the agreement between the Department of Human Services and the Department of Public Health with regard to personnel, transfer of funds, and property. It remains to the Department of Human Services. Be happy to answer any questions, but I'd move for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2734. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2734, and is declared
passed. Senate Bill 2746. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2746. Signed by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bush, on your motion.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. The underlying bill exempts feminine hygiene products from taxation. House Amendment 1 provides that the underlying bill is subject to the automatic five-year sunset provision of the Sales Tax Act. And I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2746. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2746, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2797. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2797. Signed by Senator Steans.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans, on your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is an agreed-to amendment between the craft distillers and the distributors. It increases the production limit from thirty-five to a hundred thousand gallons for craft distillers. It enables craft distillers to do tasting licenses. It also says that no craft distiller can produce more than a hundred thousand -- gallons in aggregate over multiple locations. They say it's agreed to and I urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Koehler, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purpose of legislative intent. I'd like to ask the sponsor of -- just a question here. On line 1 of page 5, you have language that says if a craft distiller is not affiliated with any other manufacturer of spirits, then the craft distiller licensee may sell such spirits to distributors in this State and up to two hundred -- twenty-five hundred gallons of such spirits to non-licenses {sic} (non-licensees) to the extent it'd permit in this Act. Is it not your intention to permit a brewer of beer to be able to distill spirits on the same licensed premises without getting the proper manufacturer's license for each product? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:
No, a manufacturer would still be required to get the proper manufacturer's license for each type of alcoholic liquor product.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

In other words, a tasting room for a craft distiller could not be on the same licensed premises as another manufacturer of alcoholic beverages.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with -- House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2797. 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 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2797, and is declared passed.

Senate Bill 2813. Senator Forby. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in their adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2813.

Signed by Senator Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby, on your motion.
SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. This is a agreed bill. Senate Bill 2813 with the Coal Mining Act, it just makes sure that the State and the federal is on the same page.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2813. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2813, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2820. Senator Mulroe. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2820. Signed by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Mulroe, on your motion.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The amendment actually keeps the underlying language of Senate Bill 2820, which passed the Senate 53 to -- to nothing, and combines or adds the language from Senate Bill 2822, which previously passed the Senate 52 to nothing, I think 1 Present. So I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2820. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate concurs on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2820, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2861. Senator Hastings. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2861. Signed by Senator Hastings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings, on your motion.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Floor Amendment No. 2 deletes all and becomes the bill. It makes several changes to remove opposition from the Attorney General's Office, in particular, clarifying the Attorney General will serve as the appellate counsel for appeals for -- arising from court-martials. There's no opposition. I'll answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2861. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
question, there are 56 Ayes -- or 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2861, and is declared passed. Senator Hastings, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HASTINGS:

I was so distracted by all the great things happening here today, I didn't even vote on my own bill. I'd like to be a Yes vote for the last bill. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Record will reflect your intention. Senate Bill 2864. Senator Collins. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2864. Signed by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins, on your motion.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Amendment No. 1 and House Amendment No. 3 deletes all and becomes the bill. The amendments retain the underlying idea of the bill but caps the amount that the Treasurer can invest in long-term corporate obligations at five percent - as passed the Senate, it was thirty-three and a -- and a third percent - and only allows this authorization until June 30th, 2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment
1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2864. 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 58 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with Amendments -- House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2864, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2882. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2882.
Signed by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bush, on your motion.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank -- thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2882 deletes all and becomes the bill. The House amendment requires contract carriers that transport employees to carry a minimum of five hundred thousand dollars of uninsured/underinsured motor coverage per passenger beginning on January 1st, 2017. This is a bill that's been negotiated for quite some time. It's an agreed bill and I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2882. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having
received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2882, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3003. Senator Cunningham. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 3003.

Signed by Senator Cunningham.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cunningham, on your motion.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move we concur with the House on their amendment. It makes a minor change at the request of DNR to add a youth-only wild turkey season to the hunting schedule. Know no opposition. Would appreciate the Chamber's support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3003. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3003, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3047. Senator Nybo. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3047.
Signed by Senator Nybo.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENIOR LINK)

Senator Nybo, on your motion.

SENATOR NYBO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask for -- to -- to -- move -- move for concurrence. There. This is my first concurrence, so I'm a little new at this. In any event, you guys may remember, this was the cancer therapy treatment bill to make sure that we're taxing this treatment at the appropriate rate. The Department of Revenue had some concerns and I asked for your indulgence so that we could clarify them on the House side. We have and what we've done is we've removed therapies from the underlying bill and instead provides that only Class III medical devices or related accessories or components to the devices that are prescribed as cancer treatment are to be taxed at that lower one percent rate. So this addresses the Department's concerns. No concerns. And -- and if you give me your Yes votes, this will be my first concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENIOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3047. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3047, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3071. Leader Clayborne. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.
ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3071. Signed by Senator Clayborne.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Leader Clayborne, on your motion.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:
Yes, House Amendment 1 removed the surety bond requirement for the custodian to Illinois State Board of Investment because it was seen as duplicative and would be negotiated as part of the contract with the investment consultant.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3071. Awful late light, Senator Biss. Senator Biss, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISS:
An incredibly spontaneous question of the sponsor.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BISS:
Senator, it's my understanding the Illinois State Board of Investment is issuing an RFP for a custodian this year. Is it your intent that the changes in SB 3071 will take effect upon ISBI's selection of a custodian this year?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Leader Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:
Yes.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3071. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3071, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3095. Senator Hastings. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3095.

Signed by Senator Hastings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings, on your motion.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3095 codifies a longstanding Liquor Control Commission interpretation, thereby prohibiting a non-resident dealer from holding a distributor or importer (sic) (importing) distributor's license while simultaneously prohibiting a distributor or importer -- or importing distributor from holding a non-resident dealer's license. A non-resident dealer is both an out-of-state manufacturers {sic} and a non-manufacturing importer of beer, wine, or spirits. This bill is unambiguous. Senate Bill 3095 protects the health, safety, and welfare of the State through the sound and careful control of the importation of alcoholic liquor
into Illinois. Senate Bill 3095 keeps the importation of alcohol into the State of Illinois transparent and accountable to the Illinois Liquor Commission -- Liquor Control Commission by preventing distributors who are the primary United States importer from shipping alcoholic liquor products into Illinois from United -- from other U.S. states. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Senator Hastings, for legislative intent, Senate Bill 3095 includes an amendment that modifies the provisions regulating to -- importing distributors and distributors simultaneously holding a non-resident dealer licensee {sic}. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Yes, the Senate {sic} amendment to Senate Bill 39 {sic} amends the Illinois Liquor -- the Illinois Liquor Control Act to give clear authority that an Illinois importing distributor or Illinois distributor license holder may not also hold a non-resident dealer's license and also prohibits a non-resident dealer from holding an Illinois distributor or an Illinois importer {sic} (importing) distributor's license.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.
SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

There are generally two types of non-resident dealer license holders. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

...those two types?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

A non-resident dealer either, number one, has an interest, direct or indirect, in a manufacturer of alcoholic liquors or, number two, is an importer that acts as the primary American source for an alcoholic liquor product - that is, a company that imports into the United States, but has no interest in a manufacturer of alcoholic liquors whatsoever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3095. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate -- the Senate, having -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3095,
and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3130. Senator McCann. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3130.
Signed by Senator McCann.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCann, on your motion.

SENATOR McCANN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that we concur with the House in the adoption of its Amendment 1. We are simply establishing a definition for what a "seed swap event" is and establishing for -- some required recordkeeping at seed swap events and at seed libraries. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3130. 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3130, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3162. Leader Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill {sic}.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 3162.
Signed by Senator Harmon.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)  
Leader Harmon, on your motion.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The underlying bill, Senate Bill 3162, creates an electronic business filing fee at the request of the Illinois Supreme Court to fund its -- its new electronic enterprise. The House amended the bill to provide for some corresponding reductions in other filing fees and I would move to concur in their amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)  
Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3162. 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 50 Ayes, 3 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3162, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 320. Leader Trotter. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 320.

Signed by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)  
Leader Trotter, on your motion.

SENATOR TROTTER:  
Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 320 - yes, correct bill - creates a task force to
complete an action plan to divert certain youth who are in contact with law enforcement agencies into appropriate mental health care settings. It was an agreed bill when it went over to the House. It came back and went through committee as an agreed bill and I would like to see its passage on the Floor today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 320. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 320, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 420. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 420. Signed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans, on your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This Senate Bill now allows Healthcare and Family Services to remove prior authorization approval on replacement of wheelchair parts, allows the Department to determine reimbursement rates by factors other than actual acquisition costs, and requires all the durable medical equipment providers to be accredited by an organization
approved by federal CMS. It's an agreed-to bill. Really appreciate all the work HFS did with the advocates to get this to an agreed bill. Urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 420. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 420, and is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll skip over Senate Bill 637. Senate Bill 2138. Senator Nybo. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2138.

Signed by Senator Nybo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo, on your motion.

SENATOR NYBO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Now that I have such extensive experience on this, I would ask everybody to support the motion. I can explain what the motion is and I think I should do so now, because there's two amendments that I'm asking the Body to adopt. So, all bills are good, but this has been the most fun bill for me to work this Session. This was the Snow Removal Service Liability Limitation Act, if you guys recall. And -- and we had some
opposition, some concerns raised by business groups. I asked for your indulgence to work them out in the House. We've done so. I apologize that I -- I -- I missed when the bill was initially called. In the flurry of activity that we had on Senator Biss's bill, I -- I took a restroom break, but I'm hoping that we can plow through this concurrence with your support and I'm happy to answer any questions. What the amendments do is, we do add a provision on contract terms that require service receiver -- that requires the service receiver from indemnifying or holding harmless or paying to defend the service provider from damages or tort liability. It does some other things. That's the first amendment. The second amendment provides that this Act does not affect any liabilities arising under other laws. Again, there's no opposition on this and I'd appreciate a -- a blizzard of support on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you get up?

SENATOR RAOUL:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Do you know that I'm a lawyer?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo. I think there was a question there.

SENATOR NYBO:

Do I get to answer the question? Senator, you could've fooled me.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion on this blizzard of a motion? Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2138. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2138, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2585. Senator Laura Murphy. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2585. Signed by Senator Murphy - Laura Murphy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Murphy, on your motion.

SENATOR L. MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2585 is the same bill, as amended by the House. It just changes the date. So it was an initiative from Budgeting for Results and I ask an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House -- House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2585. 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 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2585, and is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll return to page 18 of the printed Calendar, House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 5598. Senator Hutchinson. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

House Bill 5598.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hutchinson, on your bill.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 5598 makes changes to the Local Tax Collection Act to conform it to other local taxes and to direct the administrative fee to the Tax Compliance and Administration Fund, rather than GRF. This is the Act under which IDOR collects Cook County's and Chicago's private vehicle use tax, otherwise known as the PVUT. This codifies an intergovernmental agreement between Cook County and the Department of Revenue that will expire soon and was negotiated over the last two years. Don't know of any support. Would appreciate -- I mean don't know of any opposition. Would appreciate your support on this last day.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5598 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 5598, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5931. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

House Bill 5931.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans, on your bill.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill addresses a critical issue that folks -- the providers of care for people with developmental disabilities have been -- been experiencing. It increases their rates and reimbursements so that direct service personnel, or DSPs, can earn a base wage rate of at least fifteen dollars per hour. Biggest single issue that are facing providers right now are the inability to hire folks and keep them on board. They have twenty-five percent vacancy rates. They have not had any rate increases since 2008. Their current wage rate is about -- just a little over nine dollars an hour. At that, they cannot fill positions. This has become so problematic that the Ligas Consent Decree, which means people should be getting -- able to place into home and community environments if they so desire, the court monitor for that found us out of compliance because we have such high vacancy rates in these provider locations. Urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose
do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:
    To the bill, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
    To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
    Thank you very much.  Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, rumor has it, rumor has it - and rumors are not always true, but rumors along this line are almost always true here - that rather than find the willpower to do something responsible with regards to the State's finances and do something smaller that makes sure schools open and critical services are maintained, that instead what we're going to do is we are going to eat the Speaker's crow again and call a bill for -- and pass a budget bill that spends seven billion dollars more than what the taxpayers can afford to send to us.  If that weren't enough, we're going to load this on top of it.  The Senator is exactly right - the turnover rates in these facilities are absolutely too high.  Decide what you want to spend your money on.  Set your priorities and decide when -- what you'll spend your money on.  We cannot afford this and this, in the end, unless your side of the aisle decides to do something dramatic and responsible, is going to be another empty promise.  Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion?  Is there any further discussion?  Senator Anderson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ANDERSON:
    To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
To the bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Senator Steans, I -- I -- I'm really conflicted on this bill. I see the need for these people to make more money. I -- as -- as a fireman and paramedic, I work with these folks every day when I go pick up patients from their agencies and they do -- they do a lot -- they do a lot of things. They have a lot of responsibilities. They have a lot of liabilities. But why I'm conflicted is the huge jump, the huge jump from where they're at now to fifteen dollars an hour, and the issue that some of the workers have brought to me in discussions back in district is the fact that if this legislation passes and somebody that's been there working for fifteen years and makes fourteen ninety-five an hour, with this legislation, now they're going to be at fifteen dollars an hour and so is the person that starts the next day. So where is the benefit for them? Is -- is there -- is there any way that we could negotiate this and have more reasonable step raises, fifty cents -- fifty cents a year, something -- something more, rather than the big jump? I -- I -- I just have -- I -- again, I'm really conflicted on this. I mean, it was ten years ago I started as a new paramedic, making nine bucks an hour in the back of an ambulance, having to push meds, put tubes down people's throats, and I -- I understand what they do. So, at -- at this point, I would urge a -- a No vote, but, man, I -- I would really like to work with you on this on -- on something a little bit more reasonable. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Oberweis, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR OBERWEIS:
To the bill, briefly, Mr. President.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
To the bill.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:
We have this crazy thing out there called the "free market". The "free market" should set wages based on supply and demand. If in this particular business there is an excess of workers, wages rise slower; if there's a shortage of workers, wages rise faster. It's not government's obligation or duty or even rightful place to step in and determine what those wage rates should be. You talked about high turnover. That may mean that -- that could be an indication that wages aren't high enough and to reduce that turnover, the employer, the State in this case, is going to have to raise those wages on its own, because that's what the market determines, not State government. When we start to tell ourselves that we know more about the market here in Springfield, than the markets do about the markets, I think we've gone looney crazy. I urge a No vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you rise?

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

SENATOR RAOUL:
Mr. President, I just want the Body to know that things are normalizing. Senator Oberweis and I are not on the same page anymore. And I urge an Aye vote on this bill.
SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

I'd like to thank the sponsor for bringing this forward. Since I got here into the Illinois Legislature, I've had a lot of dealings with the Ray Graham Association. Ray Graham -- former Speaker of the Illinois House, Lee Daniels, was a big advocate for Ray Graham. Ray Graham will talk consistently how their funding has been cut, how they're unable to keep people willing to help. These are the most vulnerable of our society and they can't keep people in the jobs. People are earning more at McDonald's than they are cleaning up and taking care of our disabled. This is a bill you should be voting for, this is a bill that is a positive thing, and this is a bill that cares for people who cannot care for themselves. So I thank the sponsor for -- for bringing this bill forward and I'm an -- and I ask for an Aye vote.

SENATOR NYBO:

The previous speaker, the gentleman from Villa Park, is a
good friend of mine. He's very involved with Ray Graham. He also knows that I have been very involved with Ray Graham, and so if we're going to talk about Ray Graham, let's talk about Ray Graham. I've served on that board. I served for four years on that board. Ray Graham knows. They're not stupid, Senator. They know there's no money to fund this, okay? So what -- you know, you could take this vote and you're not helping them a bit. You want to help Ray Graham? You know what they talked about consistently when I served on the board? Workers' compensation. You want to help out non-profits in this State? You want to help out businesses in this State? Pass a workers' compensation bill, Senator. Let's get some workers' compensation done. But this, this doesn't help Ray Graham, so let's not talk about that. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hastings, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. In light of the previous conversation, move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

There are three speakers seeking recognition after Senator Nybo turns his light off. Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MCCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR MCCARTER:

Specifically to the last comment on workers' comp. There's a House bill that's already written...
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
   To the bill, please. To the bill.

SENATOR McCARTER:

   This is to the bill, sir. There's a House bill that speaks specifically to workers' comp that applies only to -- to government entities and non-profits, which helps providers like this. Now, you know, it's interesting that since 2008, it was commented, that there hasn't been a raise, yet those in control passed the largest tax increase ever and didn't bother to give 'em anything. So who's -- who's the compassionate one here now? All of a sudden we want to go from nine thirty-five to fifteen? That doesn't make sense. And then one of the previous speakers said, these providers need help. Well, help the providers, help 'em in their rates. Let the free market decide who gets the raise and who doesn't get the raise. Then the speaker behind me says, if someone's at fourteen seventy-five, why should they be at less than somebody comes on at fifteen instantly? You know, the free market works every time you let it. Why don't you just let it and quit taxing the whoop out of the people of this State and do the right thing?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

   Senator McCann, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCANN:

   To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

   To the bill.

SENATOR McCANN:

   I'd like to commend the sponsor for bringing the legislation. One of the previous speakers mentioned that the free market should dictate what -- what these folks are paid and that if the free
market -- is working properly, there won't (sic) be enough people to fill the positions and the wages will be raised. Well that's precisely what we're doing. There isn't -- there are not enough people willing to work this hard, doing this kind of trying work that not one of us in this Chamber would be willing to do, especially for that money. So that's what we're doing. These are working people. They're not asking for an entitlement. They're not asking for -- a handout. They're not asking for another program. They're simply asking to be paid a halfway decent wage for a very, very difficult job. I -- I know that, myself included - I'm including myself in this - we all go on local radio stations and talk for our media outlets and we talk about ten- and twelve- and fifteen-dollar-an-hour jobs, as if they were some sort of panacea that were coming to our region, when, in fact, a ten- or twelve- or fifteen-dollar-an-hour job hasn't really been a good job since President Reagan were in office. So I commend everyone who invests in Illinois. I -- I commend them. I commend everyone who creates a job, but these people deserve to be paid a fair wage. They haven't had a raise in a decade. It's the right thing to do. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Our final speaker, Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

A question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator Steans, could you explain to me how the Ligas Consent Decree is not in compliance currently and how this would actually
assist that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you. The court monitor for the Ligas Consent Decree found Illinois out of compliance within the limitation of the Consent Degree in January, precisely because of this issue. So, you can talk about the free market. Clearly, the free market's not working here. We have twenty-five percent vacancy rates. We are in control; the State is the one who sets the rates. People have not -- the providers have not been able to increase the wages because the rates haven't gone up. We're precisely trying to enable this to happen. If we don't, it's going to, once again, because of the court ordering us to do so, that it will happen, which I think is precisely what the administration has said they no longer want to be doing, is having to do everything by consent decree. So this certainly is in keeping, in my view, with trying to do the right thing, as well as getting into compliance with the consent decrees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Senator Steans. I ask all the other Members of the Senate to please join me in voting Yes for this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Steans, to close.

SENATOR STEANS:

Appreciate the robust discussion here. Want to note also, just based on previous conversations, that Ray Graham Association
actually has slipped in support of this bill, so we know where they stand. We know what the issues are that they're facing right now and the fact that they haven't gotten rate increases for an incredibly long time and these providers cannot do their work without it. I urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall House Bill 5931 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 Ayes, 18 Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 5931, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Will the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom immediately? Will the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom immediately? Leader Muñoz in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hastings, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HASTINGS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed on your personal privilege.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Since we just came off a bill where people don't get paid a lot of money to do their profession, for those legislative assistants that work so hard for us today, I just ask that we increase their wage, because I'm not able to keep my legislative aides very long. And I can tell you, he's moving on to make a higher wage with Senator Dick Durbin. Dan Lewis, let me just -- I got to brag about Dan a little bit here, because -- you know, I
-- I think my brother told me yesterday, you go through legislative aides like you go through a lot of things. And you guys can make your own analogy for that. But Dan came here as ranked as one of the top ten percent students at Illinois College, graduated magna cum laude, and he's editor of the Illinois College paper. He's going to get married here in the next month. We tried to counsel him on that. Dan's last day is tomorrow. He's moving on, like I said, to work for Senator Dick Durbin. He's going to be doing constituent services for immigration, IRS, and he's going to be part of the advance team for the Senator. And for the last -- the last six months that we've had Dan, it's been an absolute pleasure. And I was just hoping that we can all give him a round of applause and send him on his way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Congratulations, Dan. Wish you all the best. Senator Oberweis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

A -- an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed on your personal privilege.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

For those of you who are not aware, even though we have not been paid today as of the end of the month, if you look in your checking account, you'll probably see that you've all received the reimbursements for the last month or two, all of a sudden, just in the last day or two. So, there's money there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 153.
Offered by Senator Tom Cullerton. And adopted by the House, May 30th, 2016. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House. It is substantive, Mr. President.

A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 154.
Offered by Senator Haine. And adopted by the House, May 31st, 2016. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House. It is also substantive, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Criminal Law Subcommittee on Statutes of Limitation - House Bills 1127, 1128, and 1129; refer to Executive Committee - Senate Bill 2190, Motion to Concur on House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 10, Motion to Concur on House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2357, and Motion to Concur on House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2989; refer to State Government and Veterans
Affairs Committee - Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 571, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 730, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2427, and Motion to Concur on House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2469; refer to Transportation Committee - Senate Resolution 1943; re-refer from Transportation Subcommittee on Special Issues to Executive Committee - House Bill 173 and Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 173; Be Approved for Consideration - House Joint Resolution 153 and 154, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2340, and Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3336. Pursuant to Senate Rule 3-8 (b-1), the following amendments will remain in the Committee on Assignments - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 442, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1052, and Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 1646. Signed, Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To all Members, scheduling announcement: Executive Committee will meet at 2:50 p.m. in Room 212; Licensed Activities and Pensions Committee will meet at 2:50 p.m. in Room 400; State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee will meet at 2:50 p.m. in Room 409. Back to 3rd Reading, final action, page 17. House Bill 4334. President Cullerton. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4334.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton.
SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Back in September, the Secretary of State announced that they were no longer going to send out vehicle registration renewal reminder notices because of our budget impasse, and the decision to stop mailing the reminders was going to save them about four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. But a -- a good number of folks -- actually, there's -- eight hundred thousand renewal reminders are sent out each month. There's eleven million vehicles in the State and a lot of people missed getting those reminders and therefore they were subject to a registration renewal -- delinquent -- delinquent registration renewal fee. So this is in response to this. The bill would say that the Secretary of State is prohibited from imposing a delinquent registration renewal fee while the office is not sending those registration renewal notices to -- to vehicle owners and for -- we're providing an affirmative defense for any citations for expired registrations issued by any law enforcement for the -- the fact that the vehicle registration expired during that period of time. And then, pursuant to an amendment suggested by Senator Radogno in committee, this would apply to vehicle registrations that expire on or after the effective date of the amendatory Act. So it sunsets on June 30th, 2017. I believe we had this in the record before. There was some questions. I think they've been answered. And so I'd be happy to answer any more questions, but ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR SYVerson:
Thank you. Just a comment on the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. And thank you, Mr. President, for taking it out so we could talk -- talk about this bill. I support this, but I think it is important to point out that that -- that -- that pass we get from getting tickets is for thirty days only on this legislation. So, an individual whose license -- or plates were -- were going to renew on May 1, they'll get the pass until the end of May, but if they get stopped sometime in June, they would still be faced with that ticket. And I don't know of a better solution than what you have anyways, but I thought it was important we point out that this isn't a free pass forever, it's just a thirty-day pass, if -- if I understand what the bill is saying, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Senator. I -- I should've mentioned that, that the affirmative defense may only be used for one month after the expiration of the vehicle registration and a printout from the Secretary of State website will -- shall be admissible as evidence to establish the affirmative defense.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

No further discussion, President Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Simply ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 4334 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 59 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4334, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Page 20 of the Calendar. House Bill 6291. Senator Raoul. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6291.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUl:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 6291 is an initiative of the Cook County Board President and the Juvenile Justice Initiative and the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice. It's a -- a negotiated bill, a compromise bill with the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. It provides that a minor may not be committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice if he or she is found guilty of a Class 3 or Class 4 felony violation of the Illinois Controlled Substances Act, unless the committed -- commitment occurs upon a third or subsequent judicial finding of probation violation for noncompliance with court-ordered treatment or programming. It also reduces the period of probation or conditional discharge for minors guilty of Class X felonies and forcible felonies. Instead of a -- minimum period of five years' probation or conditional discharge, the period would range from eighteen months to thirteen -- thirty-six months minimum, depend
-- depending on the offense. However, regardless of the length of
the probation order, the court must hold hearings to determine
whether it is in the best interest of the minor and public safety
to terminate probation. I urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR NYBO:

Will the sponsor yield, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR NYBO:

Senator, I -- I -- voted Yes on this bill in committee,
correct? Do you -- do you recall that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUl:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

I believe I voted Yes because this is putting us more in sync
with what other states are doing with respect to juvenile justice,
correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUl:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
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Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

To -- to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR NYBO:

I know there were a lot of No votes in the House on this bill. I'm not sure if those were principled votes or those votes out of fear, but I think this is a good bill to support. I'm happy to support it and I appreciate that you brought it forward. Thank you. I -- I would encourage Yes votes on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Connelly, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Senator Raoul, I'm not going to remind you that I did vote No in committee. Quick question. What this does, it -- it reduces the number of years of mandatory probation from five to three. Give me some of the background why you thought that was reasonable and appropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

First off, you -- you did remind me that you voted No. So, it reduces the floor and it -- it does not create that three as a ceiling. So it allows a judge to have discretion, to some extent,
because there still is a floor, as to what is appropriate for -- for a minor respondent.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Connelly.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

...there?  There you go.  I guess the point I'm trying to make is we're talking about juveniles, and we've heard for the past, I don't know, two or three years about how we -- and we do, we treat them differently.  Their brains aren't developing as quickly - the -- the -- the data shows that.  Don't you think it's appropriate that we extend that probation period, because what we're trying to do with probation is to kind of keep a watch on -- on these folks so that they're, you know, they're -- they're towing the line? Wouldn't you agree with me on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I don't agree with your conclusion.  I think that -- let's take a minor who's committed an offense at the age of fifteen.  If you put them on thirty-six months' probation, that means you're putting 'em on probation until they -- they become the age of majority.  One of the -- one of the things that -- again, to the point that I raised earlier about it being a floor, a -- a judge is put in the position to make a determination as to whether or not, based on all of the information, and I used to be a juvenile prosecutor, so you have folks coming forth with information to inform the judge as to what the appropriate sentence should be.  And so I think we should trust in our judiciary to make that -- that appropriate decision.  Again, this is a floor,
you can still -- a judge can still, if -- if -- if the case demands it, sentence a minor respondent to five years' probation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Senator Connelly.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

  I appreciate the answer and this kind of flows into my next question. I -- I, too, agree with you with respect to judicial discretion and providing judges with the ability to make that analysis, but it says here in our analysis that this bill would create a rebuttable presumption that it's in the best interest of the minor and public safety to terminate probation. Why do we create that rebuttable presumption and not just simply give the judge full discretion to analyze the facts as they are?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUl:

  You know, I think -- I think it sends a message, that instead of reflexively saying, hey, let's have this minor serve a -- a five-year term of -- of probation and, in many instances, have probation hanging over their head after they've complied with most, if not all, the terms of probation -- any sort of technical violation could have them in -- in -- in violation of the probation -- and so it's in the -- it's -- it would be in the best interest to revisit that, and -- and the judge is still making ultimately the -- the determination. You'll still have all of the same evidence put forth and -- and the judge will make that determination on that evidence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Senator Connelly.
SENATOR CONNELLY:
   To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR CONNELLY:
   I -- I thank the sponsor. We had a robust discussion in Criminal Law. In a prior life, I, too, was a juvenile prosecutor at Eleventh and Hamilton in Chicago. I had red hair back then, so you wouldn't recognize me, Kwame. I'll only say this, that there -- I'm very concerned about the reduction from five to three years. I think the -- the fact that we're talking about aggravated criminal sexual assault and other very serious crimes. I think we've made great progress in terms of juvenile justice. I just simply think it's a little bit too far right now. And I respect the sponsor, but I also would respectfully ask for a No vote.

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

SENATOR OBERWEIS:
   Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:
   Senator Raoul, just when things were getting back to normal around here, I take offense to the fact that you throw out a bill that I feel like I have to support. That's not right. But I do think it's a good bill and I have to vote in favor of it anyway, even if you're on the same side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   No further discussion, Senator Raoul, to close.
SENATOR RAOUl:

I don't know how to close. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 6291 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, 15 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 6291, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator McGuire, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENSOR McGuire:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to waive all notice and posting requirements so that Senate Resolution 1913 can be heard today in the Senate State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McGuire moves to waive all notice and posting requirements so that Senate Resolution 1913 can be heard today in Senate State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee. All those in favor will vote -- say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and all notice and posting requirements have been waived. On page 24 of the Calendar, Concurrences. Senate Bill 637. Leader Link. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the concurrence.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 637. Signed by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. These amendments are initiatives of the Secretary of State and make the following changes in compliance with the federal ID Act: require all applicants of State identification card or driver's license show proof of lawful status in United States; prohibits residents from having both a State ID and a driver's license; and requires identification cards or disability identification cards to expire within eight years after issue. This is just getting us in compliance with the federal law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 637. 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 59 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 637, and the bill is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go back to page 22 of the Calendar. House Joint Resolution 136. Senator Forby indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 136, offered by Senator Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:
Thank you. House (Joint) Resolution 136 -- put a portion of Illinois 146 as "Deputy Elizabeth Edwards Memorial Highway". After the events -- September 11th, Deputy Sheriff Edwards joined the U.S. Army Reserve. After serving her country, she went on to become a deputy for the Hardin County Sheriff's Department in fall of 205 (sic) (2005). She began her career with a department as a dispatcher. From there, she became a bailiff of the courthouse before going on the road part-time. Deputy Sheriff Edwards was killed in the line of duty while responding to a traffic accident on February 2nd (sic) (12th), 2006.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Any discussion? There being none, as this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 136 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 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Joint Resolution 136, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Supplemental Calendar No. 1 has been distributed. We will now go to Concurrence, Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2300. Senator Trotter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2393. Senator Harmon. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the concurrence.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2393. Signed by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2393 is the Breakfast After the Bell program for -- to expand access to school breakfasts. It was amended in the House to provide for a more robust waiver opportunity for school districts that wouldn't be able to participate. With the amendment, I believe we've addressed any concerns and there's no opposition. I'd ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to commend the sponsor. I know the sponsor worked on this legislation. Due to his efforts, I think school districts find this a much more agreeable proposal by the sponsor and I want to encourage an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2393. 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 Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2393, and is —
the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2823. Senator Koehler. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2823. Signed by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The original bill allowed a high school that had a construction program where students renovated or built a residential unit to sell that by -- through a real estate agent, rather than by a sealed bid, which is the State -- how the State does business. This -- the amendment just clarifies that -- that it is not a structure, but it's residential property, so that's the change. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2823. 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 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate does concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2823, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3163 -- correction, Senate Bill 2929. Senator Mulroe. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2929.
Signed by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The House amendment actually removed portions of the bill and in -- as a result of that, it removed the opposition from the Department of Human Services, Healthcare (and) Family Services, and Department of {sic} (on) Aging. So there's no more opposition. Ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2929. 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 Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 2 to Senate Bill 2929, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3163. Senator Van Pelt. Indicates she wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

...move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 3163.
Signed by Senator Van Pelt.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Van Pelt.
SENATOR VAN PELT:

...Mr. President. Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 3163 replaces and -- the original language. It prohibits an employer from -- from entering into a non-compete covenant with a low-wage employer. It passed out of this Senate unanimously. With the amendment in the House, it passed out of the House unanimously. And I urge your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 3163. 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 56 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 4 to Senate Bill 3163 -- and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3335. Senator Rose. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3335. Signed by Senator Rose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rose.

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you. This bill was amended in the House to add epinephrine administered by -- from an ampule to the list of ways to administer epinephrine. I completely agree with the amendment and would ask for its favorable adoption. With the concurrence
motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Nybo, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR NYBO:
To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
The bill, Senator.

SENATOR NYBO:
It's a good bill. Actually, there's additional things that we can do in this space and I -- I -- Senator Rose, I'd like to follow up with you, because in the space of EMS, I think we can do a lot more with epinephrine. So, look forward to working with you over the summer.

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

SENATOR ROSE:
As a lawyer, I look forward to looking -- working with you this summer. The -- now I've totally lost my train of thought. I hope everybody just votes for the bill. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments (sic) 1 to Senate Bill 3335. 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 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments (sic) 1 to Senate Bill 3335, and the bill is declared passed. Now, Senate Bill 2300.
Senator Trotter. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2300. Signed by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

...President, Members of the Senate, Senate Bill 2300, as amended, represents an agreement between the Cook County Department of Public Health and the Illinois Association of Realtors, who passed the ball, which -- the bill, which makes changes in the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act to provide that prior to entering into a renewal of an existing lease agreement or before entering into a new sales contract for a dwelling that requires lead mitigation, the owner must furnish the current leasee with a written notice of lead hazard in the -- in the premises.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. Maybe a question or a comment for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, thank you for your work on this legislation, both as it started here and as it went over to the House and has evolved and you -- and you worked out some of the arrangements. I don't
think there's any opposition to the idea of doing notification and having these rules when it comes to dealing with landlords. The -- the concern that the rental property owners had, that I think we can clarify when rules get drafted, is in the area where the legislation talks about lease renewals, when it says when a lease -- when a -- when a renewal -- when a lease is renewed, and my understanding is that there's -- and I'm not a lawyer -- but my understanding is that there isn't a term "renewal of lease". Either a lease is rewritten or the lease is -- is -- a lease is expired but continues month to month, because the contract that they signed may say, when your lease expires, if you stay there and you pay your rent month to month, it is an in facto {sic} continuing that lease, but it's not necessarily a renewal. And so during the rule process what I guess what I'd like to have spelled out is it very clear that we're talking about when a -- when the lease is going to be rewritten, as opposed to renewal, rewritten, and if a lease in fact is going to be extended de facto month to month, that -- that this same rule would apply, that the -- that the notification that would -- would be sent out. So I guess my other commitment to you is to ask that -- or make sure or on the record today we're talking about that it's clearly spelled out what the terms of this legislation are when it comes to when notification has to go out with this -- with this. Does that -- does that make sense?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENIOR TROTTER:

Yes, sir. As a non-lawyer that made a lot of sense to me, President. I -- I don't know what the lawyers have to say about
that, but it's -- it's certainly that my intent is not to add to that confusion. And as you mentioned, it -- it is a situation, one that we need to look at - the law itself and -- and there's some cleanup that needs to be done that's been brought to my attention because of the many different laws that we've done through the year, and the Attorney General of the State of Illinois has become involved with us trying to get the correct language and the clear language going forward with this. So certainly this is nothing to impede them from -- from renting the apartment going forward. So I agree with you, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

And my hopes would be that -- and -- and I think this is something that can be easily spelled out and clarified during the rule process, that we don't need to come back and do more legislation. This is a, I think, a simple fix and so I -- I hope this gets supported and that the administration just deals with it on a rule basis so we can get it done much quicker. So I appreciate your patience and your work on this as it's worked its way through both Chambers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter, to close.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much. The -- the whole impetus of this bill, one, is to -- to continue to address the lead issue and the lead specifically that -- in our children. We know that there's no safe levels of lead in our bodies and sadly those impacted by lead ingestion are our children under six and it -- it affects their
development, their brain development. It causes many disabilities going forward. It has been attributed to some -- the violent tendencies of some youth and it's something that we can take care of. It's something we've been trying to address since 1979, not only in this State, but in this country, but more work is needed. And because of that, I put this legislation forward, and I would like to see it passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2300. 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, 1 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments (sic) 1 to Senate Bill 2300, and the bill is declared passed. We'll still proceed on Supplemental Calendar No. 1. We're going to House Joint Resolution 127. Senator Martinez. Indicates she wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the House joint resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 127, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Joint Resolution 127 requires that Bilingual Advisory Task Force to study the feasibility of professional certification standards for foreign language education interpreters in public schools. The resolution also adds two members to the task force and extends the task force
deadline for submitting its findings and recommendations from December 15, 2015, to December 15, 2016. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, as this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 127 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. House Joint Resolution 127, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I forgot to hit my green button on my own resolution. So can you please record me as a Yes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Record will reflect that you voted Aye. On page 28 of the Calendar, House Bill 229. Senator Bush. Indicates she wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the concurrence -- motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to recede from Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 229.

Filed by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:
Thank you. This is a motion to recede from Senate Floor Amendment 4, which exempted mental health boards from potential dissolution by a county board. And I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate recede from its Amendment 4 to House Bill 229. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. 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 55 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate recedes from the Senate Amendment 4 to House Bill 229, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll now go to page 21 of the Calendar, Senate Resolutions. Starting at the top of the page, Senate Resolution 1102. Senator McGuire. Out of the record. Senate Resolution 1152. Senator Morrison. Indicates she wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Morrison.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Morrison, on Amendment 2.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to adopt the amendment and discuss when we discuss the entire resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Resolution 1152, offered by Senator Morrison.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Morrison, on your resolution.

SENATOR MORRISON:
Thank you, Mr. President. Here's a resolution I think everyone in the Senate Chamber can get behind. It designates November 10th (sic) (June 1), 2016, as "Healthy Puppy Day". It's a day when all -- all of us dog lovers and animal -- animal advocates from across the State can gather together to ban puppy mills and cruelty to animals. I would appreciate your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1152 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1491. Senator... Before we get to that, Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RIGHTER:
On a point of personal privilege, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Please proceed on your personal point.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the -- of the Chamber. I have the special and unique privilege to introduce, in the gallery above me here, a group of eighth graders from St.
Nicholas (of) Tolentine in Chicago. Now I know the immediate reaction is, what? Why is Righter getting up and introducing a class of eighth graders from Chicago? Good question. Because their Senator, Senator Sandoval's not on the Floor right now, but he has given me express permission to introduce this very, very special group of kids, eighth graders from St. Nicholas (of) Tolentine. I would ask all of them -- they're already up. If the Senate would please give them a warm welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senate Resolution 1491. Senator Stadelman. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1491, offered by Senator Stadelman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Stadelman.

SENATOR STADELMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1491 requests that the Secretary of State conduct a study on the need and feasibility of establishing a driver's license reinstatement fee payment program with the goal of allowing individuals to pay down -- pay a down payment and pay a monthly percentage until those fees are paid in full. We hope to alleviate some of those financial burdens that outstanding traffic tickets and resulting license suspensions can cause, particularly for low-income residents who rely on driving to get to school or work. If we can get people to have their license -- have those licenses returned more quickly, hopefully they can keep or get a job and certainly pay down -- pay down those fines more quickly. Not aware
of any opposition. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, as the resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall Senate Resolution 1491 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 59 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House -- Senate Resolution 1491, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Senate Resolution 1633. Senator Steans. Out of the record. Senate Resolution 1719. Senator Bush. Indicate -- Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bush, on your Amendment 1.

SENATOR BUSH:

I'd be happy to explain the amendment on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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)

Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Resolution 1719, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1719 urges Congress to pass legislation to allocate funds from the Interim Storage Fund and/or any other fund to the local authorities in Zion and similarly -- similar, excuse me, situated communities to mitigate the social and economic impacts arising from the storage of nuclear materials. This resolution is in response to a nuclear -- nuclear facility that was shuttered in my district and this is urging our federal government to pass legislation that allows some of the funds that have been in -- that have been collected to move nuclear -- nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain to be -- to be released to those communities that become interim waste storage facilities. I would urge an Aye vote and I would certainly suggest anyone that has a nuclear facility in their district should be particularly concerned about this and asking that the federal government allows the release of some of those dollars should our facilities, if in fact, become interim nuclear waste storage facilities. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1719 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Bill {sic} 1741. Senator Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Resolution 1753. Senator Collins. Indicates she wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Collins, on your Floor Amendment 1.

SENATOR COLLINS:
Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1. I will discuss it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
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)
Please read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Resolution 1753, offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:
Thank you, Mr. President. What the Floor amendment actually did for Senate Resolution 1753, it makes a technical change to the resolution that clarifies that Mondelez neither received nor used an EDGE credit on its Naperville facility because it failed to hire the required twenty-five employees. Let me just -- I think it's important, I just want to specify what Senate R 1753 is attempting to do. It commends the Rauner administration for closing the EDGE credit loophole and urges the Governor and DCEO
to continue working with the General Assembly to tighten accountability related to all corporate incentive programs in order to ensure taxpayer dollars are used to create good-paying jobs that sustain families and communities for the long term. In addition, the resolution urges Mondelez International, which is in my district, to reconsider its decision to move production lines out of Chicago, thereby causing six hundred jobs to be lost. It's moving it out of Chicago, out of the United States, to Mexico. So I would ask for acceptance of this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1753 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted.

Senate Resolution 1761. Senator Lightford. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Lightford, on Floor Amendment 2.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move for its adoption and will be happy to explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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)
Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1761, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1761 urges Governor Rauner's administration to comply with the statutory goal of twenty percent participation with minority- and women-owned firms in professional services and legal services. The resolution further urges the Rauner administration to make every effort for fiscal year '16 to satisfy the twenty percent goal for participation with minority- and women-owned firms in professional services. The resolution finally urges the Rauner administration to comply with the statutory goal for veterans-owned firms as well. I know of no known opposition and I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1761 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1782. Senator Jones. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1782, offered by Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
Senate Resolution 1782 urges the U.S. Congress to recognize the Ku Klux Klan as a terrorist organization and pursue in dismantling this domestic terrorist hate group with the same powers used to protect the United States from other terrorist organizations. Welcome to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1782 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1783. Senator Collins. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1783, offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1783 calls upon all elected leaders in state legislatures, the United States Congress, and the President to make it a top priority to end hunger by 2030.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1783 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1824. Senator Hunter. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1824, offered by Senator Hunter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Resolution 1824 urges all federal, State and county legislators and officials to consider and enact policies to enhance access to mental health services in the criminal justice system. The resolution also urges law enforcement community to consider the integration of mental health treatment/services, such as crisis intervention, to address mental health crisis and reduce arrest rates. And it also urges all states and federal government to examine benefits and costs -- the cost of suspending Medicaid coverage instead of terminating coverage for individuals in the criminal justice system. I know of no opposition and I would ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1824 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted.

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution designates November 2016 as Lung Cancer Awareness Month. This past month, I brought down a young man, named Ian Piet, who had raised over eight hundred dollars at the Hancock Hustle, and he's an advocate for lung cancer awareness, and I would just hope that everyone would
support the resolution. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1826 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1840. Senator Bennett. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Bennett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bennett, on your Floor Amendment 1.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I was -- I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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)

Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1840, offered by Senator Bennett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution tries to recognize
the importance of college savings programs, particularly the 529 savings programs, which are state-run college savings programs established by Congress in 1996. It would also designate May 29th, 2016, as 529 College Savings Day in Illinois to raise awareness for the escalating costs of higher education and also to emphasize the importance of saving for college. Of course, the Office of the Illinois State Treasurer Mike Frerichs administers the State's college savings plans, including Bright Start and Bright Start -- and Bright Directions College Savings Plans. Ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1840 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted.

Senate Resolution 1741. Senator Clayborne. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1741, offered by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Majority Leader Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1741, recommendation of Baxter Healthcare, urges Illinois to recognize the significance of equal access to all End Stage Renal Disease to save State funds by allowing more patients who can benefit from home dialysis to secure access. Senate Bill (sic) 1741 urges State agencies and policymakers to implement policies to reduce the lack of access to home dialysis modalities, which adversely impact African-Americans and others -- other
racial and ethnic minorities, by enhancing access to home dialysis. This is personal for me, because for a year and a half - nobody knew it - I would go home every evening and leave here and do home dialysis when I had renal failure. So I know the importance of being able to control your -- your schedule and being able to continue to function in our society. So I would urge the passage of Senate Resolution 1741.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1741 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. With leave of the Body, we will go -- page 22 of the Calendar. Senate Joint Resolution 53. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution 53, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 53 creates the Feral Cat Task Force. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, as this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call will be required. The question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 53 pass. All 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 54 voting
Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Joint -- Senate Joint Resolution 53, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committees, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess.

(PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ))

The Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Martinez, Chairperson of the Committee on Licensed Activities and Pensions, reports Motions to Concur - House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill -- House Amendment 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2701 Recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Motions to Concur - House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 10, House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1582, House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2357, and House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2989 Recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Landek, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs, reports Senate Resolution 1913 Be Adopted; Motions to Concur - House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 571, House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 730, House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2427, and House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2469 Recommend Do Adopt.

(PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ))

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1954, offered by Senator McGuire and all Members.

And Senate Resolution 1955, offered by Senator Oberweis and all Members.

They are both death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1953, offered by Senator Hastings.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Will all Members please come to the Senate Floor? All Members, please come to the Senate Floor. We will continue on Resolutions as well as going to 3rd Readings for final action. If you want your resolution and bills called, please come to the Floor. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 2604.

Together with the following amendments which are attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2604.

We have received a like Message on Senate Bill 3112, with House Amendments 1 and 2. Passed the House, as amended, May 31st,

Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

  House Bill 6418.


PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Mr. Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

  House Bill 6418, offered by Senator McConnaughay.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Mr. Secretary, Senate Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

  Senate Bill 3435, offered by Senator Radogno.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  We'll now proceed to page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 550. Senator Steans indicates she wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? Correction: Senator Steans seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 550 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 550. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for
consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Steans.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Steans, on your amendment.
SENATOR STEANS:
   Yeah, don't want to call Floor Amendment No. 2.  Want to do Amendment No. 3.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Steans moves to withdraw Amendment 2.  Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Steans.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Steans, on Amendment 3.
SENATOR STEANS:
   Yes, this bill -- this amendment becomes the bill and I'll speak about it on 3rd.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Is there any discussion?  Senator Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR ROSE:
   Mr. President, if I may, not to the bill. We would like to ask that Senator Bivins be excused for the rest of the day due to a family emergency. And that's all I can really say, but I would ask for prayers for his family. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   That is noted and will be recorded and we will have prayers for his family and him. 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. Mr. Secretary, on the Order of 3rd Reading, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 550.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Just first for clarification, we had had this bill. This bill is addressing lead in water and a follow-up to what's happened in Flint, Michigan. We had had this bill in the Environment Committee and I had said I would bring it back to that committee. Just to be clear, we did have a new amendment; it was just assigned to the Public Health Committee I think in the interest of time and expediency. So I just want everyone on the Environment Committee know that we did have a second amendment that got heard in committee, it just wasn't in Environment. We have continued to further narrow this bill. My goal right now is to pass it over to the House and keep working on it. This is not in its final form. We've been really narrowing it. There's no lead that can be ingested by kids at any safe level, period. And current status right now is that not all schools need to have sampling of water
to see that there is no lead in it, and yet we know that that has been the case. Chicago Public Schools, for example, has voluntarily been doing some lead testing and finding lead at above -- at action levels in it. This bill is now requiring sampling for lead in drinking water sources at the higher risk schools. These are schools that were built prior to 1986 (sic) (1987), when you no longer have lead piping put in. And it's also limiting the number of samples that need to be taken. We're trying to just continue to work out who needs to actually provide for that -- the sampling that'll be done by the schools and where the testing should happen. We're going to continue to work that out to get to an agreed bill, hopefully, in the House. Ask for your support as this is really a critical issue. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR MCCARTER:

Questions of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR MCCARTER:

Senator, you were talking about this new testing, the new -- new mandates to take samples. Who does this -- who do you -- who is this going to apply to? You -- you talk a lot about schoolchildren and schools, but does this not apply to all water systems in the State? And -- specifically, tell us who it applies to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.
SENATOR STEANS:

There -- there's -- it -- the -- section on the schools applies only to schools built prior to 1986 (sic) that have kids in K {sic} (pre-K) through 5th grades in the building, so it's been narrowed. And there's -- it applies to the schools that aren't -- don't have their own -- there are some schools right now -- only schools that rely upon non-community water supplies are tested by the schools themselves right now. The sample results are provided by the schools to the Illinois Department of Public Health. That's happening. Other schools are not already tested. So it's taking those schools and requiring sampling. We've also been trying to narrow it down on how much -- how many samples will need to be taken within each school. So, for example, if you have water fountains that were all put in at the same time and are the same model, only a sample from one of those water fountains would need to be taken. So we've been continuing to sort of narrow the scope of this to make it more practical. And there's -- they have a three-year time period in which to do the required samples. So it's a one-time over three years that we would do this sampling to make sure that there's not lead in the water in those schools.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, why -- you -- you seem like you've made some progress from the time you came to Environment and in a pretty quick fashion. Why couldn't you have completed that here? Because -- I mean, we do this all the time. We put a lot of trust in the House to do the right thing and then all we get is a Yes or No vote on Concurrence when it comes back. I'm -- I don't ever take
up that battle with the House a lot, because I didn't come from there, so I don't have that, you know, rivalry. But you made such good process. Why can't we get this right here in the Senate? And tell me what you haven't achieved yet that you expect to achieve in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Great question. Thank you for it. And -- and I should note that there's two -- I -- I've been focused here on the part that applies to school. There's two other sections that we generally -- we do have agreement on now, and that's doing inventory of lead pipes when somebody's in doing construction, that they just inventory where they have lead pipes and report that. And there's another section that when there's construction happening, notification is going to the homeowners, who may be impacted by the construction, with information about what you should do to make sure you flush out your water so you don't have lead. So we've gotten to an agreement on those portions. The area that we don't is simply around the school items. I think the real outstanding issue is, we know that the schools will do the sampling. The question is who should be paying and sort of bearing the costs of the testing. And that's what still needs to get worked out. So it's a much smaller scope. I do trust that I can work with the House sponsor over there. And all the parties have been great at coming together and negotiating on this, so I do have a high confidence that we'll be able to get to an agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter.
SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, you said you had an agreement. Who did you get an agreement with on those last two issues that you talked about?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Been working with the impacted departments and various water supply companies around those pieces - the State departments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCARTER:

I -- again, I think this is something we -- we should have taken up perhaps even a little earlier, because if we made -- if we made -- if we got some, you know, quick agreement here just in the last few days, we probably could have gotten this thing done to where it was ready to go with only minor adjustments. My concern is that this is going to raise the cost of water to consumers, because of more requirements. And to say that, doesn't mean that myself or anybody else is not concerned about lead in water, but we're reacting to something that took place in another state. I have no idea what took place in that state. All I know is I've seen the pictures of the brackish water. I've also seen congressmen drinking the water, showing us it was okay. I -- I don't know anything about that. But I just don't want us to overact and put more mandates on public water systems that really
take us incrementally safer for a much larger cost and there's not really a value there. So, because of it not being its -- in its final form, I will not be supporting the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Holmes, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HOLMES:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes, Senator Steans, as you well know, we -- 'cause this did come up in Environment and I obviously had some great concerns, and with a background in construction, I'm very, very aware of the issues with lead and how they impact, especially young developing brains. And of course, the concern is, is, quite frankly, there is no safe level of lead, period. My question is, what is the impact of this going to be on the municipalities right now? Do we have any idea what their responsibility is going to be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

There's -- we've worked with them. There -- there -- they have no opposition to this bill. We've -- the part that had impacted them, we've taken out of the bill and are -- continue to work on a broader bill then. This really is limited. The only impact there is, if there's construction going on, it's just by notifying if you're doing a construction project. No new construction or anything like that, nothing's required. Just if you're doing a construction project and you identify a lead pipe,
that it gets notified to the IEPA so we can start building an inventory. And there's no opposition to my knowledge around that portion of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

And just one last question. So, is the plan at this point going to be to continue to work on this over the summer even while they have the -- I mean, it's not like this is something the House is going to take up immediately?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

To the bill. I just want to say that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR HOLMES:

...I -- I think there are some things that still need to be worked out on this, but I'm going to continue to support it because I think we have to understand that first and foremost this is a vital, vital issue when it comes to the young developing brain; how desperately the impacts are felt for the rest of a child's life if they have ingested too much lead. So, I applaud the sponsor for bringing this to our attention. I'm glad to see we will still be working on it this summer. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Muñoz)

Senator Steans, to close.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you. I appreciate the discussion. Just to note that this is a real problem now that we need to address. USA Today had done a report on elevated blood -- excuse me, elevated lead in water and they had found it -- that it was in existence in schools here in Illinois. Chicago Public Schools has voluntarily started to do this and they found in their testing that they started that they did find high levels of lead in a few of their schools. This is a real problem we need to get a handle on and make sure we're not creating unwarranted situations and situations that are going unnoted for these developing brains. As I say, we're going to continue to work on it and try to get everyone in agreement on it. And I urge your Aye votes and really appreciate the discussion and attention to this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Muñoz)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 550 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 48 voting Aye, 5 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 550, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will now go to page 6 of the Calendar. Sponsorship has been changed. Senate Bill 325. Senator Bennett. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Senator Bennett seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 325 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 325. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for
consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Bennett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bennett, on Floor Amendment 2.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just ask to -- we would ask to adopt Floor Amendment No. 2 and we'll 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:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 325.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. You may recall, last year, Senator Chapin Rose and myself brought a piece of legislation to address a landfill that was over the Mahomet Aquifer, which is the sole source of drinking water for about eight hundred thousand people in Central Illinois, including the citizens of our two districts. We are back with this bill and it
should note that he is the chief co-sponsor - he would want me to add - to Senate Bill 325. Now this bill would create a task force to put the best and the brightest minds in the room, those that are affiliated with both government, local bodies in the State, as well as environmental experts, to address the issue of maintaining the clean drinking water of the Mahomet Aquifer. I would ask for an Aye vote and be willing to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Bennett, I commend you on this landmark legislation. One question. You indicated you wanted the best and brightest to be on this task force. Would that include Senator Chapin Rose?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

If so determined to be the best and the brightest by the Governor, who would make that appointment, then -- then yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Connelly.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

In all serious {sic}, I -- I appreciate the -- the sponsor's efforts here and Senator Rose's spirited remarks regarding this the other day, when he changed his vote on the Floor regarding a -- a matter near and dear to my district, so I -- I encourage an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There being no further discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 325 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 Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 325, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave, we'll now go back to page 21 on the Calendar to Senate Resolutions. Senate Resolution 1852. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1852, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 852 -- 1852 urges members of the United State Congress and the President of the United States to return U.S. veterans, who have been deported to Mexico, to their families, children, and communities in the United States. And I'm -- be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1852 pass. All those in favor, vote {sic} Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1914. Senator Bush. Senator Bush. 1914, your resolution? Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1914, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. So, in April of 2016, the first responders, the Grayslake Lake Fire District and the Grayslake Police Department, completed a training course to make Grayslake a -- a dementia-friendly community. Grayslake will have the distinction of being the first dementia-friendly community in Illinois. They literally will be doing trainings with their restaurants, their hair salons, financial institutions, related businesses, so that they can recognize dementia and understand how best to deal with customers that perhaps are suffering from dementia. And according to the Alzheimer's Association, dementia is the symptom of Alzheimer's. So the resolution is a recommendation of the Right at Home (In-Home Care) and Assistance facility and the Village of Grayslake. It declares Grayslake the dementia -- first -- excuse me, you know, it's either...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please, let's keep the noise down a little bit. Keep your conversations low.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you. It will...
Let's respect the speaker.

It will help me speak better. I -- I appreciate that. The "Dementia-Friendly Community Day", paralleled with the Alzheimer's Association "Longest Day of the Year" celebration of 6/20/2016. Grayslake is the first community to become a dementia-friendly community in the State of Illinois and I think everyone should take a look at it and ask their communities to consider doing the same, as we see our senior population rising. And I would urge adoption. Thank you.

There any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1914 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 1916. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. Senate Resolution 1938. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

Senate Resolution 1938, offered by Senator Bush.

This may be about the sixth time I've run this one. So, anyway, Senate Resolution 1938 creates the Working Group on Local Government Consolidation. The work group consists of nineteen members that represent taxing bodies in Lake County. I know of no objections and I would appreciate an Aye vote.
Any discussion? There being none, as this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call will be required. The question is, shall Senate Resolution 1938 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Resolution 1938, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Senator Silverstein, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed on your announcement.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

There will be a very peaceful and noncombative caucus for approximately an hour upon recess, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Republicans would also like to caucus for about an hour upon recess.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Silverstein and Senator Althoff move that the Senate recess for the purpose of a Democratic and Republican Caucus, each lasting one hour. Seeing no objection, the motion is granted. The... (microphone cutoff) ...recess to the call of the Chair. After the Democratic and Republican Caucus, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess to the call...
of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Senate will come to order.  Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

  A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

  Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

  Senate Bill 324.

  Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

  House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 324.

  We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2261, with House Amendment 3; and Senate Bill 3096, with House Amendment 3. Passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2015 {sic} (2016). Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

  Will all Members please come to the Floor?  We will be going to Supplemental Calendar No. 2.  Senator Link in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

  With leave of the Body, we'll go to Supplemental Calendar No. 2, Resolutions.  Senate Resolution 1913.  Leader Muñoz.  Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Resolution 1913, offered by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Muñoz, on your resolution.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Resolution 1913 recognizes that persons who serve in the United States Armed Forces should be entitled to a peaceful life in this nation. As a result, this resolution calls for the limiting of deportation of military veterans who are immigrants and urges members of the U.S. Congress to pass House Resolution 5012, the Restoring Respect for Immigrant Service in Uniform Act. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution (sic) (Senate Resolution) 1913 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise? Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to waive all notice and posting requirements so that Senate Resolution 1943 can be heard...

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'll -- I will refrain from making my remarks in the record and come back at you at a later date.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

We appreciate that. On -- continue on to Supplemental Calendar No. 2, House Joint Resolution 153. Senator Tom Cullerton.
Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 153, offered by Senator Tom Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cullerton, on your resolution.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the General Assembly. House joint resolution requires the IEPA, in conjunction with the Illinois Department of Public Health, to execute a study of lead in Illinois drinking water outlining the chemical (and) human health impacts of lead in Illinois piped water supplies. I know of no opposition. This bill passed out of the House -- this resolution passed out of the House 111 to 1. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

As -- is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? As this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall joint resolution -- House -- House Joint Resolution 153 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 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. House Joint Resolution 154. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 154, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine, on your resolution.
SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, an inquiry of the Chair, please. If you would answer...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your inquiry.

SENATOR HAINE:

My inquiry is, do -- am I required to read the entire detailed summary as introduced - the explanation that appears on the ballot, the arguments in favor, and the arguments in opposition? Are they noted for the record or do I have to read them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

You speak to it in your own terms, Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you very much. HJR 154 is a companion resolution to House Joint (Resolution) Constitutional Amendment 36, the Transportation Lockbox Amendment. As required by law, this House Joint Resolution 154 sets forth a brief explanation of the proposed amendment, a brief argument in favor of the amendment, and a brief argument against the amendment, and the form in which the amendment will appear on the ballot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? As the - - as this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 154 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Joint Resolution 154, having received the required constitutional
majority, is declared adopted. We'll return to the printed Calendar for -- on page 22, Resolutions, Senate Resolution 1916. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1916, offered by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler, on your resolution.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This resolution asks HFS, the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to look at providing us data over the past five years, starting in 2012. What we know has -- has happened with -- with Medicaid is that we've gone from fee-to-service (sic) (fee-for-service) for -- to managed care strategy and this would just give us the basic information of where we have been on that cost curve and -- and give us information we can use for future policy decisions. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. A couple questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. Senator, I appreciate the work we have done this year on trying to improve the MCO process and making them more accountable to that. And so the concept of doing measuring, which is -- what this resolution calls for, makes sense. I have
concerns, though, the way the resolution is drafted and maybe you can help me with a few of these things and either by legislative intent try to correct those or whether or not we need to have a different resolution. But, currently, the calculation requirement does not include agency administrative costs related to operations of the State Medicaid program. So the idea of trying to measure operations but not include in that and if -- numbers, including the group insurance, the retirement costs, the unemployment insurance, other costs paid by HFS is not in there. Now I know it's a little bit broader and it says it takes into consideration their salaries and the costs incurred directly by HFS, but it -- it doesn't say that you can include the costs that aren't direct HFS, which would be things -- things like I mentioned, like the group insurance or others. So, I -- I guess the question would be, does this -- is it your intent that there's enough leeway that when we talk about administrative costs that it -- it will include all agents, all costs, whether it's HFS or not HFS related.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you for that question. Yes, I -- I certainly would like to have the Department provide us any information that they think is pertinent and they could do that by adding a footnote or an addendum. This should be seen as kind of the floor. In other words, if -- we'd -- we'd at least like what's been laid out here, but if they want to provide us more information that we can digest and -- and evaluate, that is the intent of this resolution. We want to have information that is pertinent to what our cost curve has been in terms of Medicaid and -- and I would certainly welcome
that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

A couple of the other concerns in trying to compare -- in trying to compare the -- the traditional fee-for-service Medicaid versus now moving into managed care, which is very difficult to do, is that we're -- in this case, we're comparing calculations using data that was before the ACA population was added and now we -- so we're -- we have a -- a whole different population that we're trying to compare costs to compared to what the average cost was under fee-for-service with a totally different population. So that makes it, again, much more difficult. As opposed to moving forward and comparing managed care companies to each other or year over year under managed care comparisons, this we're talking about significant different population change from where we were pre-managed care versus after managed care. So how would we address that in trying to put together this kind of comparison?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Well, we're really looking at some averages. We want to know what the cost per patient or client is. Again, any -- anything that the Department feels is worth noting, I would -- I would ask them to put that as a footnote or an -- as an addendum so that we have that information. But, again, the -- the overall purpose is just to -- is just for us to get -- understand, as legislators, where we have been. We started out with fee-for-service. We've moved into managed care. We know we've had some hearings on -- on
managed care. I would like to help, you know, the -- the whole system be more efficient. You know, managed care uses a -- a case management strategy, which, when -- when coupled with a partner provider, offers very good care. We know that. So this is not really to evaluate so much as just to say, where are we? And going forward, then we can do evaluation and it can be -- help us in -- in determining policy decisions that we make in the future.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

    A couple more items. Let me just quickly run through some of these, which, again, makes the -- the wording of this resolution, I -- I think, very difficult to reach the goal that we want to reach. You know, in here, nursing home payments are not allowed to calculate -- be calculated in the fee-for-service baseline, because those costs were not billed to those providers. The hospital assessment, which was over a billion dollars, is not being calculated in the fee-for-service baseline, but it has to be included in the managed care baseline. That's a significant difference. And contracted services' upfront costs in other agencies are not included in the baseline calculations, but those have to be included in the capitation rate calculations. So, the problem is, I think the way this was drafted -- the people who were drafting this resolution for you I -- I think had a preconceived outcome that they wanted to achieve and so they drafted it in a way where they put those subtle little bombs in there that make it difficult, that if we follow this resolution the way it's exactly worded, would make the outcome then a predetermined one that the sponsors wanted, as opposed to if we
came up with something that wasn't so specific with these guidelines that are going to give us this kind of outcome. So, again, that's -- I understand what you're trying to get at. I think you and I want to get at the same page, same -- same results. But I think the drafters of this had a different outcome plan than what you and I wanted to have planned and so I don't think this does it. I'm more than open to looking at maybe another resolution or something, or even without a resolution, we can go to the Department with a -- a legitimate -- legitimate -- list of items that we want included so we can really have a true comparison of where we are and where we want to be at. Thoughts on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler. I think there was a question in there somewhere.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, I -- I understood that. Thank you for the question. We -- we've -- and -- and this was done by my direction. You know, this was not done for me. This was done with my asking for these things to be laid out as they were. We excluded any payments associated with the Hospital Assessment program. We talked about excluding any mandates that were added on, like in terms of heroin treatment and that. So we tried to put this together so that it's -- it's an apples-to-apples comparison. I know this is complex stuff. Again, this, I think, gives the Department the gist of what we're looking for. If they think that there is pertinent information or it needs to be categorized in a certain way, I would welcome that. The point of this whole thing is give us good data so we can just kind of see where we've been and understand what the numbers mean.
Presiding Officer: (Senator Link)

Senator Syverson.

Senator Syverson:

Thank you. I'll wrap it up with this. Senator, I -- I -- I truly appreciate the work that we've been able to work on this year. I think you are sincere in us trying to get down to a point where we can deliver quality healthcare that gets better outcomes, that's truly managed and still save those dollars. I'm not sure if this resolution does it or if this resolution really allows them to work that in a -- in a way that gives us that outcome. And so I'm thinking that we're going to be better off asking my Members to oppose this and then either come back with a different resolution or, if we have to, let's sit down with the Department and come up with -- without an official resolution, sit down with a letter that both caucuses can write to the Department listing out what we want as information, as -- as opposed to the way it's spelled out with this. But, again, I deeply appreciate working with you this year on it and -- and I think the results of what we had worked on this year is not really going to make healthcare better in Illinois.

Presiding Officer: (Senator Link)

Because of my good friend, Senator Syverson, the timer will be going on, and it will be going on all night from now on. Senator Nybo, for what purpose do you rise?

Senator Nybo:

Will the -- will the sponsor yield for some questions from a cosponsor?

Presiding Officer: (Senator Link)

Yes, he will yield.
SENATOR NYBO:

As much respect as I have for my colleague from Rockford, who knows this area much better than I do, I am learning in this area, so I have a couple quick questions for you, Senator Koehler. First of all, this is a resolution and it's not a bill, correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, that is correct. We had a bill at one point, but we took some controversial parts out of it. We're just trying to collect data.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

And that was my next question. All this resolution is asking is just that we collect data so that we can compare fee-for-service to managed care?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

This resolution is not asking us to move away from managed care, is it?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:
Not at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

And this resolution in doing this data comparison, it's very important for healthcare providers - hospitals, doctors and everybody else who participates in this system, correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

And MCOs and legislators who make policy decisions. It's good for everybody.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

To the bill {sic}, 'cause I know the timer's on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill {sic}.

SENATOR NYBO:

I can't think of any good reason why we shouldn't support this bill {sic}. I -- I -- I -- I enjoy learning from you on this issue. I think it is important that we start gathering this data. I think it's important that we help our providers if we can. I'd encourage the Members on our side to really support this. All we're doing is just trying to gather information to know if we're doing this right. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:
To the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill {sic}.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, you know, my side talks about -- a lot about sunshine, transparency. One of our -- you know, somebody on, you know, that's typically -- well, even ran as a Republican, Adam Andrzejewski, with OpenTheBooks, spends his whole time just presenting data, so people can make up their own minds based on what the facts are. This resolution says, what are the facts? There's no predetermined conclusion that managed care is good or bad. It says, what are the facts? And with that transparency and that data, we can make a decision that's best for this State. So I encourage everyone to vote for transparency in Senate Resolution 1916.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Koehler, to close.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you for the questions and -- and I want to thank, in particular, Senator McCarter and Senator Nybo and Senator Connelly for being cosponsors of this legislation, because something like this truly needs to be bipartisan. It needs to be bipartisan. We're just asking for the data. It's not an evaluation. We can do that later. But I would encourage an Aye vote on this and thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

As this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall Senate
Joint -- Senate Resolution 1916 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 54 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. Senate Resolution 1916, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 250.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 250.

We have received a like Message on Senate Bill 1529, with House Amendments 1 and 3. Passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2015 {sic} (2016). Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The Senate Executive Committee will meet at 7:45 in Room 212 - 7:45, Executive, in Room 212. Transportation Committee will meet in Room 400 at 7:30 - Transportation, Room 400 at 7:30. Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to waive all notice and posting requirements so that Senate Resolution 1943 can be heard today in the Senate Transportation Committee.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sandoval moves to waive all notice and posting requirements so that Senate Resolution 1943 can be heard today in the Senate Transportation Committee. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and all notices and posting requirements are waived. Senator Brady, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRADY:

Purpose of a motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Your point of interest?

SENATOR BRADY:

You're cautious tonight, Mr. President. I would move to waive the posting requirements for HJR 119 so that it could be heard in committee tonight.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Brady, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRADY:

Purpose of motion. Mr. President, I ask that the posting requirements be waived on HJR 119 so that it could be heard in the Transportation Committee this evening.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Brady moves to waive all notice and posting requirements so that House Joint -- House -- Joint Resolution 119 can be heard today in Transportation Committee -- in the Senate Transportation Committee. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and all notices and posting requirements are waived. Will the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom immediately? The Committee on
Assignments, please meet in the President's Anteroom immediately. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Executive Committee - Motion to Concur on House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 250, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3112; refer to State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee - Motion to Concur on House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2261, Motion to Concur on House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2604; and Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 324, Motion to Concur on House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2048, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3096, and Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 2990.

Signed, Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Executive will meet -- will be meeting today at 8:30 in Room 212. State Government and Veterans Affairs will meet today at 8:30 in Room 409. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committees, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senate will please come to order. Will all Members please come to the Senate Floor? All Members, please come to the Senate
Floor. Lee Milner, Illinois Times, requests permission to photograph. There being no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Sandoval, Chairperson of the Committee on Transportation, reports Senate Resolution 1943 and House Joint Resolution 119 Be Adopted.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Motions to Concur - House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 250, House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529, House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3112 Recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Landek, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs, reports Motion to Concur - Senate -- House Bill -- House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2261 and House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2604 Recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

   Senate Bill 206.

   Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

   House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 206.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Can we get a little quiet in the Chamber? We'll now be proceeding, final action from Resolutions to 3rd bills. We will putting on the timer from now until the end, so this way everyone can be -- get a chance to speak on the bills and also so you can move your bills that you need to get out of the Chamber. We're short of time, so this way we can be fair to everyone. The timer is on. On page 22 of the Calendar, House Joint Resolution 138. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 138, offered by Senator McCann.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCann.

SENATOR McCANN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Tonight, I bring HJR 138 as a tribute to the life and sacrifice of Officer Francis Scot Fitzgerald and his family of Murrayville. Officer Fitzgerald was a past Scott County Sheriff's -- Department Deputy and was an EMT - thank you, Mr. President. Thank you - and was an EMT with the Murrayville-Woodson EAS and Winchester EMS. Scot Fitzgerald was also a firefighter for the Murrayville Fire District, a member of the Morgan County 911 Board, and a member of the Special Response Team in Morgan County. I'm sure you can tell by now that Scot Fitzgerald was a man who gave of himself in immense proportions. Sadly, he gave that last full measure of devotion on March 5th, 2016, while responding to a call in his capacity as a South Jacksonville Police Officer. He leaves behind a widow and two very young children. HJR 138 designates the
portion of Illinois Route 267 between Interstate 72 and Nortonville Road as the "Officer Scot Fitzgerald Memorial Highway". I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, as this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 138 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 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Joint Resolution 138, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. On page 17 of the Calendar, House Bill 2990. Sponsor has been switched to -- President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2990 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2990. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter will present the Floor amendment.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. If you would, adopt Floor Amendment No. 2 and No. 2 will become the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? 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. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
House Bill 2990.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:
Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 2990, as amended, would appropriate 11.6 billion General Revenue Fund and 15.7 billion all funds to provide FY'17 funding for schools, early childhood education, and the normal cost of teacher pensions. In Pre-K to 12 education, General State Aid, a freeze will be applied to the current school funding formula and provide school districts with the following: First, the same level of funding that they received in FY'16 and including any amount received from the additional eighty-five million lump sum to the needier schools. Second, it would -- an additional seven hundred million equity grant that will factor in a district's low-income population and available local resources in order to provide additional funds to districts with higher concentrations of lower-income students. And thirdly, this bill will -- if the total amount as provided from the two sources listed above is less than what a district would receive in FY'17 under the current funding
formula, then additional funds will be provided to bring them up to the funding level. This is intended to, at a minimum, to fund all districts at the full foundation level of sixty-one... (inaudible)... per student.  

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)  
Excuse me one second, Senator. Please let's keep the noise down in the Chamber. You might think your conversation is not loud. It's -- it's really bad on both sides. Please keep the noise down. Please proceed, Senator.  

SENATOR TROTTER:  
Thank you. And -- and finally, this bill, as amended, would include 3.9 billion for the State contribution to the Teachers' Retirement System and two hundred and five million for the FY'17 normal cost of the Chicago Teachers' Pension System, basically bringing parity to those -- two pension systems.  

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)  
Is there any discussion? Senator -- Leader Radogno, for what purpose do you seek recognition?  
SENATOR RADOGNO:  
Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.  

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)  
To the bill, Leader.  
SENATOR RADOGNO:  
I just want to reiterate some of the comments that I made in committee. First of all, I am pleased that we are considering an education budget separate and apart from the rest of the budget that we have, or don't have, I should say, right now. I think that indicates that we're all committed to finding some stability for the public schools. I -- and I definitely appreciate that.
Having said that, I do have a couple of concerns about the bill. The total additional money to this -- for this bill from last year to this year is nine hundred million dollars. That's an enormous amount of money and I don't know how we can talk realistically about adding that amount of funding when there's so many other critical services that we can't fund. So I would love to have a discussion about, you know, somewhere at a lower number. We're all in favor of increasing funding to education. I think we're all also knowing that Chicago needs some help. Having said that, we just recently got numbers from the State Board that indicate, when all the different pieces of this are applied, Chicago Public Schools get nine -- or four hundred and seventy-five million of the money, so almost one-half of the cost. I guess I think we need to have a little further discussion about that. That number is achieved by an additional layer that we're adding to the formula. A number of people, while we're interested in looking at that, don't feel that we fully understand how that works in the most equitable way. So, kudos for a step forward in considering something different. I would urge a No vote, because I don't think this is where we need to be, but I am pleased that we're finally considering education as a separate piece. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And to kind of add to what the
previous speaker said, we -- in this particular bill -- and first of all, I -- I applaud the Leader for bringing this forward. We've had many education funding bills the past month or -- and this one fully funds the formula in -- for the FY'16 levels, which is something we've been talking about. However, we've also added a new grant, an equity grant. So on top of a poverty grant that is already in the formula that school districts will receive, we've added a new equity grant and this is the -- about the third time that we've asked questions about, what is an equity grant? What's the formula? And how will it be applied to the school districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much for the question, Senator. The poverty grants -- this -- the equity grants are very much like the poverty grants with the exception that it takes in the -- the formula of the local resources - in this case, the low local resources of a particular school district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. Trying to read the -- a question for the sponsor again, Mr. President. Thank you. Trying to go through the language explaining how the equity grant will be -- how the equity grant is broken down. They talk about the low income constant, which is a new definition. I asked our staff, what does that mean? And, again, as we're trying to figure out the formula for the equity grant, how it was written, and how it will apply to all of our school districts. By any chance, can you explain to us what
the low income constant is?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, thank you very much. It is the amount in the formula which allows them to get to the number which they need to make the determination of how many dollars will be spent in the various districts.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rezin. Be advised you have thirty-five seconds left.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. To the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...bill, Senator.

SENATOR REZIN:

Yes, and I appreciate the sponsor for bringing this and, again, this is the discussion we've been having and all of the proration in the past six years has most directly affected many schools in my district. So just fully funding education's very important. Having said that, we've had many questions about this equity grant component in this bill. This -- within the equity grant, there's seven hundred new dollars -- seven hundred million new dollars, and we literally just got the numbers from ISBE from our way -- walking on our way up from Exec, and that will equate to, I believe the number was about forty percent on the grant or two hundred and seventy million dollars would go to CPS on top of the two hundred and five million dollars for the pension. So, of this new dollars in this nine-hundred-million-dollar bill, almost fifty percent of the new dollars are going to CPS. Because of
that and because...

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Time's up, Senator. I let you go over.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Barickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Senator Trotter, we have had numerous discussions in this Body and seen numerous proposals in this Body regarding the many attempts individual legislators have made to change the funding formula that exists today. Where'd you come up with this new equity grant proposal that is proposing to distribute some nearly one billion dollars towards the education line here?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yeah, and you're absolutely correct. We've had multiple ideas float around this and -- and we've passed out of this Body to recognize -- the reality is, and that is that we do a very poor job of spending dollars to educate our -- our -- our kids. Can you hear me? Is that better? Okay, so -- so, again, just...

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please let's keep the noise down. Let's respect.

SENATOR TROTTER:
...recognizing the fact that -- that we need to do something. I mean, the -- the levels in which we fund our children and the disparities of -- of how we fund those -- our children have been a concern for many of us. So when you ask, where do I come up with the ideas, it's a cumulative of all the ideas that float around in this room, 'cause we have some very knowledgeable individuals that look into it. We certainly have had Senator Manar's idea of changing the entire formula going forward and we certainly had Leader Lightford's ideas going forward as well. So, yes, it's -- it's a cumulative thought from all of us to get -- that came to this formula.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To -- to the bill, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, here -- here's the problem. Here's the problem. Yet again, a new formula that distributes taxpayer dollars - a formula never been vetted, a formula evidently created in a vacuum, a formula for which many people in this Chamber probably have no idea how it works. Let's follow the math. One billion -- nearly one billion dollars of additional spending. How is that money distributed? Two hundred and five million dollars to Chicago Public Schools for a pension pickup. Two hundred and seventy million dollars through this new formula that's being proposed. CPS, the big winner today - the Chicago Public Schools, the big winner. Four hundred and seventy-five million
dollars being spent today, tonight, call it what it is. CPS, here's your bailout. Thank you, Mr. President. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, would it be correct -- our -- our numbers show that the Chicago Public School system will lose around thirteen thousand low-income students.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Ladies and Gentlemen, I've said this three or four times. We've got a lot of Members from the other side of the aisle -- from the other side of the Chamber. Love to have you in here. The voices are getting really loud. Let's be respectful to everybody.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

I -- Senator, I was told that some thirteen thousand less low-income students in Chicago next year. Is that a fact or...?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Leader Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Those are numbers that we have not verified and I've heard that number before as well. But that doesn't take away from the fact that -- that the school district in the City of Chicago, CPS,
has more students than any other school district in this State. So that number that you just quoted isn't a -- a -- a major factor of the funding that they're getting. They will be funded at the level that they are supposed to be funded at based on not only the number of students, but also for the poverty levels that are in the -- in the system as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

You know, I understand that, but thirteen thousand less poverty students, that's a lot of students, even in Chicago, Senator. And -- and, you know, I understand that there are -- around eighteen percent of the total school population in the State of Illinois is in Chicago. Now, forty to forty-five percent of the money going there does seem a -- a bit much. Now, I -- I like the idea that -- of -- of the fact that you're interested in education, that you want to put money there, but wouldn't you say that it's sort of a -- a -- almost a fantasy that we're going to be able to stick nine hundred million new dollars into education next year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

No. As per the -- the memo that the -- the Governor sent out this morning, saying that he wants to sit down and have more meetings in which we can look at and find in at least a stopgap budget on -- in route to having a full year's budget that we -- also in those discussions that we'll be talking about new revenue streams as well. So, no, it's not a fantasy. It is something
that we need to be doing to be responsible citizens in the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

But, Senator, nine hundred million new dollars, you -- you know that's -- that's -- that's -- that's going way too -- it's not going to happen. You know that. You know it's too much. I think yesterday, we -- you passed a bill to -- or today maybe -- to increase wages for people who do work for the State, a -- a billion dollars. You know, if we're going to have a balanced budget -- the thing that scares me about it, if you have a balanced budget, fine, but we have debt so great that sooner or later you have to take in more than you spend. That's -- when do we do that to finally get out of a hole that's maybe not even possible to get out of?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Fifteen seconds, Senator Luechtefeld. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator, and I thought we -- I hope that we start now in doing that, as these discussions go forward before we meet the end of our fiscal year, which is June 30th, not May 31st.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

But, seriously, if we -- if we want to do that this year -- and I agree with you -- you know we can't spend that kind of money and -- and have a balanced budget and start to dig out of this hole. I mean, it is -- and -- and again, I -- I'm glad you're
separating it, making it possible for schools to open on time, those sorts of things, but we -- I think we sooner or later have to be realistic with some of these numbers. Anyway, thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR McCARTER:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, I -- I'm just trying to understand the numbers. As you know, the -- the Governor put forth another idea this afternoon, and -- and I think I understand where his numbers are. But can you just tell me what's the total amount spent and how much is from GRF and -- and what are the additional components?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

The total dollars spent here will be total of -- total spent, that's including GRF, federal funds, and OSF, will be fifteen billion, six hundred and ninety-four million dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Okay -- can -- if -- I thought I heard you say fifteen billion and can you give that full number again?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:
694.3 billion dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Okay. All right. I -- I don't think I need a breakdown of the rest of it. I'm -- I'm -- I'm aghast by the -- the total. I'm -- I'm just... I -- I understand this is what many here wish. And I'll speak to the -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCARTER:

I understand this is what many wish we could do, but, you know, at some point we've got to come back to reality as to what we can do. And -- and I'll be real honest with you, I -- I was willing to propose even less than what the Governor said, because I think we're in a tough time here that we have to really be honest with people as to what we can do for them. I would have -- I would have been satisfied with ninety -- ninety-five percent. If people could have walked away with what they had last year and we could've guaranteed that to them, I think they would have said, okay, you did your best. But now we've stepped this up with some huge, huge numbers. I -- I don't think it's fair. It's not fair to tell people that you're going to do this for 'em when you really have no -- no plan to actually keep your word. So I would -- it's -- it's very disappointing. I hope that the budget talks go a little bit better than they're going right now, here in the future. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR M. MURPHY:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

I have far too much respect for the sponsor's ability to rope-a-dope to be chased down the rat hole of getting into a back-and-forth when I only get five minutes. A tip of the hat, sir. So, we have competing K through -- or pre-K through 12 budgets that we're considering in this General Assembly right now. The House Democrats opened the bidding with a seven-hundred-million-dollar increase that we don't have the money for. Not to be outdone, our good friends on the other side of the aisle here in the Senate have upped the ante in the Chicago bailout bidding war to almost a billion-dollar increase. This is great news if you live in Chicago. But if you don't live in Chicago, you know what you get for this Chicago bailout bidding war going on? You get the bill. Congratulations. Everybody in here that doesn't represent the City of Chicago, make sure you go home and tell all your taxpayers, hey, we did it. Not for you, we did it for Chicago. They'll love it. They'll love it, and when they get their property tax bill and see what they needed to do to make up for the fact that their money goes to Chicago, they're going to love it even more. The worst part about this is, there's a legitimate alternative out there. First of all, Governor Rauner proposed, for the first time in seven years, fully funding K through 12, one hundred percent -- no eighty-seven percent proration, like the Democrat House, Democrat Senate, and Democrat Governor signed into law a few years back, not the eighty-nine percent proration that the Democrat
House, Democrat Senate, and Democrat Governor signed into law after that. No, a hundred percent funding for the first time in seven years, the Governor proposed, a record high investment in K through 12. We even went a little bit further than that, because the Governor said — and we thought he was right — there should be no losers. So we're going to fully fund, one hundred percent, House Bill 3434. We're looking for cosponsors. Fully funds it. Plus a hold harmless, so not one district loses. The fact that Chicago Public Schools lost six thousand kids at the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Thirty seconds left, Senator.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

Thank you, Senator. At -- this is why I didn't ask any questions. At thirteen thousand a kid, that's seventy-eight million or thereabouts. That's why it was going down seventy-four. But you know what? We are willing to hold Chicago harmless and so is the Governor. There's a better alternative that is actually able to be funded and affordable. If you don't represent Chicago, don't do this to your taxpayers. Do not participate in this Chicago bailout bidding war. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR MANAR:

First, I would like to -- thank -- thank you -- thank our Appropriations Chairman for bringing this bill forward at this
late hour. This is the debate. I would say this to both my colleagues on the Republican side and the Democratic side that this is the debate that's been missing here in Springfield for far too long. This is a healthy debate, because this is a back-and-forth that we haven't had here on this Senate Floor for years, and I compliment the sponsor for bringing forward an Appropriation bill that would seek to bridge a divide of inequity that we have all over the State today. The Governor asked for a clean appropriation bill from the Legislature. He said, don't lard it up. He said, don't glob something onto it. He said, give me a clean appropriation bill. This bill is clean, just like the one last year. I appreciate this -- the previous speaker mentioned the Governor amended his proposal today to change what he had put in place in his budget proposal in February. Yes, he fully funded the foundation level, but that's fully funding the foundation level that he, himself, admits is completely flawed. So I appreciate the fact that he amended his proposal to get rid of losing school districts, as he ran around the State and said, nobody should lose. He fixed that today. It should have been fixed back in February. That's a step in the right direction, but it doesn't go far enough, because it doesn't fix inequity that exists today. We've debated the issue about CPS for a long time, in committee and on this Floor, so I appreciate the unhealthy obsession with the Chicago Public School system that we are again talking about on the Senate Floor. But let's be honest. There are hundreds of school districts that we each represent that are going through the same financial challenges as the Chicago Public School District today. That's a fact. We can't ignore it because it's not convenient for politics. It doesn't make the top of the fold when we talk about
Beardstown. Let's be honest. But the plight of Beardstown should be part of this conversation. This bill will help fix districts like Beardstown. And if your home's on fire and your neighbor -- neighbor's house is on fire, do you leave your burning house and go stare at your neighbor's house? Nobody does that. Nobody does that. But when we talk about schools...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Thirty seconds, Senator.

SENATOR MANAR:

...we look at the other district, the one that gets all the attention and we point a finger. The equity grant was brought up by a previous speaker. This equity grant is a substantial change from the status quo. That is the key to this bill. It will address inequity. It will address students that don't have the proper investment, those that live in poverty. It will get right at the heart of the issue that we've been debating now for a full year on this Floor. I ask for an Aye vote and I compliment the sponsor for his bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Leader Trotter, does this appropriation bill fund higher education?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.
SENATOR TROTTER:
   No, it does not, Leader.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Sullivan.
SENATOR SULLIVAN:
   Does this appropriation bill fund human services not covered
   by the consent decrees?
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Trotter.
SENATOR TROTTER:
   No, it does not.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   Senator Sullivan.
SENATOR SULLIVAN:
   To -- to the bill.  Ladies and...
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
   To the bill, Senator.
SENATOR SULLIVAN:
   ...Gentlemen, I have huge respect for Leader Trotter, probably
   as much for him as any Member of this Chamber.  Donne, I think the
   world of you and I know you do tremendous work.  The -- the issue
   with this appropriation bill is that it's -- it's -- it's only
   part of the funding that the State of Illinois needs.  We all know
   K through 12 education is important.  I appreciate Senator Manar
   talking about Beardstown that's in my district and they would
   benefit under this appropriation bill if it becomes law.  But I
   also have Western Illinois University in my district and higher
   education is on their knees.  I have six community colleges in my
   district that are struggling.  I have two -- excuse me, three
private colleges as well that rely on MAP funding. That's also not in this bill. And for those reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask for a No or a Present vote on the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Delgado, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR DELGADO:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Ladies and Gentlemen, in the Governor's proposed legislation on education, there were quite a few things left out. When you come to parent mentoring programs, national board certified teachers, lowest-performing schools, Teach For America, Ag education, wasn't in there. Talk about moving dollars. I'm very interested in all education in the State, but I have to do -- talk about bilingual education. I appreciate them bringing up Beardstown. You can go through a hundred and two counties and find people with language all through this State, and one of the things this bill does do, it just keeps it at level, which, of course, I like it to always grow with the populations, because even at level, does not follow my communities and communities of language, because at percentages that we're at, we suffer...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Thirty-five seconds, Senator.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you. But with all due respect, this is at level of '16 for 63.7 million dollars for bilingual education. I appreciate the sponsor for bringing this to us. This is what the Governor's
been asking for. We have brought it to him. That's what a General Assembly does. We needed to tweak it, but he wants a stand-alone. I commend the Senate President, of course our budgeteer leader and Senator Trotter and we can find a little crack in everything we do here, in the last eighteen years I've been here, but on this one, it does give a little bit to everyone. And as we know, we are going to do our best as this year goes on, because we know it's not over. I would ask for an Aye vote and the consideration for all Illinoisans…

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

   Senator Righter, for…

SENATOR DELGADO:

   ...and let's check our ego at the door.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

   ...what purpose do 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. You know, before this bill went up on the board, our staff had done a tally of the additional cost to the taxpayers of bills that had just come out of this Chamber and that number was 2.5 billion dollars. Now that number approaches with this bill 3.5 billion dollars. The sponsor was asked the question earlier whether or not this is realistic and whether or not this is real. Of course it's not. Of course it's not. With the multibillion-dollar backlog of bills in the Comptroller's Office, a budget sent from
the House that spends seven billion dollars more than the taxpayers can afford to send us in FY'17 and then this. Of course this isn't realistic. I agree with the previous speaker that there is an unhealthy obsession with the Chicago Public Schools, but the unhealthy obsession is driven by those who seem to be able to construct any formula imaginable to shovel hundreds of millions of dollars more to the Chicago Public Schools. It's not an issue that it's Chicago. It's an issue, as we've talked about before, the system, the system in Chicago is dramatically failing the people it was constructed to serve, and that's the kids, and that's the point that you are missing here. We can drive up the numbers, nine hundred and eighty-two million more, maybe the next one will be 1.2 billion more, but when we leave this Chamber tonight, you will have failed to put on the Governor's Desk an education bill that can be paid for that is real. And maybe you'll pat yourselves on the back and say, we suggested more spending and more money for Chicago than anyone else. But the taxpayers around the State, and particularly the people who work in the public schools and the parents who send their kids there, are going to look at you and say, they did nothing. And we are back at it in June. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, President.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:
Yes, thank you very much for the debate. The Governor has asked that we do a stand-alone education funding bill. That's what this is. The Governor has introduced a bill and then increased the amount by a hundred million dollars. I'm not sure where we're going to find that hundred million dollars, but we will find it. This bill adds seven hundred and sixty million dollars for education. We will find that money as well. Especially in a year when we know we have a huge deficit, we have a working group that's trying to close that budget gap. This amount of money for education is within that framework. The other thing that this bill does is to actually fully fund pension parity. In fact, it funds the TRS in the same bill. So we are appropriating seven billion three hundred and ninety-seven -- I'm sorry, three billion nine hundred and eighty-six million for the TRS to cover the normal cost for all the school districts other than Chicago, and only two hundred and seventeen million for Chicago to cover its normal costs. That's called funding pension parity. So the formula has been explained. It's a fair way of distributing money. Ironically enough, the difference between this and the House bill that was passed is that Chicago gets less money under it. So I'm very certain that we can sit down with the Governor after this passes and we can work out the differences between our two approaches to having a stand-alone bill to fund education and I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter, to close.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I want to thank everyone for their questions and for the spirit of the debate that we've
had today. It's very important, because, number one, we -- we are all in this together. These are our taxpayer dollars and certainly these are all of our children. So it's important that we -- we have these discussions of how we help try to build the future of Illinois. As pointed out by some of our speakers, especially the -- President Cullerton, who talked about -- this bill does fully fund the foundation level. It brings pension parity to the two pension programs that we have here in the State of Illinois for teachers and -- and it also brings more dollars for those individuals that live in poverty and have not had the resources -- the same resources that some parts of our State does have. So it's important that we pass this legislation. It's important that we pass it now and it's important that we collectively find the resources to pay for this needed necessity here in the State of Illinois. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 2990 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 37 voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. House Bill 2990, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar No. 3. Now proceed to Senate Bill 2048. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2048. Signed by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
Ladies and Gentlemen, whoever's in the Chamber, I've asked a number of times. I will -- whoever is not a Member will ask -- be asked to leave. This is the last time that I'm going to ask for it to be quiet. President Cullerton, Senate Bill 2048.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is the bill that I think Senator Sullivan was referring to. This has education also, K through 12, very similar to the bill we just passed, but also appropriations for higher education, appropriations for human services, and appropriations for some other items that I can talk about, including some capital. So the K-12 appropriation is almost identical to the bill we just passed. It's just that the amount of money appropriated to the Chicago pension fund is -- I guess we'd have to call it a half parity, 'cause it's half of what would be the normal cost. That's a hundred and twelve million dollars. Group health insurance is covered. Human services are covered. As I indicated, K-12 is almost identical to the bill we just passed. Higher education is at 1.986 million, the same - billion - is the same as the last budget we -- we -- we passed for higher ed. And as a result, this would be the remainder of the items that we need to pass that are not covered by court order, consent decrees, or continuing appropriations. There's also money, as indicated, for back pay for State employees. There's money for operations for the correctional facilities. And the State group health insurance, the appropriation is 1.4 billion. I really would like you to help me pass my first appropriation bill and be -- I'll do the best I can at answering any questions.
Is there any discussion?  Any discussion?  Leader Radogno, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President.  To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...bill, Leader.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

As much as I would like to help the Senate President pass his first appropriations bill, I don't think I can do that today.  This bill has been widely discussed.  It is seven billion dollars out of balance.  It would require at a minimum an income tax rate of 5.5, which is even more than we had under Quinn, more than was -- money was there and -- and the budget still couldn't be balanced.  You mention that it's almost identical with respect to the school funding.  The only difference is Chicago Public Schools do even better under this plan, granted nominally, but nonetheless better.  But that's not the issue.  The issue is this is irresponsible.  Seven billion dollars out of balance.  It absolutely drives spending to force a tax increase.  That's wrong.  I suspect most people or many people on that side of the aisle know it's wrong.  We've heard many of you comment and we've heard about the discussions that you've had intramurally on that team.  You know this is wrong.  We need to stop -- we need to pass a bill that will keep State government running at least in the interim and not buy into this nonsense.  This is fantasyland.  Please vote No and let's get serious.  Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR M. MURPHY:
To the motion, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the motion, Senator.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

So, welcome to the other half of the Chicago bailout bidding war, the House edition. So, forty billion dollars, that is an eleven percent increase in spending over 2016. Forty billion dollars. Thirty-six in 2016 – forty in this budget. For those of you out there in the real world in Illinois who think that Illinois government needs to cut spending, pay particularly close attention to who in this Chamber tonight votes for a record-spending forty-billion-dollar, seven-and-a-half-billion-dollar out-of-balance budget that increases spending by eleven percent. Note one other thing, to those of you out in the real Illinois, there's no job growth reforms in this. There's nothing to make it easier for you to get the best job you're capable of doing. If you've got a kid in college and you're worried about whether they can come back to Illinois if there's any opportunity here, there's nothing to assuage your concerns in that regard in this bill. All there is, is a green light for you to go find your grandkids and visit 'em in North Carolina, or Florida, or Tennessee, because this is the no-growth, no-opportunity plan. Finally, this bill was dumped on this Chamber by the Speaker of the House. The only difference this year compared to others is he didn't adjourn before it got here. I often hear that my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber want to stand up to Speaker Madigan. Here's your chance. Vote Senate Bill 2048 down and let's get real.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
President Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I guess I need to correct a few misconceptions. There must be some idea that this is appropriating seven billion dollars more than we have. This total appropriation GRF is thirteen billion; we have thirty-two billion available to us - if that's the way you want to debate the bill. If you want to debate the bill that way, those are facts too. Now as far as I know that we're going to focus on Chicago and perhaps there's some confusion, this -- in this particular bill, the Chicago Public School district gets less money, about a hundred and thirty-two million less money than the bill we just passed. What I would say is this, this Chamber has not yet voted on an appropriation for higher ed or human services. This is that vote. I think it's important for us to authorize the Governor to spend money for our higher education institutions and the millions of people affected by our human services in the State, and for that reason, I would ask an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2048. 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 17 voting Aye, 31 voting Nay, 10 voting Present. Having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, the motion fails. Supplemental Calendar No. 2 has been distributed. We'll be going to Senate Bill 10. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 10.
Signed by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This -- Floor Amendment No. 1 and 3, 3 actually becomes the bill. Extends the Compassionate Use or -- of Medical Cannabis Pilot Program (Act) to July 1 of 2020. Creates two conditions -- or adds two conditions: terminally ill patients as well as the -- the stress -- the post-traumatic stress. It removes fingerprint requirements for renewals for cards and various other things that favor the ease of patients dealing with renewal of -- of cards. This was negotiated with the Department of Public Health and His Excellency, the Governor's Office, as well as Members of the House and the Senate. We appreciate very much the input of the Governor and his staff, as well as the Department of -- of Public Health -- Health and of course the Illinois State Medical Society. Some of the -- some of this language in here came from discussions, raising the comfort level of our doctors.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Question of the sponsor, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Haine, are you familiar with a study conducted that was reported by the American Psychiatric Association that was performed on about twenty-three hundred individuals with post-traumatic stress disorder, a group of which used marijuana following the treatment in a medicinal fashion and a group of which did not? Are you familiar with that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

No, I'm not. I was...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber, I hear and I agree with Senator Haine that there are a number of groups that are on board with this. Apparently the Governor's Office is on board with this and that's fine, but we need to slow down on this issue. The sponsor of the bill has not had brought to him - and I just discovered it earlier today - a study reported by the American Psychiatric Association of -- of a test done on almost twenty-three hundred people suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, some of which smoked marijuana medicinally or used marijuana medicinally after they began their treatment and a group which did not. The highest degree of symptoms shown were by those who used the marijuana. In fact, the
violent behavior, to the extent there was any in this group, was exhibited by those who used marijuana. Now, you know what? I haven't researched the entire study, I haven't. I mean, I've read several pages of it. I have it right here. But that's the point that I'm making. Do we know what we are doing here? The marijuana that is used is not FDA approved. Now you're suggesting that it's not -- now we're going to suggest that it's not just going to be used to alleviate symptoms that are treatments of other diseases, such as chemotherapy, now we're going to say that it is going to be instrumental in the treatment of people who have psychiatric disorders. And perhaps we should listen to the people who are experts with regards to that, and they're saying, wait, you don't have the evidence to go forward and so far the evidence suggests that this is not good for the people who suffer from this disorder. Let's slow down. I urge a No vote on the gentleman's motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hastings, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HASTINGS:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

So, let me speak on behalf of a population that suffers from this, the modern-day war generation, and I love the fact that in committee and on the Floor people continually bring up the fact that, oh, well, a study doesn't show that this is going to fix the problem. Well, for every study that you have, I have an opposite study and let me just read, first of all, what PTSD is for a
person. They live in intense fear, helplessness, or horror. And let me assure you that when you're on the receiving end -- when you're on the receiving end of a Katyusha rocket and it lands fifty meters away from you, you're going to have some things wrong with you, and I will just assure you that's the case with a lot of people, including some of my personal friends that I had listed off yesterday when we honored them on Memorial Day. According to this study, a majority of the patients have either ceased nightmares or a significant reduction on nightmare intensity, and I can go on and on. They've improved their sleep time. They've improved their quality of sleep. The reduction of daytime flashbacks, night sweats - also noted by a lot of other patients. I guess that study doesn't -- match up with the other studies that were mentioned. But I will tell you this, veterans in the modern-day population turn to alcohol abuse and drink themselves to death. And today being the thirteenth anniversary of graduating from West Point, I will just assure you that one of my closest West Point classmates, instead of talking it through, instead of getting some sort of treatment, I much rather would have had him smoke a joint to help him relax than drink himself to death. And that's why I urge an Aye vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MCCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCARTER:

You know, I was on one of the task force to look at the heroin
crisis and the opiate use in the State, and as you know, that's very close to me and we had -- in fact, I -- this same bill I was a sponsor on before it became this. Through all of the meetings that we had throughout the State, there was not one where professionals didn't show up and say that marijuana was the number one gateway drug to heroin. I'm not making this up - every one we went to from the southern part of the State to the far north. I've got a problem with that. I've got a -- I've got a problem with anything that introduces a young person to a drug that has a fifty percent chance of killing 'em the minute they use it. I got a problem with that. My second problem is this, I'm not sure if you left this issue up to the voters, the public would have said that this was a good thing. Instead, we allowed lobbyists to come and convince us, the legislators, that this was a good thing. We then allowed those same lobbyists to own and profit from this new industry. I'll say it again - we should be very ashamed of what we've done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

To the resolution, Mr. President. I -- I certainly appreciate and respect the concerns that colleagues have about this bill. When we first created this pilot, I -- I didn't vote for the bill. I still have some concerns about the bill and the concept. That being said, two things: One, I very much appreciate the sponsor's willingness to work with the Governor and his persuasive agents on this bill. I think this is a really good example of how this can go when people put all the other things aside and figure out how to get to a joint conclusion, excuse the pun. That was actually
not intended. But this is -- this is an issue where we put this pilot in place, we induced people to invest a significant amount of money - and with all due respect, they're not all lobbyists. There's a lot of people who invested a significant amount of money, and you know what? We're not guarantors of outcomes for people and sometimes investments go badly, but the way this has worked thus far, we've essentially given the concept no chance to be successful. Now I have reservations about this concept, but the pilot concept is a legitimate one and one that should be allowed to go forward in good faith in a fair, open way. When we get to 2020, if we continue to have the issues that some of us who opposed it initially thought we might have, well, then we can have another debate about this. But in the meantime, I think you've tightened it up in a reasonable way. I think you're giving people, who we induced to invest in this State, an actual chance to potentially be successful. And for that, one, I appreciate again your efforts and, two, I encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine, to close.

SENATOR HAINE:

I would very much appreciate an Aye vote, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The Journal of American Medicine has indicated that there are tremendous problems among twenty-five percent of those who suffer post-traumatic stress and these are serious traumatic episodes. Senator Hastings outlined some. But twenty-five percent of those have problems with opioid painkillers also. And there's -- this is a matter for the doctors to address. A doctor-patient colloquy will take care -- care of this. And I -- when I presented this bill some years ago, I pointed out the fact,
and this has been repeated in the Wall Street Journal, as recently as last month, that the gateway drug to heroin is OxyContin and similar prescription drugs, not marijuana. So I -- I agree with the last speaker. Let the program work. This has been tightened up. The Department of Public Health has indicated to me that they think it's working extremely well. There's been no scandal, no abuse. We -- this is the tightest law in the nation. It should be allowed to work and bring relief from pain, especially to the people that are dying, and part of this -- this bill has to do with those that are dying. They're terminally ill and they face their final years in agony and pain. If this can help them -- and we all know the anecdotal comments made to us from people back home -- we should do it. I'd like to reiterate, I want to thank all those involved in this: Majority Leader Lou Lang, the Governor's Office, the medical community, their -- our excellent Department of -- of -- of Public Health, everyone that has come together to make this come to fruition. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 10. 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 50 voting Aye, 7 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 10, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 571. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 571.
Signed by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill allows for enterprise zones to be effective on certification date instead of the following January 1st. This was brought to me by a -- a enterprise zone in Peoria, but there's others around this State, and what happens is that there's some that are up for renewal in the middle of the year, rather than waiting for January 1st, where there'd be a lapse period. This would allow DCEO to be more flexible on renewing those. So, that was a change that was made in the House. They also reduced it to just one year instead of two or three years. And I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 571. 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 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments (sic) 2 to Senate Bill 571, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Link in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Muñoz back in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)
With leave, we'll be going back to the Supplemental Calendar No. 3. Senate Bill 1529. Senator Link. Mr. Secretary -- read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529.

Signed by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Leader Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. As amended, this makes numerous technical changes to the Election Code, including correcting oversights by Public Act 98-1171. Senate Bill 1529 aligns election day mailing deadlines with the military and overseas ballots with other vote-by-mail ballot. It includes clarifying language concerning other election deadlines and filing requirement. It also contains numerous cost-saving measures, including electronic capture and storage of election information. It also allows election authorities to use intelligent barcodes as postmarks by voter (sic) (for) voter (sic) (vote) by mail. It also creates an Election Registration Information Center fund and will allow the State Board of Election (sic) (Elections) to access four hundred and twenty thousand dollars from Pew grants. I know of no opposition to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. I do want to commend the sponsor on this bill. This is an unusual bill, where we typically agree on the same bill, so I would like to commend him on it and we heard it in Exec and we were all in agreement, so I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Link, to close. The question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529. 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 53 voting Aye, 5 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529, and the bill is declared passed. Mike Adams, WMAQ NBC 5 Chicago, requests permission to film. There being no objection, leave is granted. Senator Link in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

We're back to Supplemental Calendar No. 2. Senate Bill 730. Leader Lightford. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 730. Signed by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Lightford, on your -- on your motion.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:
Mr. President, I ask to move its adoption and be happy to debate it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill is a bill to address the Child Care Assistance Program challenges that we've had. We all know that last year the Governor cut the program from eighty -- one hundred and eighty-five percent, down significantly. We lost over ninety thousand student -- children on the child care program. Senator Hutchinson and Representative Jehan Gordon-Booth negotiated the bill with the Governor and increased that level to a hundred and sixty-two percent. Our goal here is to move that to two hundred percent by July 1 of 2016 and two hundred and fifty percent by July 1 of 2017. There are a number of proponents on this bill and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

To the concurrence motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Well, unfortunately, here we keep going. With what we have already spent tonight, this just adds to it. This takes the CCAP spending up to two hundred percent for FY'17 and up to two hundred and fifty percent in '18 - a cost over two hundred million dollars
first year, five hundred million the next year. So add that to the three-plus billion that we've already spent in the last few hours. It's important to point out that the national average for this funding is at a hundred and seventy-seven percent. Illinois is already above the national average. This will put us clearly much higher than that, but also the problem is, how do you pay for this? Where is the money going to come from for yet hundreds of millions of dollars of more spending? At some point, somebody has to talk about how we're going to keep paying for all this new spending. So as important as child care programs are, I would ask -- I would urge people to vote No, until we can come up with some way to pay for the existing child care program. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

You know, ninety-four -- ninety-four percent of parents whose children receive care through the Child Care Assistance Program are single working moms. Mothers make seventy cents on every dollar paid to fathers. The overwhelming majority of children of child care providers are women, ninety-nine percent, and they are disproportionately forty-seven percent women of color. These cuts to CCAP last year cost many single moms, who are full-time students, to lose access to care entirely, forcing them to leave school and their paths to greater earnings and career advancement.
By expanding access to child care, Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 730 will create jobs, stabilize the child care workforce and boost longtime earnings to economic stability for women. This is a great bill that really helps many of the working class moms that are out there trying to make a living for their children. I really commend the sponsor on this bill and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Any further discussion? Senator Oberweis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

To the motion, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

Unfortunately, Senator Bivins is not able to be with us this evening. On his behalf, I will mention thirty-two billion in revenue, forty billion in spending. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I just wanted to point out a couple of things that I know get lost in a debate about this on a regular basis. Number one, when someone gets this assistance, this child care assistance, it is not a direct payment to the individual. It's not a payment to the family. It goes to the provider, the ones that are actually
giving -- providing the service. That's number one. So you can't take your child care allotment. Nobody has babies just so they can try to get a child care check from some place that's not going to them. This is actually paying for child care services provided by providers. Secondly, this level that we're talking about is forty-eight thousand six hundred dollars between -- yeah, forty-eight thousand six hundred dollars. It would give you three thousand seven hundred and forty-six dollars and twenty-five cents a month. So I want to repeat that -- three thousand seven hundred and forty-six dollars and twenty-five cents a month for a family of four. You -- that's all you make. So before you get caught up on the forty-eight -- three thousand -- a little over three thousand -- thirty-seven hundred dollars a month for your rent, your food, your -- any medical things, any other activities your kids are in, your medications, your -- anything that life costs -- three thousand seven hundred and some change for a family of four. And I also would point out that child care assistance doesn't make child care free, so this is no free ride. We are talking about a program that incentivizes work. It helps women stay stable. It helps families, where a large percentage of them are heads -- headed by women, stay in school and continue working. So, while we are busy blaming people for being poor, these are folks that are actually working and trying to better themselves and they're doing everything we told them that they should do. I find it ironic also that we still don't have a budget, and when we went through those negotiations with the Governor to raise it back to the one eighty-five level, you could not have paid me to say that we would get through March without a budget. And here we are on the last day of Session in May. So, please, I can't deal with any
more of the righteous indignation, not when we're telling people
to do exactly what we should have them do to be competent, taxpaying citizens and not a further drain on the -- on the series
of social safety-net programs that we know most folks don't want
to pay anyway. This is a good bill and I salute my sister, the sponsor. Thank you for bringing this and I urge an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCann, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCANN:

...you -- thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR McCANN:

Or to the motion. Thank you, Mr. President. The CCAP program
reminds me a lot of the earned income tax credit. The earned income tax credit was signed into law in the early 1970s by a
Republican, Gerald Ford. It was later expanded by another Republican President, many of us have heard of, President Ronald Reagan, who deemed it the best anti-poverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress. The CCAP program incentivizes people to go to work. It helps people to go
to work. Many times I've been asked by the press and by -- by a lot of folks, you know, how do we get ourselves out of this financial mess that we're in? And I've responded many times, we can't tax our way out of this. We can't cut our way out of this. We do have to grow our way out of this and that means we have to have people going to work. And as the previous speaker just made an excellent point, how on God's green earth can a family of four survive on thirty-seven hundred dollars a month, especially if
they have to figure out how to -- pay for child care completely on their own? There comes a point in time when we have to look ourselves collectively in the social mirror and realize that if we don't stop practicing partisan politics and start looking for real solutions, there's no hope. So, I rise in fervent support of the lady's motion and recommend an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Mulroe, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR MULROE:

I, too, rise in support of the bill. This is about keeping our mothers and fathers working, rather than keeping -- putting them on welfare. It's not about a handout, it's about a hand up. This is a shortsighted approach to think that by not giving people child care assistance, it's going to cost less. If we don't do this and don't allow people to work, it's going to cost our State more, and it will allow the person to continue working and to continue educating -- getting educated. So I'd -- I'd ask everyone for an Aye vote as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McGuire, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McGUIRE:

To the motion, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR McGUIRE:
I rise -- I, too, rise in support of Leader Lightford's bill -- motion. I would like to point out that during the five months that we suffered the most restrictive eligibility rules in the nation for our State subsidized child care program, that resulted in the expenses for CCAP for FY'16 being three hundred and fifty million dollars fewer than was projected. That's an admission, if I may characterize it as that, by GOMB. A previous speaker talked about how CCAP enables parents to go to work and that helps build -- build our State. CCAP also enables parents to go to school. So the investment in State subsidized child care, the CCAP program, pays off twice. Kids get essential early childhood education and parents are able to earn a GED and proceed to post-secondary education and gain the skills necessary to lift our State back up to prominence. So, again, I rise in strong support of Leader Lightford's motion and urge a Yes vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, and a thank you to all of the Members who spoke so significantly on this bill. I just want to add that one of the speakers brought up a cost factor and his numbers were grossly inaccurate. In the first year, this bill will cost a lot less than the amount he gave and, in fact, during the debate in committee, the -- the Department acknowledged that they were basing this on a hundred percent of participation. Right now, the -- the program is only at thirty percent. So I want to remind us that we're talking about a co-pay here. They're not getting by without paying any contribution. We have increased the co-pay to ten percent of their gross income. So that same family
of four that Senator Hutchinson described is paying three hundred and eighty dollars a month of that thirty-seven hundred into child care, as well, in addition to all of their other expenses. These are families that are on TANF. They're children with special needs. These families are below fifty percent of the poverty level. They are teen parents, who are either working or in a training program, and I find it important for us to do our part and assure that their children are in a safe learning environment while they're trying to better their lives. The proponents were the Shriver Center; Father {sic} (Fathers), Families and Healthy Communities; Illinois Action for Children; Ounce of Prevention Fund; EverThrive Illinois; and the Illinois African American Family Commission. I encourage an Aye vote. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 730. 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 37 Ayes, 18 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate concurs with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 30, and is declared passed. I'd just like to remind everybody we have ninety-five minutes to the great month of June. Senate Bill 1582. Senator Nybo. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1582. Signed by Senator Nybo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Nybo, on your motion.

SENATOR NYBO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I can be a very fast talker. Some bills are hot tonight. This is one I hope we can take a breather on. I think we could see a lot of good green lights on this bill. When we sent 1582 over to the House, it was a much different bill than it is right now. This is an initiative of Leader Durkin and I'm honored to be able to carry -- carry it on his behalf. And what this bill will do now is it will allow the use of multi-function school activity buses. Those are small white buses that you might see around your neighborhoods and it will allow those buses to be used by only six, small, private special education schools that are -- are financially struggling and had already purchased the buses, but are now being told that they can't use 'em. So we can do a good thing. We can help out these schools. We can help out these students. There was some disagreement with -- within the industry. All the disagreement has been worked out within the industry. I'm happy to answer questions. The -- the -- and as I ask for your support on the motion, the one thing I want to do is -- here's a good example where -- where two leaders can work together. This is Jim Durkin's bill. It's his initiative and I want to extend a special thank you to President Cullerton, who did a lot of help on -- on -- on our side over here in letting this bill get passed, so I appreciate that and a good illustration of how leaders really can work together. Hopefully, we see that continuing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Purpose of the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Illinois Senate, it truly is the witching hour of this Legislature. I remind all of you that -- of any fast-speaking politician in the Chamber here tonight. You know, under normal circumstances, we know that bills that are discussed here today usually are a lot of bad bills. And we've heard a lot of bad bills here today. Well, this is not a good one. It clearly is a bill, under normal circumstances, should have been a bill that would have been assigned to the Transportation Committee, as this is a transportation-related item. School buses for the most neediest children in Illinois, those who have special needs, those who are -- those who we have spent the last -- most of us in this Chamber and some of you even longer have spent their entire careers on trying to pass safeguards and improve the quality of public safety of those most vulnerable children, the children of special needs. Here is a -- here is a bill that carves out, in essence, a waiver of public safety specifications for children of -- children with special needs for a certain State Rep's district. I remind you that the Illinois State Board of Education has deemed these vehicles unsafe and improper for the use of moving children with special needs. These special buses, these buses that they happen to have bought -- think about it, these wealthy, well-educated school district folks, who know the laws of the State of Illinois, who know the education laws and know the laws that -- that govern the public safety of
our children, bought some buses for those with special needs without any consideration in regards to the specifications, without any considerations for the public safety. These buses, they don't have lifts; they don't have special markings; they don't have the safety arms; the flashing lights; they don't have any of -- these are the kinds of buses that transport our soccer teams, our baseball teams…

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
You're down to twenty seconds.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:
…the chess clubs, church folks. This is a bill that should not get any green lights tonight and I forewarn anyone who wants to be Mother Teresas in the future and want to promote more requirements for special needs children, more regulations for special needs children, make sure you just don't show up at the Transportation Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Thank you, Senator Sandoval. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you rise? Senator Bertino-Tarrant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:
Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:
Can you tell me, Senator Nybo, is the Illinois State Board of Education in support of this bill or -- or not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Nybo.
SENATOR NYBO:
  They are opposed.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
  Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:
  To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
  To the bill.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:
  I agree with my -- my counterpart here, Senator Sandoval. I am very concerned that these purchases -- it puts our most vulnerable kids on a less than save -- safe bus and I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
  Senator Mulroe, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MULROE:
  Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
  Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR MULROE:
  Senator Nybo, can you do me a favor? You know, we're all concerned about the safety of the disabled kids that are going to be on these buses. Can you address Senator Sandoval's concerns? And are these buses or these -- are these buses -- they're not called school buses or whatever you -- you call them, are they less safe than the -- the regular school buses? And if -- if they aren't, tell me why.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
  Senator Nybo.
SENATOR NYBO:

I appreciate the question. I'm not sure I can tell you if they're less safe. Here's what I can tell you, Senator Mulroe. I can tell you that I'm holding a -- a National Highway Traffic Safety Administration report put out by the Department of Transportation - this is part of the rulemaking process at the federal level - and they specifically opined on safety with respect to multi-function school activity buses. They've -- they've -- they've put out a report, okay? And I'm just going to read one sentence of it, 'cause we're short on time here. But, "Finally," - and I'll quote - "enabling schools and other institutions to choose the" -- "the new buses" - multi-function school activity buses - "instead of (a) fifteen-passenger vans {sic} (van) will provide them with a safer transportation alternative." So the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration says that these buses are safe, and if the federal government says they're safe, I -- I think they're safe. Are they as safe as school buses, full yellow school buses? I don't know, but I don't think they're unsafe and -- and I -- I also know that -- that the State Board of Education allows their use in certain circumstances, but not in the circumstance in which we're trying to allow these six small, financially strapped schools. These are not wealthy schools. I think it's been suggested their wealthy schools; we're talking about six poor schools that are trying to teach kids with disabilities and they're just trying to have a little bit more flexibility to fulfill the IEP plan. So, if the federal government says they're safe, I believe they're safe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Mulroe.
SENATOR MULROE:

One other question. So a lot of these kids in these -- that -- that are disabled, they might not be able to walk on their own. They may be wheelchair bound. Do they have -- these multi-functional buses, do they have lifts? Do they have ramps? Or how do they -- how do they get on and off the buses?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Nybo.

SENATOR NYBO:

Senator, this bill came to my attention about forty-eight hours ago. I can't answer that question. I do not think there are lifts on the buses and I think it's correct that they do not have the -- what do you call it? -- the -- the wing that -- that -- that shows somebody...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Twenty seconds. Senator Mulroe. Senator Sandoval's name was used in debate.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to refer to the marketing information by these -- the multi-function school activity buses. The -- the manufacturer of these buses, in their marketing information, they have a disclaimer; they forewarn the consumer that the National Transportation Safety Board has declared these vehicles to be extremely dangerous and has made it illegal for a fifteen-passenger van to be sold for the purpose of transporting students. They recommend that these buses only be used to transport small groups, such as chess clubs and art clubs, show choirs and cross-country teams. This is from their marketing information, Senator Mulroe.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
   Leader Harmon, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR HARMON:
   Thank you, Mr. President.  To the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
   To the bill.
SENATOR HARMON:
   Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this bill was before the Senate Executive Committee today.  There was no opposition to the bill.  Those folks who had been opposed had reached an accommodation with the sponsor, an understanding of how future incidents may be addressed.  I understand that there are folks who are concerned, but it's 10:30 at night on the last night and there's no opposition to the bill from the -- the stakeholders who initially raised the issue.  So I'd ask everyone to take a deep breath and vote Aye.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
   Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR HAINE:
   A question of the sponsor.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
   Indicates he will yield.
SENATOR HAINE:
   Does this -- these vehicles have any -- is there a marketing tool for giving people tires or discounts on tires?
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)
   Leader Radogno, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR RADOGNO:
   Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
I appreciate Senator Harmon's comments. This is a practical issue. These kids typically are not in wheelchairs. We're trying to take kids out to learn how to open bank accounts. This is a practical solution that helps kids get an experience that they wouldn't otherwise have. As Senator Harmon pointed out, there's no opposition. Please let's vote Yes for this to help these kids in these poorer school districts. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator Nybo, to close.

SENATOR NYBO:

    Thank you, Mr. President. To my esteemed colleague, who chairs our Transportation Committee, I've already apologized for the way that this bill was moved to a committee. I don't -- I'll apologize again. I'm sorry, but I have no control over where bills go, you know, in terms of committees. And -- and if you think that I do, you're giving me a lot more credit than I deserve. So I apologize for that, but it's still a good bill and it's going to help out a lot of kids and that -- that's the main thing. It was unanimous out of the House. It was unanimous out of Exec. It should be unanimous out of this Body. I think we should do the right thing and I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

    The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1582. 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 Ayes, 9 Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate concurs with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1582, and is
declared passed. Senate Bill 2340. Leader Lightford. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2340. Signed by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lightford, on your amendment -- your motion, I apologize.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill did exactly what -- the change is that we moved the effective date. We ran out of time. I shared with you, we would make that change in the House. The change was made. It removed the opposition from the Department of Human Services. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the Senate -- the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2340. 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 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2340, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2357. Senator Sandoval. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2357.
Signed by Senator Sandoval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sandoval, on your motion.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Mr. President, Senate Bill 2357 removes the requirement that the racetracks include these extensive annual reports by small businesses to report exhaustive financial data. There's no opposition to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2357. 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 45 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2357, and the bill is declared passed. House Bill 2427. Senator Jones. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move -- I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2427.

Signed by Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jones, on your motion.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2427 provides that a taxpayer may avoid penalties and interest of enormous (sic) (erroneous) homestead
exemptions. House Amendment No. 2 is a result of negotiations between the Cook County Assessor's and the proponents. I know of no more opposition to the legislation and I look for a Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2427. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2427, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2469. Leader Lightford. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2469.
Signed by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lightford, on your motion.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This motion amends the provisions of several bills that was introduced this year regarding debt limit exemptions. The bill came over from the House and the goal here was to allow for school districts or libraries to be approved via referendum. The school districts affected would be the Bureau Valley CUSD, School District 340 - they would like to exceed its debt limit and issue bonds not to exceed twenty-five million; the Paxton-Buckley-Loda School
District 10 would like to exceed its debt limit and issue bonds not to exceed 28.5 million; and Hillsboro School District Unit 3 would like to exceed its debt limit and issue bonds not to exceed 34.5 million. And finally, the Brookfield Public Library would like to issue bonds to not exceed eleven million. I know of no opposition. The proponents is the Library Association, the Illinois High School District Organization, and the Large Unit School {sic} District Association. I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator McConchie, for what purpose do you seek...

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

To the bill -- or, yeah, to the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

...motion. I just want to comment, for anyone who's concerned about this raising further indebtedness, that this, as was explained to us in committee, it will only allow for these organization -- or these entities to seek further debt upon referendum. It goes to the public. So this is not raising debt in and of itself. So, thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Barickman, for what...

Senator Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
The question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2469. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed -- or will vote Aye or vote 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2469, and is declared passed.

Senate Bill 2701. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2701.
Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Althoff, on your motion.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:
Thank you very much, Mr. President. The concurrence, the House amended the bill to leave the underlying language of the bill, but it does include a new provision that prohibits participation by a person who is newly elected member of a county board and requires a logging of the amount of hours that they put in for this position. Representative Franks, who carried the bill in the House, has promised a trailer bill to remove that provision if, in fact, the county board has already been audited. I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House
Amendments 2 and 3 on Senate Bill 2701. 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2701, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2989.

Leader Clayborne. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2989.

Signed by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Clayborne, on your motion.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This created the shipper's -- wine (sic) (winery) shipper's license and the amendment does several things: One, it increases fees at the request of the administration and it also redistributes the money to the General (Revenue) Fund and to the Liquor Control Commission. I would ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2989. 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 53 Ayes, 2 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional
majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2989, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3336. Senator Righter. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 3336. Signed by Senator Righter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter, on your motion.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber. When Senate Bill 3336 left the Senate, it was a bill that, among other things, required that all pharmacists and pharmacies be a member of a patient safety organization. It passed unanimously. The House added House Amendment 2, which simply allows the Attorney General to access records on behalf of the Department of Professional Regulation if necessary. I would ask the Body to concur in the House amendment, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3336. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3336, and is declared passed. We will now go to Supplemental Calendar No. 3. On Supplemental Calendar No. 3, Senate Bill 250. Senator Manar. Mr.
Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 250. Signed by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. The House made several changes to the automatic voter registration bill that we passed. There are four significant changes. They are designed to remove opposition that was presented to us from the State Board of Elections. With this -- with this motion, that would remove the opposition and would leave all proponents of the bill. Be happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR REZIN:

To -- to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the motion.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. I do commend the sponsor for fixing. There were several questions that we had regarding this. We do feel that the changes that were made by the sponsor are better and we ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion?
Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments (sic) 3 to Senate Bill 250. 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 50 Ayes, 7 Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 250, and is declared passed. Senator Rezin. Senator Rezin. Thank you. Senate Bill 324. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 324. Signed by Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, on your motion.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is in regards to the veterans' loan program that was passed out of here a couple weeks ago. This simply addresses, the House amendment, to cap the amount of administrative expenses.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 324. 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate concurs.
with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 324, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2261. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 2261.

Signed by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine, on your motion.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This was an agreed motion between the Municipal League, the towing industry, that creates a commission and follows along the same lines that we had in the original Senate bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2261. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2261, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2604. Leader Lightford. Senate Bill 3096. Senator Bennett. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 3096.

Signed by Senator Bennett.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Bennett, on your motion.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill left this Chamber with, I believe, unanimous support. It's known as the anti-sexual (sic) sexual assault incident bill, which looked at different procedures and training so that we could better address and be more sensitive to the victims of sexual assault. When it went over to the House, the Illinois State Police added an amendment that would help streamline certain procedures there, particularly regarding their polygraph operators and the disclosure of the toxicology reports. There are no known opponents and I believe it got -- it was 118 to 0 in the House after the amendment. I'd ask for an Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3096. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3096, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 3112. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3112.

Signed by Senator Haine.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Senator Haine, on your motion.

SENATOR HAINE:

    Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This -- this amendment in the House was actually prepared by the Attorney General's Office and Attorney General Madigan thought it would improve the -- the FOIA bill that we have, and it does in my opinion and I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3112. 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3112, and is declared passed. Senate Bill 2604. Leader Lightford. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

    I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 (sic) (1 and 2) to Senate Bill 2604. Signed by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

    Leader Lightford, on your motion.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

    Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a trailer bill to Senate Bill 2531. When we passed that bill, there were some questions regarding the definition of
economic development and which we define that in this legislation and it removed all of the opposition from the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and Cook-Witter. They were actually -- they actually drafted the amendment in the House. I'll be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Connelly, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates she will yield.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, I know it's late. I'm going to try to make this into one question. We had a long debate on this when it was here previously. Economic development corporations, basically, you -- you pay to join. You can pay at different levels - some at a thousand, two thousand, five thousand - and the money is pooled to pay for staff, to pay for marketing, and to do those things necessary to retain business and to encourage new business to come into that region. One simple question: Why shouldn't a union pay like everybody else?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

This would be erasing the fee for everyone, not just the unions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Connelly.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

One quick clarification: I -- I thought I heard you say the Chamber is -- is no longer opposed. I believe they are opposed. What -- is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I did not say that. I said the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, and Cook-Witter drafted the amendment together. The Illinois Chamber was offered a deal and they didn't take the deal. They actually had a good opportunity, but they're just -- there's a lot -- just opposed to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Connelly.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Briefly, to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

To the bill.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Folks, we went through this debate a few months ago and the -- the bottom line is, people in companies, small businesses in Decatur, in Lake County and other parts of the State, they pool the money so that they can retain staff to encourage people to bring their businesses to that region or keep their businesses in that region and I don't see any reason -- I've not heard any reason why a union shouldn't be able to do the same as a small business or whatnot. Lord only knows we've had people bused into this
building for the last three weeks. Somebody's paying for that. Maybe that money should go to paying for the application to these economic development corporations. I -- I encourage a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates she will yield.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, we -- we talked about this just this evening and it was the same issue. So, first of all, let me just say that I don't think the Chamber just completely refused to come to the table here. I think their -- their issue was that many of these -- these economic development organizations, they are integrated within them, and to say that the Chamber would be exempt doesn't mean that these other -- these economic development organizations would all be exempt. So, you know, there's so many times we -- we get in negotiations and we find that somebody really didn't come to the table. This is not one of those situations. I think they did. Should they have taken the deal? Perhaps. Could it have been clarified that not only they would have been exempt or -- but the organizations they were integrated with would have been exempt as well? That would have been great. So all I'm asking is -- 'cause I do agree, there are -- there are economic development organizations that have unions as members, paying members already, and it would make sense that they would pay in -- in any situation, so that they could have a voice and a vote. So, I know this is a trailer. I would just ask if it's possible with very little more
conversation you could address this in the near future with a
trailer to the trailer. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Lightford, to
close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd be happy to consider that,
Senator. I just want to note that the prices to join is just so
high. You can -- if you don't have five hundred dollars - in some
areas, a thousand, two thousands (sic) - the minimum amount, then
community people cannot take part in being a part of this venture,
where there is public dollars. That's the reason for the request.
It has nothing to do with being against the Chamber and it's not
necessarily a bill for the unions not to pay. It's for anyone
that would like to take part. I ask for an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The question is, shall the Senate concur with the House
Amendment 1 (sic) to Senate Bill 2604. 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 Ayes, 19 Nays, none
voting Present. Having received the required constitutional
majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendment 1 (sic) to
Senate Bill 2604, and is declared passed. On the top of page of
the Supplemental Calendar No. 3, House Joint Resolution 119.
Senator Brady. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 119, offered by Senator Brady.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Senator Brady, on your resolution.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution designates a section of Illinois Route 9 near Tremont for an individual who gave his life in the line of duty -- as the "(Deputy) Craig Whisenand Memorial Highway". Deputy Craig Whisenand was born in Peoria, completed his studies at the University of Illinois Police Training Institute in Champaign. He began his career as a corrections officer in 2000 and was appointed to serve as Deputy Sheriff with the Tazewell County Sheriff's Department. He was killed in the line of duty on August -- 2015. I ask you to support this resolution in his honor and his memory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, as this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 119 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 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. With leave of the Body, we'll turn to page 21 of the regular Calendar, Senate Resolution 1752. Senator Jones. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1752, offered by Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jones, on your resolution.

SENATOR JONES:
Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would first like to start by saying this Senate Resolution 1752 has five major components that we'll address in a second. I would like to talk about why this bill is needed. Illinois' LBGT (LGBT) population is protected from discrimination in the Land of Lincoln. They can legally be denied logging -- logging, a meal, a job when visiting the State of Mississippi and North Carolina. With these states being popular vacation destinations and hubs for business activity, it is imperative that we take a stand to protect the civil rights of the LGBT Illinoisans. This bill has national issues in recent months. As I stated before, this resolution has five components. One supports the civil rights and equal treatment of all people, opposes discrimination, prejudice, homophobia, and transphobia. Calls on North Carolina and Mississippi to repair the anti-equality laws. Encourages business to serve public in North Carolina and Mississippi to openly welcome LGBT people in their establishments. It also urges Governor Rauner to prohibit non-essential travel to the State of North Carolina and Mississippi. Please join me and give me a Aye vote on this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rose, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSE:

Mr. President, we'd like a roll call on this, if we may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rose requests a roll call. It's always in order. Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Seeing
none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1752 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 32 Ayes, 14 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Resolution 1752, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Resolution 1941. Senator Morrison. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1941, offered by Senator Morrison.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Morrison, on your resolution.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This -- Senate Resolution 1941 urges the Directors of DCFS and Public Health to submit, by January 1, 2017, a joint report to the General Assembly and the Governor on a transition plan to transfer the administration of child death review teams from the Department of Children and Family Services to the Department of Public Health.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1941 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 57. Senator Brady. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution 57, offered by Senator Brady.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Brady, on your resolution.
SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I was asked by a group of constituents to introduce this legislation that would declare the State of Illinois as a Purple Heart State. This resolution adds Illinois to a list of states that honor combat-wounded veterans for their service and sacrifice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 57 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senator Collins, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. While we're at a lull, I would just like to announce that in forty-five minutes, our colleague, Leader Hunter, will be celebrating her -- I think, her third twentieth birthday, something like that. But let's wish her a -- a happy birthday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

I think you're only twenty-nine. Leader Harmon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HARMON:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR HARMON:

Since we're announcing birthdays and we are filling some time, I -- I would like to tell you all that it is my son Don's sixteenth birthday today and I would also like to say for the record, he
picked a lousy day to be born for a legislator's son. But I want to wish him a happy birthday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

I hope he had a better day than you did. Senator Matt Murphy.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

On the subject of birthdays, it is none other than GOMB Director Tim Nuding's birthday today. I'm not going to tell you what number it is, but it's somewhere around a half a century. So if we could all give Tim Nuding a nice Senate happy birthday, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

We'll go to page 22 of the printed Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 36. Senator McConnaughay. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution 36, offered by Senator McConnaughay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McConnaughay, on your resolution. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 102. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 102, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine, on your resolution.
Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This names a couple of blocks of Broadway for the City of Alton for a longtime entrepreneur, successful entrepreneur, and civic leader who tragically died last summer, Edward Royce Sholar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? As this resolution will require expenditure of State funds, a roll call will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 102 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 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Senator Rose, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSE:

Parliamentary inquiry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your inquiry.

SENATOR ROSE:

Ladies and Gentlemen, there's approximately thirty-eight minutes left for Senator Althoff to hit the hundred bill mark this year. Would the Chair entertain a couple scribbled ideas on a piece of paper maybe and just go ahead and vote on those?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

House Joint Resolution 116. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 116, offered by Senator Holmes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
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Senator Holmes, on your resolution.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. House Joint Resolution 116 designates the Orchard Road interchange on Interstate 88 as the "Suzanne Deuchler Honorary Interchange". Suzanne Deuchler served in the Illinois House of Representative for eighteen years and she cofounded the Illinois Math and Science Academy. I'd appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, as -- as this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 116 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. House Joint Resolution 121. Leader Muñoz. Leader Muñoz. House Joint Resolution 133. Senator Manar. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 133, offered by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Manar, on your resolution.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution came over unanimous from the House. It simply directs the Office of the Governor to prepare an agency or office workforce report, based on geography in the State, and report back to the General Assembly. No -- no
opposition. Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Joint Resolution 133 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is -- the resolution is adopted. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to House Joint Resolution 121. Leader Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 121, offered by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Muñoz, on your resolution.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Resolution designates State Route 59 overpass over Interstate 90 the "Trooper Chong Soo Lim Memorial Overpass". This trooper was killed in the line of duty, June 6, 1995, at the age of twenty-nine. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, as the -- as this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 121 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Joint Resolution 139. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 139, offered by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Althoff, on your resolution.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution also came over from the House unanimously and it urges IDPH to study with all three pharmacy schools in Illinois effective methods for transitioning care of a patient between the various healthcare settings and their medication regimes, as well as to examine and recommend solutions for the cancelation of automatic electronically prescribed medicines.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, should House Joint Resolution 139 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 141. Senator McCann. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution No. 141, offered by Senator McCann.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator McCann, on your resolution.

SENATOR McCANN:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Joint Resolution 141 urges the Illinois Department of Natural Resources to reintroduce and protect four native species of gar back into the Illinois waterways and implement measures to help sustain their population. The alligator gar, which is one of these four, used to be abundant in Illinois and virtually has vanished. This is the only species —
indigenous species of fish in Illinois that is a predator of Asian carp. So I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

As this resolution requires expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 141 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 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill -- House Joint Resolution 141, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Joint Resolution 145. Senator Harris. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 145, offered by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harris, on your resolution.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House -- House Joint Resolution 145 is -- designates a portion of 130th Street from the Bishop Ford Freeway to State Street in Chicago as the "Hazel Johnson EJ Way". Mrs. Johnson was an advocate. We call her the Mother of Environmental Justice in the Altgeld Gardens community, where she started a community group for recovery to put pressure on the Chicago Housing Authority to remove asbestos. She also was a part of helping pass legislation and urging then President Bill Clinton to sign the Environmental Justice Executive Order, which holds the federal government responsible for communities exposed to pollution. And I respectfully ask an Aye
vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR LINK)

   Is there any discussion?  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, as -- as this resolution requires expenditures of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 145 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 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  House Joint Resolution 147.  Senator Brady.  President Cullerton, for what purpose do you rise?  

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

   For the purposes of an announcement. Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have concluded the business for today. We are going to wait for the -- the House is still in Session. We will call the adjournment resolution at the end, but for now our -- our -- I just wanted to say thank you for all your hard work this Session. Actually, today started on a very positive note from my perspective, 'cause we met with the Governor and we agreed that we are going to start negotiating perhaps some type of an interim agreement and we'll hope to do that soon and hope -- with the -- the four Legislative Leaders and the Governor, and we will not bring you down here if there's no reason for you to be here, but hopefully we will be able to negotiate something, come back shortly with a -- a -- a interim agreement that can solve some of the problems we've been confronting for the last year and a half. Everybody did a great job working together this year in the Senate and I'm very proud of that fact and look forward to
coming back soon with more good news.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

    Leader Radogno, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

    Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, have to tell you how proud I am of the Senate this Session. I think generally we're known to be a more collegial Body, a more policy-oriented Body, and we've proved that in the last several hours. We rejected a wildly out-of-balance budget. We agreed to pass a stand-alone school funding bill, albeit I think it needs quite a bit of work and I think we all agree on that. I think it spends way too much money. But we -- we've also pledged together to work not only for a stopgap budget that will continue to fund critical State services, but also continue all the hard work of the working groups, and that's an effort that really started here in this Body, to continue to try to get the long-term reforms that we all need we know -- all know we need, as well as pass a truly balanced budget. So I think we should all congratulate ourselves. We have a long ways to go, but we've really done a good job under very difficult circumstances. Thank you, everyone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

    We will now proceed to the Order of Resolution Consent Calendar. With leave of the Body, all resolutions read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, have there been any objections filed on any resolution on the Consent Calendar?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

    No objections filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)
Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Resolution Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries. The resolutions are adopted. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 155.

Offered by Senator Harmon.

(Secretary reads HJR No. 155)


PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

On the Order of Resolutions in {sic} the House Joint Resolution 155. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution. Senator Harmon moves...

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 155, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon moves to suspend the rules for the purposes of immediate consideration and the adoption of House Joint Resolution 155. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Senator Harmon moves the adoption of House Joint Resolution 155. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution's
adopted. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the -- pursuant to House Joint Resolution 155, the Senate stands adjourned to the call of the Senate President. The Senate stands adjourned.