134th Legislative Day 5/30/2018

HB0109	Recalled	136
HB0109	Third Reading	138
НВ0156	Third Reading	5
HB1804	Recalled	90
HB1804	Third Reading	91
HB2354	Third Reading	6
HB3342	Recalled	159
HB3342	Third Reading	160
HB4100	Third Reading	15
HB4104	Third Reading	16
HB4165	Motion	59
HB4165	Second Reading	108
HB4208	Second Reading	165
HB4290	Third Reading	162
HB4309	Third Reading	16
HB4554	Third Reading	33
HB4781	Recalled	92
HB4781	Third Reading	94
HB4873	First Reading	90
HB5166	Second Reading	164
HB5201	Third Reading	19
HB5341	Third Reading	29
HB5721	Second Reading	5
HB5749	Third Reading	23
HB5777	Third Reading	25
HB5868	Third Reading	17
SB0065	Concurrence	34
SB0211	Concurrence	108
SB0337	Concurrence	109
SB0457	Concurrence	47
SB0544	Concurrence	48
SB0558	Concurrence	49
SB1437	Concurrence	95
SB1453	Concurrence	50
SB2270	Concurrence	50
SB2270	Vote Intention	56
SB2281	Concurrence	52
SB2298	Concurrence	53
SB2303	Concurrence	55
SB2368	Concurrence	124
SB2376	Concurrence	60

134th Legislative Day		5/30/2018
SB2380	Concurrence	61
SB2411	Recalled	98
SB2411	Third Reading	99
SB2428	Concurrence	62
SB2459	Concurrence	64
SB2493	Concurrence	65
SB2516	Concurrence	67
SB2598	Concurrence	73
SB2628	Concurrence	67
SB2640	Concurrence	83
SB2644	Concurrence	68
SB2662	Concurrence	95
SB2662	Vote Intention	96
SB2675	Concurrence	69
SB2696	Concurrence	96
SB2777	Concurrence	70
SB2851	Concurrence	71
SB2899	Concurrence	72
SB2905	Concurrence	74
SB2941	Concurrence	75
SB2954	Concurrence	76
SB3022	Concurrence	84
SB3046	Concurrence	77
SB3048	Concurrence	78
SB3072	Concurrence	78
SB3075	Concurrence	80
SB3075	Vote Intention	81
SB3075	Vote Intention	81
SB3108	Concurrence	97
SB3119	Concurrence	81
SB3143	Concurrence	82
SB3190	Recalled	105
SB3190	Third Reading	106
SB3617	First Reading	3
SR1797	Motion	79
SR1809	Resolution Offered Resolution Offered	2 2
SR1810		2
SR1811 SR1812	Resolution Offered Resolution Offered	2 56
	Resolution Offered	56
SR1813 SR1814	Resolution Offered	87
SR1815	Resolution Offered	87
DIVIOIO	Vesoincion Offered	0 /

5/30/2018 134th Legislative Day Resolution Offered 87 SR1816 SR1817 Resolution Offered 87 Resolution Offered 87 SR1818 Resolution Offered 165 SR1819 SR1820 Resolution Offered 165 Resolution Offered SR1821 166 Senate to Order-Senator Martinez 1 Prayer-The Reverend Martin Woulfe 1 Pledge of Allegiance 1 Journal-Postponed 1 Committee Reports 2 2 Messages from the House 56 Committee Reports Messages from the House 58 Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes 86 Committee Reports 87 Messages from the House 88 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 135 Message from the House 135 Committee Reports 136 Adjournment 166

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The regular Session of the 100th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desk? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Reverend Martin Woulfe, Abraham Lincoln Unitarian Universalist Congressional -- Congregation, here in Springfield. THE REVEREND MARTIN WOULFE:

(Prayer by the Reverend Martin Woulfe)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please remain standing for the Pledge Allegiance. Senator Cunningham, to lead us in the Pledge.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Cunningham)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The following three seek leave: NPR Illinois seeks leave to photograph and video record; Lisa Yuscius from the Blueroomstream.com, videotape; and Mike Miletich from WCIA, record video. Leave is granted. No objections, leave are {sic} granted. Mr. Secretary, Reading and Approvals of the Journal.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Journal of Tuesday, May 29th, 2018.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and approval of

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the Journal, pending arrival of printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1809, offered by Senator Haine and all Members.

Senate Resolution 1810, offered by Senator Barickman and all Members.

And Senate Resolution 1811, offered by Senator Lightford and all Members.

They are all death resolutions, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Resolution Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Morrison, Chairperson of the Committee on Human Services, reports Motions to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2662 Recommend Do Adopt; and House Bill 5721 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Raoul, Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary, reports Motions -- Motions to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2696, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3108 Recommend Do Adopt.

And Senator Hutchinson, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports Motion to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1437 Recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

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

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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 486.

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 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 486.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 585, with House Amendment 2; Senate Bill 2350, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 2667, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 2838, with House Amendment 2; Senate Bill 2913, with House Amendments 1, 2, and 4. Passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2018. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Mr. Secretary, Introduction of Senate Bills.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3617, offered by Senator McCarter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Would all the Members at the sound of my voice please come down to the Senate Chamber? Would all the Members in their offices please come down for final action? Senator Schimpf, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Make an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please make your introduction.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I'd like to -- like to introduce my Page today, who's going to be -- she's going to be working for me this summer. Her name is Madison -- Madison -- she goes by Maddie - Epplin. Maddie is from Pinckneyville. She's currently a junior at the University of Alabama, studying public relations, political science, with a minor in psychology. That's the bad news. The good news is, we're going to get her back to Illinois eventually. She is going -- she is going to come back. But I'm extremely fortunate to have her working with me this summer and I would ask that we give her a warm Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Welcome to the Senate. Senator Connelly, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Thank you, Madam President. For an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please, your introduction.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I'd like to introduce my Page for today, Isabella Kolin. She is going to be a junior at Downers Grove North High School. She's an honor roll student there. She intends to go to law school, like both of her parents, and either advocate for animal rights or children's rights. She's accompanied today by her mother, Renata Kolin; her brother, Benjamin; and her friend, Danielle Gargiulo. Please give a warm welcome for Isabella Kolin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Welcome. A Supplemental Calendar has been distributed, Supplemental Calendar No. 1. We're going to go to the top, to House Bills 2nd Reading. Senator Hunter. Let me read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5721.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Human Services adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Has there been any Floor -- any further Floor -- Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

3rd Reading. Moving on to the Calendar on page -- on page 6, House Bill 156. Senator Bush, do you care to proceed? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 156.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you very much, Madam President. We adopted the Floor amendment yesterday. House Bill 156 adds language to the -- the current language that deals with brownfields. It adds abandoned nuclear waste so that communities, like one that I represent, Zion, that has a -- a -- a huge storage of nuclear waste there, can --

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that criteria can be added so that they can apply to be an enterprise zone. We worked with DCEO on this. I know of no opponents and I would very much appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 156 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 156, having received the required constitution — constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Morrison, on House Bill 2354. Do you wish to proceed? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 2354.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill is the Firearms Restraining Order and it is very close to a bill we passed previously, which was a Senate bill. There have been some accommodations made which makes it a better bill. I will tell you that in the neutral category is the Illinois State Rifle Association, which is an improvement. This bill would require that when firearms are, by court order, removed from someone who is considered dangerous to himself or others that the order would only be in effect for six months, that an -- that a hearing must

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

be held within fourteen days of the removal of that, that a judge may issue a search warrant, and that firearms that are removed from an individual will immediately go to law enforcement, as first course. Happy to answer questions on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Good afternoon, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Indicates she will yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much. Senator Morrison, I want to kind of take a little time and walk through this. This has been a somewhat controversial issue. Your -- the Senate passed a bill earlier this year. This is the House version, which I would agree with you, I think is a -- is a little bit better version in terms of what many consider to be due process rights, and that's where I want to start, with the process by which an individual has their firearms returned to them if the petition for the emergency order of protection, the -- the -- I'm going to say "plenary", but I'm not sure that's the word used in the bill, is denied. What -- if that happens, then what is the process by which the lawful owner of the firearms would seek to get his or her firearms back? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator, if I'm understanding your question correctly, the

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

firearms would be automatically returned to the fire owner -firearm's owner. He wouldn't have to -- there would be no
additional requirement for him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay, I just want to be clear. So, under the operation of the bill, there's no petition that needs to be filed, no paperwork, no form. The -- I'm assuming the individual would then go to the law enforcement agency, wherever the firearms were seized and -- or kept, and would be entitled to those immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Yes, Senator, that is my understanding of the bill as presented today to you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, in your -- in your opening description, you said -- you talked -- I think you used the word "may" when you were describing whether or not a judge could issue a search warrant. It's my recollection from reading this language, but I do not have it in front of me right now, that if the court grants the emergency order -- so the individual comes to the court ex parte and makes the case that there's an individual who's in the house who is a significant danger to themselves or someone else and there are firearms in the house...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Righter, let me just see if I can quiet down the Chamber. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are in a debate. Can you please hold it down while the debate is done? Thank you. Please continue, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. If the court grants the emergency order, it's my recollection the language compels the judge to issue a search warrant for the residence where the firearms may be and that search warrant will be executed, regardless of any involvement by the State's Attorney. Am I -- is my recollection correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator, the State's Attorney is not mentioned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. The other part of that question was about, I think you said "may", the court "may" issue a search warrant. It's my recollection that that's a "shall". Can we confirm that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

We're -- we're looking at the text of the language. One second.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, let me help, I think. Page 5 of the engrossed

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

version, I'm looking at line 20. "If the court issues an emergency firearms restraining order, it shall, upon a finding of probable cause that the respondent possesses firearms, issue a search warrant directing a law enforcement agency to seize the respondent's firearms." So -- now, the -- the emergency order can only be granted if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the individual is a danger to themselves or someone else. My understanding is, is if the court then finds by probable cause that there are -- that the person possesses firearms, the search warrant must be issued. Is that your understanding? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

It's exactly as you stated in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And I'm going to end with an open-ended question here. Thank you, Madam President. Senator Morrison, can you walk through a few more of the details with regards to after the search warrant is issued, okay, and then a permanent order is pursued, the process by that, including the -- whether the State's Attorney is required to be involved in that? And with that, I'll close the questions. Thank you, Senator. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise? I'm sorry, Senator Morrison, do you want to speak on the... Senator Haine. SENATOR HAINE:

Would the sponsor yield, Madam President?

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The sponsor indicates she will.

SENATOR HAINE:

Senator Morrison, we had a colloquy in the Judiciary Committee on this bill and the -- I asked you if you would consider, in a trailer bill -- since this is a work in progress, we're attempting to formulate a fair process consistent with our constitutional protections, and I asked you whether, in the trailer bill, you would consider including into this process the State's Attorney, as Senator Righter mentioned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator Haine, let me restate that I would be interested in working on a trailer bill to include the role of the State's Attorney in this action.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

And -- and to clarify this, what I would -- would ask is that the State's Attorney may take up the -- the matter if a layperson comes in and seeks the help of the State's Attorney's Office in filing a petition, or the State's Attorney may assist the court in filing the documents for a search warrant, or the State's Attorney may assist a police officer in seeking an order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator Haine, I believe that this House bill, while superior

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

in some ways to the Senate bill we passed, does omit this important role for the State's Attorney and I would pledge to work with you to correct that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Senator Morrison. And then, last of all, I would include the possibility, what State's Attorneys have now, the power to -- but have it clearly spelled out, the power to seek a psychological evaluation, with different ramifications of course, which may include involuntary commitment, as well as the seizure of firearms, since many of these nationwide incidents, these terrible incidents, are done by people, young men, unfortunately, that are mentally disturbed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator, you and I have discussed this, the Baker Act, which, while I believe it may have merit, I don't believe belongs specifically in this bill. So I would be happy to discuss it with you this summer, but I believe, for purposes of this legislation, House Bill 2354, the State's Attorney already does have that ability and that option. I don't know that I would expand that any more in this particular bill, but would look at a separate bill with you on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Okay, that's -- that's fair. The -- I'm looking at the Baker

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Act in Florida, which outlines some of these procedures, and if they'd have used it in Florida, that terrible incident at Parkland would have been prevented, but it was only because of the incompetence of the local sheriff that that did not occur. And my last question is this, to have a clear admonishment by a court on the court — a clear on the record admonishment, as well as in the order, that any false statement by a petitioner would result in a perjury charge. That admonishment has to be made clear upfront. It's mentioned in the bill, but it should be an admonishment by a court that any false statement, any exaggeration of the facts that led to this petition for a court to seize firearms would be subject to a heavy sanction of perjury.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator Haine, it's my intention for this legislation that forms be developed that could be uniformly used across the State and that in that form the petitioner would sign, they would read the language that does speak to the fact that this would be subject to perjury.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Senator Morrison. And I must say, I appreciate very much your work on this and your courage in -- in taking it up. It's highly controversial. The initial bill, I was not in support of, but this is an improvement. It's an area which must be addressed with these terrible shootings and incidents by -- especially by those with disturbed minds. And we -- we must act,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

we -- but we must act consistent with the Constitution and due process, and -- and that's, again, why the State's Attorneys, who are the chief law enforcement officers of the county. Their officers are used to dealing with these issues, with warrants, advising courts, and various other matters, and they're answerable to the voters for any excesses. On this basis, I must say that I strongly recommend an Aye vote and, again, a -- a -- a congratulations to you for taking up a difficult, complex matter and bringing it to fruition, not complete fruition until we have a trailer bill, but certainly you're on -- you're on the right road. Thank you so much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

I simply want to thank Senator Haine and other Members of the Senate for the input that I've received over the past couple months as we have developed this policy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

With no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2354 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. With 43 Members voting Aye, 0 voting -- I mean, 11 voting Nay, 0 voting Present, this bill received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. WLS-TV and WGN requests to videotape and film. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 2477. Do you wish to proceed? Leave of the Body, we'll return back to that bill. Next bill, Senator Manar, on House Bill 3080. Do you wish to proceed? House Bill 3142. Senator McGuire.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator -- President John Cullerton, on House Bill 4045. Senator Castro, on House Bill 4100. Senator Castro. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4100.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Madam President. This -- House Bill 4100 creates the Health Care Violence Protection Act by instituting provisions concerning workplace violence against nurses in specific medical facilities, contacting law enforcement, and mental health services. The bill also requires specific medical facilities to create a workplace violence prevention program with specified requirements and whistleblower protections for any nurse of a specified medical facility if management retaliates against the nurses {sic} for certain action. I have to thank the House sponsor and the sixteen different organizations who played a key role in this legislation, and we worked on five different amendments. This is in result to some incidents not only in my home county, Kane County, but also in Joliet, where, you know, it's important to provide our health care workers with some protections. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, does House Bill 4100 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4100, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. WBBM-TV and WTTW seek leave to photograph and videotape the proceedings. Is there any objection? Seeing none, leave is granted. Senator McCarter, on House Bill 4104. Do you wish to proceed? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4104.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 4104 is the identical bill to House Bill 4697 that we had a long discussion over before. There was a major drafting error and we had to move it onto this bill. This also gives Senator Hastings a chance to vote Yes this time, so -- perhaps, perhaps not. But I -- I appreciate a -- a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4104 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. We have 55 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4104, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Bush, on House Bill 4309. Mr.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4309.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you very much, Madam President. HB 4309 creates the Frail Individual Family Visitation Act {sic} (Frail Elderly Individual Family Visitation Protection Act), allowing people to petition courts for visitation when a caregiver has refused to let them see their frail family member. The bill also requires caregivers to notify the frail individual's family of hospitalization and relocation. And I know of no objections and I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4309 pass. All those voting in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now 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 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4309, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hastings, on House Bill 4554. Senator Hastings. Senator Mulroe, on House Bill 4702. Senator Mulroe. Senator McGuire, on House Bill 4781. Senator Link, on House Bill 4808. Senator Link. With leave of the Body, we're going to the Calendar, page 10. House Bill 5868. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5868.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill permits insurers to provide residential extended care services and supports for persons battling addiction. Though it does not mandate the provision of these services, it states that if these services are provided, then the following conditions must be met: One, a specified health care provider must conduct an individualized assessment of the person's condition and determine that the person is at risk of a relapse and is in need of supportive services; two, residential extended care services and supports must be administered by a community-based agency that is licensed by or under contract with DHS; and, three, a health care clinic, or similar facility, must make the referral for the residential extended care services and supports after discharging the person. I know of no opposition to the bill and I will attempt to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5868 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 57 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5868, having received the required

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 5147. Senator McGuire, on House Bill 5198. Senator Castro, on House Bill 5201. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5201.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Madam President. 5201, as amended, establishes a mechanics lien demand and referral pilot program that is intended to resolve expired mechanics liens by referring those liens to an administrative law judge for resolution, demanding the lienholder commence a suit or require the forfeiture of the lien. This is a pilot program that is just for Cook County. What we're finding is, there are folks, especially low-income folks, who are trying to either refinance their home, buy a home, who are finding that there are liens against their property and they're finding the process a little burdensome to be able to do that. I want to thank everyone who was involved in working on this bill. I ask for an Aye vote and I'll take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Madam President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

She indicates she will yield.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Castro, someone -someone came to me on this bill and asked me to walk through a
hypothetical with you to see if we could get an answer on how this
would be handled. If there is a mechanics lien placed on multiple
properties - one of the counties {sic} is in Cook County, one of
the counties {sic} is in Kane County, let's say - does this new
process, which purports only to affect Cook County, would that
work to extinguish the lien in Kane County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

The answer to that is, no, Senator. It only applies to the lien that is in Cook County. Now, in Section {sic} (subsection) (c) of House Bill 4201 {sic} (5201), the -- it creates the authority for each county recorder to establish a similar pilot program, a mechanic lien demand and referral process for residential property, if they'd want to. But it only -- this only applies to Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So you're saying there's -- there's no mechanism in this bill, either explicit or implicit, that would allow the individual who gets the -- the lien extinguished in Cook County to be able to take that to a court in another county and use that as a justification to -- because I think that the proponents of this bill -- there has been a -- there has been a series of mixed messages on this issue and, obviously, that has raised many

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

eyebrows in the industries that work within this, and so I think it's -- we be crystal clear that there's nothing in the bill, explicit or implicit, that would indicate that and that it's certainly your -- not your intention to create a mechanism that would allow a Cook County process to affect the validity of a lien in one of the other one hundred and one counties in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

You are correct, Senator. It is only in appliance to Cook County, and the reason, because under administrative law, the county administrative law court may only hear matters which pertain to the county agency initiating the suit, which is Cook County. This only applies to Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

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

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Senator, first of all, you -- we've -- we've spent some time in committee and -- and on the Floor and, I apologize, I'm reading some of the notes that Cook County sent to me when you sent -- when you called your bill, so I'm trying to play catch-up on that. I -- I want to express the concern that I -- that was raised in committee that I'm still not sure I have an answer on, which is -- which -- which takes the scenario that Senator Righter outlined,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

one lien affecting properties in two counties and the impact that the administrative law order from Cook County may have on that lien. I think Senator Righter and you discussed whether that Cook County order would extinguish the other county's lien. The answer is, no, but -- but my concern is, what impact that may have regardless on those who are financing properties, trying to provide title insurance, because there's going to be this new court that's going to issue an order that will need to be interpreted by someone. And so maybe it's -- it's not a -- a question as much as it is a -- a concern that I have that I want to express to you. I'll draw to a close here. You're free to -- to comment to that, but I think our -- you know, for some of us who are going to be No votes, I think we want to make sure you understood why. So thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Castro, to close. SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator Barickman, I thank you for the lively discussion. I know both of us have been trying to clarify that. Obviously, the intention is good. We also just don't want to open a can of worms. So to recap, and I'll give an example, if a mechanic lien was recorded against a property in Cook County and Will County, and was beyond the two-year period to foreclose, pursuant to House Bill -- this House bill, the residential property owner would have to go to both the Cook County Recorder of Deeds and request the demand and referral process and then separately go to the Will County Recorder of Deeds and request the demand and referral process in order to obtain a release order from an administrative law judge in both Cook and Will County, separately. Cook County

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

administrative law judge decisions pertain exclusively to Cook County matters, because the technical plaintiff in such matters is the Cook County Recorder of Deeds or whichever Cook County agency is initiating the suit before the administrative law judge. So, again, I just want to be very clear that this just is Cook County and no other liens would be affected. This is a great opportunity to help folks who are kind of stuck in the silo and be able to refinance their homes, sell their home, who may not have the means to hire an attorney and so on and so forth. So I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

So the question is, shall House Bill 5201 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 37 Members voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5201, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 5341. Senator Harmon. Senator Syverson, on House Bill 5541. Senator Harris, on House Bill 5593. Senator Harris. Senator Fowler, on House Bill 5749. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5749.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of this Chamber. This is

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a very important bill for our -- our farmers. House Bill 5749 amends the Vehicle Code between September 1 and December 31st and will require IDOT to issue special permits authorizing the movement of loads of agricultural commodities that may not exceed the current axle or vehicle gross weight limits by ten percent. This has been an ongoing conversation. It originally passed the House as a twelve-month program, but we amended it to just go from September 1 through December 31st. And thanks to negotiations and compromise -- especially like to say thank you to Senator Sandoval for all his hard work on this. And I respectfully ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

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

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Senator Fowler, I fully intend to support this bill and commend you for the amount of work that all of you put into it, but can you clarify for me, how does this affect local roads and local control with regard to how the program is actually operated? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Thank you. Great question. This will actually take in place of the harvest emergency period. Instead of issuing that proclamation, then this would just be a standard September 1

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

through December 31st. So it'll give our -- some -- some red tape -- or some lenience to our farmers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. I -- I understand that, but I also was given to -- understand that there still is local control over participation. So can you kind of just elaborate a little bit on how that works locally?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Fowler, to close.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Yes, thank you. There will be the local control and it -- it pertains to our -- yes, our highways in our...(inaudible)... Yes. I respectfully ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 5749 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 55 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 5749, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator T. Cullerton, on House Bill 5777. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5777.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Illinois Senate. Senate Bill -- or House Bill 5777 is actually a gut-and-replace. The original bill that I had passed over to the House had been taken out. It passed out of here unanimously. It dealt with the reduction of time in putting up a question in front of a county board. This just essentially takes that language and puts it on this House bill. As the House bill got -- or as the Senate bill got taken over there. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5777 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now 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 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5777, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Rezin, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR REZIN:

...you, Madam President. So nice to see you in the Chair. For purpose of an introduction, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please introduce your guests.

SENATOR REZIN:

I have some very important guests here with me today. Standing behind me is my father, Ken Schipper, and his wife, Eileen. They decided to come down to Springfield today to see what it is that we actually do in the Capitol. So I told him here

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

-- that they're here for a very exciting day. They also brought three of their friends up here in the -- in the gallery. We have Irv and Mary Sanderson {sic}. They're actually retired teachers from Prophetstown, or Ptown, as I call it. Irv was a teacher and coach for almost forty-eight years and Mary was a teacher for well over twenty years. And then their other friend, Doug Gorczynski {sic}. Do I have that correct, almost? Close enough. And Doug is a retired employee from 3M. I ask for a warm Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Welcome to the State Senate. Senator Bivins, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BIVINS:

Point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

State your business.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Madam President. I'd -- I'd like to call the Senate to order, if you would, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

I would -- please -- Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a very -- a very important guest, special guest with us today, and Senator Bivins has the privilege of presenting. Can you please give your attention? Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Madam President. I want to introduce to you a hometown hero today, but first I have some other folks who have come down to help us recognize his heroic actions. I would draw your attention to the President's Gallery on the right, where we

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

have Dixon Police Chief Steve Howell; Dixon Police Lieutenant Clay Whelan; Dixon Police Detective Sergeant Michael Wolfley; Dixon Police Sergeant Doug Lehman; Lee County Sheriff John Simonton; and also with them is Attorney James -- Mertes, excuse me. He is a friend of the family and attorney for Officer Dallas. And also, we have a -- a gentleman that I've known for over thirty years, and he won't remember this, but I was there when he was born, Sergeant Ryan Bivins; his wife, Jordan; and sons, Carson and Brady; and my wife, Terri. Please welcome them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please rise and be acknowledged by the State Senate. Thank you for your visit here today. Thank you all for your service. Senator Bivins, please continue with your introduction. SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Madam President. With me is Dixon Police Department Corporal Mark Dallas; his wife, Jennifer; his son, Joshua; and his daughter, Lauren. And we gather to recognize our hometown hero and here's why: On May 16th at 8:06 a.m., while seniors at Dixon High School were practicing in the gymnasium for their graduation ceremony, a lone gunman fired shots into the gym. Dixon Police Officer and School Resource Officer Corporal Mark Dallas ran to the sound of the gunfire - not away, but to. When he confronted the suspect, the suspect ran from the building and Officer Dallas gave chase. The suspect fired several rounds at Officer Dallas and Officer Dallas returned fire, striking the suspect, disabling him, and stopping the threat. The suspect was taken into custody and several days later was released from the hospital and is being held in the Lee County Jail under a two-million-dollar bond. Because of his selfless bravery, Officer

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Dallas undoubtedly saved the lives of many that day, including his son, Joshua, who was in the gymnasium practicing with the seniors - and he just graduated from Dixon High School. Today, we have all joined to recognize the heroism of Officer Dallas. received already a Senate certificate, a book that all the Senators here signed. And the Governor, just a little while ago, issued a proclamation naming today Mark Dallas Day. He received a -- a resolution in the House that Representative Demmer, who's also from Dixon, as I am, and -- and the House read that a little while We've had many photos, along with your family and your colleagues and friends from our hometown. We've done all this in an effort to create a day that you won't forget, because on May 16th, you gave us a day that we will never forget. Thank you for your service, your heroic actions. And I would ask all Members of the Senate, all quests, to please join me in showing appreciation to Officer Dallas, our hometown hero.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you for your heroic effort and thank you for -- for the service that you provide to us. Thank you very much. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 5341. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5341.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senate. Current law allows certain people to petition a court to have certain criminal records sealed. The current law lays out five criteria that a judge should consider in making that decision. There is some inconsistency across the State in how courts are treating unpaid fines and fees. Some courts are not considering that in the sealing determination - others are - and are refusing to seal. This would clarify that the statewide standard is that unpaid fines and fees should not be a factor in considering whether or not to seal. We are not waiving the fines and fees. We are not impacting the requirement of paying restitution, but we do recognize that if -- if you can't pay your fines and fees because you can't get a job and not being able to seal your records keeps you from getting a job, it is a vicious circle that goes the wrong way. The Illinois State's Attorneys Association is neutral on this bill, having negotiated a -- a compromise. I'm not aware of any opposition. I'd ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, for those who have been around for even a handful of the last few years, we have been witness to and taking part in a -- a change, a broad-based change, in public policies. And the change that I am describing is the change that says that

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

with regards to our Criminal Code, we are going to seek to be less punitive and more rehabilitative, to the extent that the justice system can allow that. One of the instruments that has been used in this -- in this Chamber and in this State government has been affording the ability for individuals who have been convicted of crimes to have their criminal record sealed so that they can - for lack of a -- a more articulate term - move on to another life, put the past behind them. We've -- we've debated back and forth, and people have different opinions on the wisdom of sealing or expungement, or how long should we make the person wait before they can apply for sealing or expungement. And -- and it's fine that we all have those different opinions, but one thing that, I hope, that would give us all pause, if not we could not agree on, is the fact that we are going to insist that the individual, who wants to start anew, will first complete his or her obligations to the people and to the court system before we do that. It's one thing to say, years have passed, you've paid your debt to society. We are happy to see you move on and happy to give you this tool to help you move on. We're all for that in one -- in one form or another. It's another thing to say that we are going to excuse you of your obligation insofar as the ceiling is permitted. other words, we're going to let you start new even though you haven't complied with all of your obligations to the people or to society or to the court system. One last point - thank you, Madam President - is that many of these reforms that have passed over the last two or three years, one of the major selling points that has been raised by the sponsors has been, we're going to let the courts exercise their discretion. Every case is different. Every individual is different. Every circumstance is different.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

going to let the courts exercise their discretion. In some parts of the State, the courts are exercising their discretion and saying, before we afford you this remedy, you are going to finish complying with the obligations you have to this court and to society. This bill now says we are going to take that discretion away from those judges. One of the selling points of these reforms is now going to be stopped. Let's let the judges decide whether or not it's important that that individual -- before they be allowed to seal criminal records so that no employer can ever see them, let's at least insist that they finish paying their -- their fees and their fines, perhaps on that case, or at least let the judges decide if that's appropriate before moving forward. With that, Madam President, I urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President. Is this the close?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Yes, it is.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

You're lucky.

SENATOR HARMON:

I don't disagree with Senator Righter's concerns. They are -- they are valid. They are well made. I would like to emphasize this, that we -- we give judges discretion and there are factors laid out in statute and we're not in any way infringing on that discretion. What we are observing is that, across the State, a --

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

- a -- a standard not in law is being -- being applied and it's being applied inconsistently. In some jurisdictions, not paying your fees and fines is a bar to getting your records sealed; in others, it's not. I think we should have a uniform standard and I think, to the underlying point, it -- it is a vicious cycle. People of means can pay court fines and -- and fees. People with no money can't and they can't get a job to pay those fines and fees if they can't seal their records. It's a -- it is a vicious cycle. We aren't forgiving the fines and fees. We're -- they can still be recovered. One of the reasons the State's Attorneys are neutral is because we've built into the law a portal for the State's Attorneys to access that information to pursue it. we're expecting everyone to pay their fair share, but we're recognizing that not everyone comes to the table equally resourced to do that in a timely fashion. This is not a dramatic change by any stretch. I appreciate your attention and I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 5341 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 32 Members voting Aye, 21 Members voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 5341, having received the majority -- the required majority -- constitutional, is declared passed. Senator Hastings, on House Bill 4554. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4554.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 4554 provides that it's an aggregating {sic} factor for the purposes of sentencing if a defendant has committed the offense of driving while under the influence while driving the wrong way down a road that's designated as a one-way. The presence of this aggravating factor could result in a more severe sentence. The Floor amendment to the bill also provides the definition of "traffic control devices" under the Uniform Code of Corrections. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4554 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 57 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4554, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. ...on to the Calendar on Concurrences, we're looking at page -- page 13. Senator Hastings. Senate Bill 65. Do you wish 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 65.

Signed by Senator Hastings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Madam President. We had passed this bill out of the Senate. The Floor amendment is a page-and-line amendment to the bill, as passed. It's technical in nature. It clarifies that there may be other incidental products and services that are issued when the owner -- buying the title insurance policy. This bill passed the Senate 41-6 with 3 voting Present. And I ask the -- the Body for an Aye vote. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

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

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The -- the sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator, we -- we discussed this legislation recently in committee and I think we did a deeper dive than maybe we always -- or, you know, are accustomed to when something comes back on Concurrence, but the reason we did so was because of the Department's - DFPR in this instance - the Department's concerns that this legislation may conflict with federal law under RESPA. RESPA, of course, being a consumer protection law that mandates, among other things, that consumers, buyers of real estate, people who are financing real estate, should not be subjected to unfair dealings. And so there's this federal Act that the Department says this legislation will conflict with that federal consumer protection law. What do you say to that? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

I think that this bill has been discussed in both Chambers ad nauseam, to the point where the explanations of why this bill does not violate RESPA -- and I -- and I think I can -- we can go over it again ad nauseam if this great Body would like. And I'll just tell you, though, Senator, that the industry -- there are no opponents in the industry that operates under RESPA that disagrees with this bill - the Realtors, the Land Title Association, and title insurance companies, who -- who operate under federal law. It's my belief, the belief of the industry that they wouldn't jeopardize a multi-, multi-, multi-, multi-, multii-, mul business if this was in violation of federal law. I believe that the RESPA, according to various law blogs that says that Section 9 of RESPA is a more nuanced -- than blanket statements that are made by the objectors to the bill. It's a very nuanced law with a lot of gray areas and there's a lot of interpretation to Section 9 of RESPA. This clarifies, further clarifies, these nuanced parts of the law. And like I said before, Senator, a lot of the businesses in this industry would not jeopardize their entire business on the account of something like this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

So, to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The bill.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

The -- I appreciate -- we don't need to have a debate here

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

about RESPA. RESPA is a federal law. I think RESPA is very clear on this issue. RESPA says, very simply, that no seller of property shall require, as a condition to selling the property, that title insurance covering the property be purchased by the buyer from any particular title company. That sentence directly conflicts with what this legislation does. This legislation is not good for consumers. It's not good for consumers because it takes away from buyers of real estate and those who are seeking financing for real estate a choice that they have today in the marketplace. That's what RESPA is designed to protect and that's what this legislation conflicts with. But even setting aside the -- the consumer protection issues, there are very practical considerations that this Body ought give this legislation: First, the issues raised by the Department that they are being tasked with enforcing a State law, if this becomes law, that conflicts with federal law. That issue is a real one and it is one for which there does not appear to be a resolution on. I think the Department testified in committee that they don't know how they're going to reconcile those conflicts. But even more so, for those who are real estate attorneys, this legislation creates an absolute conundrum. What does a real estate attorney advise to his client? Do we on the one hand follow State law that says do this, or on the other hand, do we advise them to follow federal law that says do something else? Real estate lawyers are going to have their hands tied. I think it's telling that while the sponsor has said there are no opponents to this bill, the -- the industry advocates and stakeholders that you might look to for this type of legislation, those in the real estate industry, those in the bar, people who care about consumers, none of those -- groups are proponents of

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

this legislation, because they recognize the difficulties that will arise if this legislation in fact becomes law. So, for those reasons, I would ask and urge that the Body consider a No vote. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Mulroe, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR MULROE:

Contrary to the prior speaker, I -- this doesn't create a conundrum. In -- in common practice right now, just so everyone's clear, at a closing, where someone wants to buy a piece of property and someone wants to sell it, the seller's attorney actually purchases a title policy -- or -- or orders a title policy. The seller pays for the -- the owner's policy. The buyer pays for the lender's policy. That's common practice - one title commitment, one -- one title policy. To create an opportunity for the buyer to -- to buy a policy and the seller to -- to buy a different policy for the owner will create chaos and create more cost to a closing. So, in my opinion, this is more or less codifying common practice and does not take away from a buyer purchasing a title policy if they wanted to refinance. Maybe that's where the misinterpretation is occurring. But I'm just telling you, in practice right now, one policy, split costs between the -- the owner's policy and the lender policy. That's the common practice,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

unless, as Senator Hastings' bill, the parties want to agree to something different. But on a refinance, when the buyer is the only one involved in that process, they have the right to purchase their own policy. I think it's a good bill. I'd ask for everyone's support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Oberweis, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

Thank you, Madam President. A -- a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

Senator Hastings, I have to admit, I'm a little confused. I -- my bias is, I want to do -- I want to give the buyer and seller as much choice as I possibly can, and listening to you, I thought the intention of the bill was to give that choice and then I listened to Senator Barickman and he's saying, no, it's the opposite, there'd be -- there's more choice now than there would be after this bill. Help me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Senator Oberweis, when -- when you go ahead and engage in purchasing a property, I want you to have the most flexibility that you have in terms of options for title insurance. So if the seller, who normally controls -- if -- the seller normally controls the title insurance policy by custom -- customary practice in the -- in the field of real estate law. I want you to be able to have the opportunity to say, I want to use my own title insurance

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

company. It gives business owners, like yourself, by agreement, the opportunity to do so. That's what I'm trying to do here with this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Oberweis, any further questions?

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

Is it permissible to ask Senator Barickman? 'Cause I think he's taking the opposite position on this and I'm -- I'm confused. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

No. He's already been recognized and he already spoke. You're -- you're speaking now. Sorry. All right. Moving on the discussion, Senator -- Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. You know, Senator Hastings, every once in a while - and I've been in this Chamber for a little while - you -- you -- you get these bills and you read 'em over and you hear the debate and you're like, where'd this come from? And I have that question for you. Who asked you to change the law in this manner?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Senator, I think there's proponents and opponents of this bill and I think you're able, just as much as everybody else, to

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

read who's for the bill and who's against the bill. It's my job to make industry, especially this industry, easier for consumers. I think the consumers of Illinois deserve the opportunity to choose, by agreement with the seller, if they want to use a specific title insurance company. I think that's -- it makes the transaction easier and it gives consumers choice. I think you, too, would be in favor of giving consumers choice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I am, Senator, that's why I'm not for the bill, and let me explain why, is I'm reading the text of your bill. The text of your bill says -- is that the buyer of the house has to use the same title company as the seller, unless one of two conditions is met: one, the seller agrees; or, two, I am somehow able to access a discount equal to what might be offered by your title company. In neither case is the buyer, the consumer, in control of that. I don't get to decide whether or not you, as the seller, give me permission. I don't get to decide whether or not I can find another title company to give me the same discount that may be offered here. And here's the problem with that, Senator, is that no one in their right minds, no one in this Chamber, would say, it's okay to pass a law that says if I want to buy a used car from someone and I want to have a mechanic go around and check it out, I have to use the seller's mechanic. I have to trust the seller's word that the car's okay. No one in this Chamber would suggest it's okay to pass a bill that says that if I'm buying a home from Senator Barickman that -- and I want an inspection done on the home, that I have to use who Senator Barickman chooses to have

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

that inspection done. That's what this bill does. Senator Hastings, can you help me understand better the -- the nuanced interpretation of the federal law on this issue? You referenced that earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

So, real quick, Senator. Just going through what you just said. It was very long and -- and detailed of comparing auto mechanics to title insurance policies. What was your specific question, one more time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You suggested to Senator Barickman that the interpretation of RESPA, which is the federal law that insists that consumers or buyers have choice in this matter, the interpretation of that is, in your words, nuanced. It -- can you elaborate on that for me? What's nuanced about the federal law on this issue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Sure, the -- the nuances are that there's very plain language that could be interpreted very different ways. I can give you seven different scenarios, hypothetical scenarios here by which the law may apply. Let's go -- you want me to read -- I can read -- I can give you a document in which we discussed in committee ad nauseam here, but I don't want to bore the Chamber in terms of all these different hypothetical situations that we spent two hours

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

discussing in which it passed out of committee. But I can if you'd like, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, I just asked you to explain what you meant by the nuances in the federal law. It's up to you how you answer the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

There's a lot of federal laws that are broad in -- in -- in scope and in nature. The states have the ability to refine the law so it's more clear, so that industries can operate more efficiently.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the gentleman's motion, if I might, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

To the motion.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. Everybody, I'm going to read the federal law for you. All right? And this will not take long, nor will you have to strain to understand the meaning of it. "No seller of property... shall require..., as a condition to selling the property, that the title insurance covering the property be purchased by the buyer from any particular title company." That's it. That's it. The federal law says -- is that if you're selling a house, you cannot,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

as a matter of law, require the buyer to use your title company. That's it. The bill on the board says that the buyer has to use the seller's title insurance company, unless the seller decides otherwise - why would the seller do that? - or you can access a discount in the market that you may be getting now, which will never happen. Will never happen. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know where this comes from, but I'm telling you, one, this is in direct conflict with federal law, but way, way more importantly than that, this is anti-consumer choice. If you buy a house -- if you want to buy a house, you get to pick who does the title search, not the seller. You may trust the seller, you may not trust -may not want to trust the seller, but one thing for sure in all kinds of transactions and that is, the only person who's really on your side is the person you pick and you write the check to. This law won't allow that. I urge a No vote. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

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

SENATOR HASTINGS:

First, I would like to thank all the Senators that came up and spoke today. Wow! Riveting testimony that we discussed for two hours in which the majority of the committee's -- majority of the committee has passed out. Since the good Senators have asked certain questions of how confusing and how nuanced this law is, let me go right ahead and read six different situations that will confuse the heck out of everybody in the Chamber, which is the sole reason, the sole reason why we bring this bill today. It's because consumers -- there's a reason why consumers have attorneys

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

on this -- on these matters. It's because it is complicated. You're about to make a gigantic decision here, a gigantic decision. Buying a house is a big -- it's a big deal. It's a big deal. Let me read some of these scenarios that are so hypothetical and nuanced in nature to where we have to have this type of law. A real estate agent has a great working relationship with Company A and decides with the seller to condition the sale on the use of Company A - i.e., if the buyer doesn't use Company A, then no deal. Is that a violation of Section 9? It depends. Real estate agent likes to use Company A, decides with the seller to condition the sale on the use of Company A and make the buyer pay for the title insurance. If the buyer doesn't use Company A and pay for their insurance, then no deal. Is that a violation of Section 9? Oh, that's another nuance. Seller will only play -- pay for the owner's title policy if buyers use preferred title company. Is that a violation of Section 9? Not likely. That's another nuance. Title insurance process was started with Company A as a part of a purchase of contract, but the deal falls through and the property is now back on the market. The seller advises the buyer that the purchase -- of the two hundred dollar or more if the buyer doesn't use Company A. Is that a violation of Section 9? Not likely, but that's another nuance. Buyer will receive a discount on the lender policy if they use Company A, selected by the seller as a result of the availability of a simultaneous issue rate. Is that a violation of Section 9? Unlikely, but that's another nuance. If the buyer uses the seller's preferred title insurance company, the seller will pay for a home warranty; however, if the buyer doesn't use the seller's preferred company, the concession's off the table. Is that a violation of Section 9? Unlikely, but that's another

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

nuance. This stuff is confusing as heck, confusing as heck. And if you're going to go ahead and buy a home, if you're going to go ahead and buy a home, you want to make sure things are crystal clear. Although the good Senators on the other side of the aisle object to this bill, this bill is going to help consumers. The industry itself, the industry itself is in favor of this bill. And like I said before, if the industry was not in favor of this bill or if it violated RESPA, their business as a whole would be in jeopardy. And last, the distinguished Senator who sits behind me who does this for a living and -- and all the other distinguished Senators that I have the opportunity to operate with, they agree with me that this would make it very simplistic and it would make it very easy for consumers. So if you are for consumers, good Senators, who do business in buying and selling property, if you want some sort of -- if you want an option, vote for the bill. I urge an Aye vote, because this is going to help people across Illinois to make it crystal clear how the process works, so that I don't have to read off all seven of these nuances again. Madam President, thank you very much. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

I think I need a lawyer just to understand that. All right. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 with Senate Bill -- to Senate Bill 65. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Having received the required constitutional majority -- take -- on that question, we have 38 Members voting Aye, 14 voting Nay, 3 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Bill 65. The bill is declared passed. Senator Koehler, on Senate Bill 457. 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 457.

Signed by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill establishes requirements for a -- cottage food operation to sell canned fruits and vegetables and baked goods containing cheese as additional foods to the authorized list that the cottage food operation may and may not sell and clarified that canned foods may only be canned in mason jars with new lids. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RAOUL:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

A question -- the sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I just want to make sure this doesn't conflict with federal law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

It -- it is nuanced.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendment 1 with Senate Bill 457. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now 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 -- 57 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 457. The bill is declared passed. Senator Mulroe, on House Bill -- I mean, sorry, excuse me, Senate Bill 544. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 544.

Signed by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Mulroe, on the motion.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. The House amendment actually corrected a technical error in the bill after it left the Senate. We passed it in the Senate 51 to 0. I'd ask for your support again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 544. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Members voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 544, and this bill is declared passed. Senator Sims. Senate Bill 558. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 558.

Signed by Senator Sims.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Sims.

SENATOR SIMS:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Amendment No. 1 expressly provides that for each of the current protective orders, the State's Attorney may petition the court for a protective order on behalf of the named victim or any minor child or dependent adult in the care of the named victim. This amendment addresses — as I mentioned before, the bill went over to the House; it addresses concerns and cleanups. It'll clean up leftover from and residual concerns from the State's Attorney. I know of no opposition and ask for its favorable adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 558. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 57 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the House -- the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 558, and this bill is

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

declared passed. Senator McCann, on Senate Bill 1453. 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 1453.

Signed by Senator McCann.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator McCann, on the motion.

SENATOR McCANN:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1453 seeks to create the Employment and Economic Opportunity for Persons with Disabilities Task Force. It passed the Senate 58 to 0 and the House 106 to 0 with this amendment. The amendment simply adds three members to the task force and clarifies the mission of the task force. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1453. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1453, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Holmes, on Senate Bill 2270. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

I move to concur with the House in their -- in the adoption

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

of their Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1628 -- pardon me, to Senate Bill 2270.

Signed by Senator Holmes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Holmes, on the motion.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you so much, Madam President. House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2270 deletes all, becomes the bill. It allows a law enforcement officer to take temporary custody of a dog or cat if the animal's exposed in a manner that's life-threatening or may result in injury. Currently, allows for emergency impoundment of a dog or cat in a life-threatening situation. However, many times the animal only needs a small interval of time and there's confusion over the ability of officers to take the animal into temporary custody. So this just allows that -- to lay out the circumstances in which it can be done just for clarification. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate... I take that back, Senator Oberweis, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

Yeah, I'm sorry, Madam President. Just a very quick question for the sponsor. Senator Holmes, this is a bill about animals that says gut and replace?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

I just wanted to mention to the Senator that this is actually

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

amending the Humane Care for Animals Act. I think your question was probably somewhat inappropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

All right. Moving on, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2270. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have 52 Members voting Aye, 3 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2270, and this bill is declared passed. Senator Righter, on Senate Bill 2281. 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 2281.

Signed by Senator Righter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I am moving to concur with the House amendment to Senate Bill 2281. The underlying bill is an Entrepreneur Learner's Permit legislation. The House, in its effort to save trees, has added an amendment on saying that any report that's made to the General Assembly or other important political entities can only be done electronically so we do not waste paper, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2281. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now 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 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2281, and this bill is declared passed. Senator Hutchinson, on Senate Bill 2298. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

...move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2298.

Signed by Senator Hutchinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Members of the Senate, this is House Amendment 1, which amends the underlying language, just clarifying something really small, which is "Except for willful or wanton misconduct" for the hemp bill. So we finally got it through the Senate and the House and it's back over here for concurrence for the first time all in one year. I'm super excited. Please vote Yes. Please, please, please vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Okay. Just -- we're almost there. Senator Anderson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ANDERSON:

To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

To the motion.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Thank you, Madam President. And I just want to say thank you to the sponsor. Thanks for your work on this. It's been a - a long row to hoe, but did good and this is going to -- this is going to be really good for -- for the State of Illinois and their agricultural portfolio going forward. So, thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

To the motion.

SENATOR HAINE:

Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I just want to call attention to the fact that not many here would remember, but my predecessor, the late Evelyn Bowles, Senator Bowles was a champion of industrial hemp. Introduced several bills. One got out of the Senate. Pate Philip allowed it out — let it out and it got out of the House and Governor Ryan vetoed it because of the suspicions about marijuana. And I just want to call attention to that fact. She was a good and gracious lady and worked very hard for this idea. She'd have probably been better off if she'd have styled it medicinal hemp. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate concur -- concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2298. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Members voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2298, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Fowler, on Senate Bill 2303. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion. ...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 2303.

Signed by Senator Fowler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Fowler, on the motion.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 2303, this simply extends the reporting deadline for the TIF task force to May -- May 31st, 2018 {sic} (2019). I ask for its adoption, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? See -- the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2303. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Members voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2303, and the bill is declared passed. Would the Committee on Assignments please report to the President's Anteroom? The Committee on Assignments, please report to the President's Anteroom. Senator T. Cullerton, for what purpose do

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

you rise?

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Two purposes, Madam President. First, I would like to be recorded as an Aye vote on Senate Bill 2270. And then secondly, I'd like to introduce my Page for a Day, if we have a moment while Assignments is being done. All right. First, I'd like to introduce Martin Beirne. Martin is out of the Batavia area. He's my Page for the Day. He goes to Holy Cross. He is also in -- plays tennis and is also a track athlete. He has met many of you here today. One day in the future, he would like to look at being a legislator, so if anybody wants to talk him out of it, feel free. But also he is joined today by his dad, Kevin, up in the audience. Kevin has just become the principal at Montini. So what you will probably see in the next course of ten, twenty, thirty years is Kevin coming down here, with all the football championships that Montini seems to always rack up. So if you can please give my Page for a Day, Martin, a warm welcome. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Let's welcome him -- let's welcome him to the Senate and let the record reflect your intentions on -- on the motion to concur on Senate Bill 2270. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Resolutions 1812 and 1813, both offered by Senator Link.

They are death resolutions, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Resolution Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to the Executive Committee - Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1804, Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 5180, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 36, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 275, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 337, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 2344, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2544, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3404, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3411, and House Bill 4165; refer to State Government Committee excuse me, Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4331, Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 4781, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 211, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2407, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2858, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3532, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3547, and a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 3560; Be Approved for Consideration - House Bill 3806, and a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2368, Senate Bill 38, and Senate Bill 212. And pursuant to Rule (3-8) (b-1), the following amendments will remain in the Committee on Assignments: Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 371, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 513, Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill -- 4339, and Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 2337.

Signed by Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Muñoz in the Chair. Senator Martinez back in the

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Chair. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House. ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

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 No. 682.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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 No. 1 to Senate Bill 682.

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 1707, with House Amendment 3; Senate Bill 1851, with House Amendments 1, 2, and 3; Senate Bill 2354, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 2362, with House Amendment No. 2; Senate Bill 2447, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 2481, with House Amendment No. 2; Senate Bill 2927, with House Amendments 2 and 3; Senate Bill 3103, with House Amendment 1; and Senate Bill 3139, with House Amendments 1 and 3.

A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk -- the previous bills were all passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2018.

Another 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 904.

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

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 904.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2579, with House Amendment 3; Senate Bill 2617, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 2804, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 2844, with House Amendment No. 1; and Senate Bill 2864, with House Amendment 1. All passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2018. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

We have some committee announcements - Executive Committee, today at 3:05 in Room 212; Licensed Activities and Pensions, today at 3:05 in Room 400; and Appropriations I, today at 4 o'clock in Room 400. Senator Muñoz -- Senator Muñoz in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Koehler, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to waive all notice and posting requirements so that House Bill 4165 can be heard today in the Senate Executive Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Koehler moves to waive all notice and posting requirements so that House Bill 7165 {sic} can be heard today in the Senate Executive Committee. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and all notice and posting requirements have been waived. Senator Koehler wishes House Bill 4165 to be waived. Record will reflect. There's a correction - that was State Government today at 3:05 in Room 400. Senator Oberweis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I would like to introduce my guest from Florida, where she pays no state income taxes and much, much lower property taxes, my wife, Julie, who plays on six tennis teams in Florida, wins most of her matches. In fact, has done so well that she even won the Bonita Bay Couples Championship with me as her partner, and that was quite a task. Please give her a nice warm Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. We will now go back to the Calendar on Concurrences. Senate Bill 2376. Senator Harris. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2376.

Signed by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to concur on Senate Bill 2376. This passed the Senate 53-0 and I ask for another favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2376. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. 2376, having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2376, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2380. Senator Holmes. 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 2380.

Signed by Senator Holmes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. This is the last animal bill I'll be doing this Session. House Amendment 1 and 2 keep the underlying bill. Add breeders to the list of microchip purchasers that must be contacted by an animal shelter before a dog or cat's adopted, transferred, or euthanized. Also modify reporting requirements by animal shelters and animal control facility renewal applicants. And it removes the address posting requirement for the Department of Ag and it allows any funds in a local county animal population fund to be used for spay, neuter, and vaccination services. 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 Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2380. 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

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2380, having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2380, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2428. Senator Stadelman. 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 2428.

Signed by Senator Stadelman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Stadelman.

SENATOR STADELMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Chamber. The underlying bill prohibits schools from publicly identifying or stigmatizing a student who cannot pay for lunch or who owes money for lunches. The amendment passed over by the House is very technical in nature, basically has two minor changes: changes the word from "a" to an "an" and changes the word "setoff" with "offset". I encourage a -- a Yes vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just to make a couple comments to the bill real quickly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR WEAVER:

First, thank you, Mr. Stadelman, for -- or Senator Stadelman,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

for bringing this forward. I understand what you're trying to accomplish. I just want to give a heads up for people that are — that are watching and wondering about this bill. Does a couple of things. First, it's an unfunded mandate on schools, but also, this is applying to — to students who are not on the program with regard to free lunch. It's for other students. And I understand trying to avoid the embarrassment. But I just wanted to point that out to Members that may want to have a heads up on it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

No further discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2428. 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 45 voting Aye, 10 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2428, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Haine, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, since there's a lull in proceedings, may I offer an historical reference today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please do.

SENATOR HAINE:

Today -- on today's date -- of course, May 30 is the historic Decoration Day, Memorial Day, but also, and I believe I -- I said this some years ago, on this date in 1431, the French leader, a nineteen-year-old young woman, named Joan of Arc, was burned at

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the stake after the -- after an English church ecclesiastical court, as a result of a drumhead trial filled with perjury, not by her - she told the truth at every turn - found her guilty of heresy, because she -- and witchcraft, because she said she was inspired by God to lead the French army in a war of liberation against the oppressive English army. And she won every battle. And the King of France, being a coward, allowed her to be captured by the English, who burned her at the stake. That trial was overturned by the Vatican decades later and she was canonized a saint in 1920. So when we're talking about the Me Too movement and the oppression of women, we should reflect upon a courageous young woman who was wrongfully executed, Joan of Arc. I also want to call attention, different lady, Harriet Tubman. Harriet Tubman led the Underground Railroad. She fled slavery in the 1850s, courageously organized Underground Railroad passages for people. She also was responsible for a -- a -- spying for the Union Army in the South, leading to several victories, and she was the first woman in American history to lead a military raid, get that, against the Combahee Ferry in South Carolina, where she helped liberate more than seven hundred slaves. She was a Republican yes, a Republican - she might not have been today, but she was then. And she was a devout Christian and a staunch defender of the right to bear arms. So today we remember Joan of Arc and one of our own great military leaders, Harriet Tubman. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Thank you, Leader Haine. Senate Bill 2459. There is a letter on file. That was Senator McConchie's bill. Senator Althoff will be presenting. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2459.

Signed by Senator McConchie.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. And this actually truly is a Dan McConchie-Pamela Althoff bill, because the House amendment was my legislation that passed out of this Chamber unanimously, Senate Bill 2452, which amended the Illinois Drainage Code that gave Lake County the permissive ability to dissolve the Seavey Drainage District by resolution. This drainage district has been basically defunct for a very long time and Lake County would like the availability of absorbing the drainage district and all of its responsibilities. I know of no opposition and I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2459. 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 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2459, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2493. Senator Rose. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2493.

Signed by Senator Rose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rose.

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur on House Amendment No. 2 to the -- Senate Bill 2493. And if I may, for purposes of legislative intent, I'd like to read the following statement. The feeding of deer remains illegal, as provided by 17 Illinois Administrative Code 635.40. The feeding of deer for research purposes allowed by this study shall only occur under the complete control of the study's principal investigators, which in this case will be the Prairie Research Institute via the Department of Natural Resources and also the University of Illinois veterinary medical clinic. And I'd be committed to running a trailer bill to address any additional issues that might come up later, but after committee yesterday, we wanted to make sure we read this into the record to just make absolutely certain that people understand that you cannot feed deer and that is still illegal in Illinois. what this bill does, as amended, would create a study to answer a very important question related to deer wildlife biology and that study would be answered -- it would be answered -- that question would be ascertained by the Prairie Research Institute and the University of Illinois Veterinary Teaching Hospital.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2493. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 46 voting Aye, 4 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2493, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2516. Senator Morrison. 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 2516.

Signed by Senator Morrison.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, this amendment shifts a requirement for employers to tell the mandated reporters about training to have any information available on the statement that they're required to sign. It addresses the concerns of the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance and DCFS.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2516. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2516, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2598. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2628. Senator Morrison. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2628.

Signed by Senator Morrison.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill creates the Strengthening the Child Welfare Workforce for Children and Families Act. It sets up a task force. This amendment simply transfers the requirement to provide administrative support to the task force from the Criminal Justice Information Authority to the Children and Family Research Center at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I know of no opposition to this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2628. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2628, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2644. Senator Tracy. 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 2644.

Signed by Senator Tracy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Tracy.

SENATOR TRACY:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Congratulations on your son.

SENATOR TRACY:

Thank you, Mr. President. The House made a minute amendment and basically, Senate Bill 2644 on page 4, line 11, they replaced the words "consent to" with the word "shall". And so I would ask for the adoption. I concur with this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2644. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. 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 2644, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2675. Senator Fowler. 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 2675.

Signed by Senator Fowler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2675, Floor

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Amendment 1 - passed the House {sic} unanimously, 52 to nothing. This adds to the bill. Specifies that HUBZone business definitions do not apply for construction or construction-related procurements. Know of no opposition. I ask for its adoption, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2675. 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 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2675, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Connelly, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR CONNELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purposes of an introduction. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR CONNELLY:

I'd like to introduce my second Page for the Day. He's from the great city of West Chicago. He once served in the Illinois House of Representatives and served here in the State Senate. He now finds himself in prisons as a member of the Prisoner Review Board, our former colleague, Tom Johnson. How about a warm welcome?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome back. Welcome to the Senate. Senate Bill 2777. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2777.

Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill -- the House amendment for 2777. When we talked about the continuing ed requirement, we reduced it here in the Senate to three hours. Over in the House what they did is they tightened that requirement and indicated those three hours of continuing ed can be offered by an accredited professional association, a State agency, a federal agency, or the hours can be used to meet the licensing requirements of other states {sic}. So it just tighten up how those three hours were to be applied. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2777. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2777, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2851. 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 2851.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. The House amendment just made a change to create a new definition of "dental plan". The amendment comes from the Department of Insurance and addressed the concerns that they had with -- when our bill changed the definition of "health plan benefit" {sic} ("health benefit plan"). They provided a clearer, more concise definition that they basically use within the agency. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2851. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2851, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2899. Senator Haine. 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 2899.

Signed by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Amendment No. 1 exempts coal extracted as an incidental part of a government-financed highway or other construction project from -- exempts them from the rules governing the Surface Coal Mining Land Conservation and Reclamation Act, since the developers' construction companies and other entities are not really mining coal. They're building something else and they run into a seam of coal. This in an agreed initiative between the Department of Natural Resources and a landfill in southern Illinois, which is necessary for the prosperity of that region. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2899. 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. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2899, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2598. 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 2598.

Signed by Senator Sandoval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. 2598 allows a home rule municipality to be -- disconnect territory from a fire

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

protection district if the municipality provides fire service to at least eighty percent of the territory within the municipality's corporate limits. It also provides the methods and procedures by which a municipality may make the disconnection. It is a initiative of the Village of Hanover Park. I'd ask a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall -- shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2598. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2598, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2905. 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 2905.

Signed by Senator McGuire.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McGuire.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur with the House in the adoption of its Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2905. This is an amendment which clarifies oversight of collective bargaining contracts in the underlying bill, Senate Bill 2905, which makes a series of technical and statutorily conforming changes to the Public

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Community College Act that affect the authority of the Illinois Community College Board and the boards of trustees of community college districts. I know of no opposition and ask for a Yes vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2905. 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 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2905, and the bill is declared passed. Mary Ann Ahern, NBC Chicago, requests permission to film. There being no objection, leave is granted. Senate Bill 2941. 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 2941.

Signed by Senator McGuire.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McGuire.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Thank you again, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur with the House in the adoption of its Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2941. Senate Bill 2941 makes technical changes to the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Act, two adjustments to the competency-based high school graduation requirements pilot program. The first is that it allows district to -- allows districts to integrate competency-based components

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

beyond the current limit of only grades nine through twelve. Secondly, it allows districts to apply to participate in the pilot program collaboratively. I know of no opposition. Ask for a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2941. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2941, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2952. Senator Bush. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2954. 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 2954.

Signed by Senator Aquino.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment is a page-and-line amendment that makes further technical changes and adds identical language clarifying the intent of the high salary cost shift to TRS. It's a simple change. It's a -- it has no opponents and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2954. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2954, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3023. Senator Bivins. Correction, Senator Bush. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3046. 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 3046.

Signed by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This change that the House made is technical in nature. It came from staff at CMS to achieve the same goal in regards to enrollment and disenrollment from health insurance with TRS. I know of no opposition and would ask for the Senate's approval. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3046. 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

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 3046, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3048. 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 3048.

Signed by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment that the House added to the bill also is technical in nature. It's intended to remove opposition from Access Living. Achieves the same goal in regards to durable medical equipment. And with this amendment, all opposition from the bill is removed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3048. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 3048, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3072. 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 3072. Signed by Senator Schimpf.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill No. -- House -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3072 simply reduces the number of members on the State Fair Board from twenty down to fifteen. Additionally, the board members will serve three-year terms, instead of two-year terms, and finally, the members' terms will be staggered so that no more than five members are appointed this -- appointed each year. The bill is an initiative of DNR. It passed the Senate 58 to nothing and passed the House 97 to 2. I know of no opposition and would respectfully -- respectfully request an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3072. 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. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to 30 -- Senate Bill 3072, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Van Pelt, what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR VAN PELT:

I move to waive all notice and posting requirements so that Senate Resolution 1797 can be heard today in Exec Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Van Pelt moves to waive all notice and posting

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

requirements so that Senate Resolution 1797 can be heard today in the Senate Executive Committee. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and all notice and posting requirements have been waived. Senate Bill 3075. 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 3075.

Signed by Senator Hastings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Excuse me. As amended, this bill requires the Department of Children and Family Services, Human Services, DJJ, and Corrections to submit quarterly reports to the General Assembly regarding workplace assaults on staff. This bill passed unanimously out of the House and I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3075. 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 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3075, and the bill is declared passed. Senator — Leader Lightford, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Mr. President, thank you. I'd like for the record to reflect my intentions to vote Aye on the previous bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The record will reflect an Aye vote, Senator. Senator Morrison, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MORRISON:

Mr. President, I'd like to be recorded that was also my intention to vote Aye on the previous bill. I was a cosponsor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The record will reflect. Senate Bill 3119. 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 3119.

Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. The House Amendment 1 allows a firefighter to no longer have to have an annual evaluation for duty disability caused by PTSD if they have signed documentation from two medical professionals and the fund board approves the disability. Amendment No. 2 limited that to forty-five years and older. This is an extraordinarily important amendment to the original legislation. Members of the Lattz family are in the gallery directly behind me, Emily and Grace. Emily is the wife, Grace is the daughter of Lieutenant Jeff Lattz, who entered into a burning building to save two of his fellow firefighters and, in exiting that fire, was involved in an

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

explosion. It resulted in a very severe case of PTSD and we are writing this legislation to ensure that he doesn't have to go through that memory year after year after year to prove his disability. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3119. 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 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3119, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 3134. Senator McConnaughay. Out of the record. Senate Bill 31... Leader Lightford in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Senator Righter, on Senate Bill 3143. 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 3143.

Signed by Senator Righter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Senator Righter, on the motion, please.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Madam President. I am embracing and moving to concur with the House amendment on Senate Bill 3143. The amendment requires that the reports that are sent out to the various governmental bodies be done electronically and not in paper

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

form.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3143. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Yea, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3143, having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 3143, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Muñoz, on Senate Bill 2640. The gentleman indicates he wishes to proceed. Please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2640.

Signed by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Senator Muñoz, on your motion.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This provides that the Office of the State Fire Marshal shall establish a policy to allow a State Fire Marshal investigator to purchase any badge previously issued to them or their service firearm if they have a valid FOID card. These items can only be purchased if the individual retires honorably. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any question? Seeing none, the

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 2640. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2640, the Senate shall concur in House Amendment No. 1 having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Muñoz, on Senate Bill 3022. The gentleman indicates he wishes to proceed. 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 3022.

Signed by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Senator Muñoz, on Amendment 1 and 2.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This adds the employment protection language requested by AFSCME. Allows a brand of liquor to be sold immediately after it has been registered with the State and makes some technical changes. Also delays the effective date of separating the Liquor Control Commission from the Department of Revenue, as well as the appointment and confirmation of the Executive Director from January 1, 2019 to July 1, 2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3022. All those in favor will vote Aye.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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 52 voting Yea, 3 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3022, having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUNTER:

The Senate Democrats will caucus, Madam President, at 5 o'clock in the President's office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Thank you, Senator Hunter. The Senate Dems will caucus at 5 p.m. in President Cullerton's office. Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Purpose of announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Please state your announcement, Senator.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. The Senate Republicans will also caucus at 5 o'clock, but in Leader Brady's office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Sounds like fun, Senator Althoff. Senate Republicans will also caucus in Leader Brady's office at 5 p.m. The Senate stands in recess to the call of the Chair. Hi, Senator. Senator Rose, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSE:

Hello, Madam President. How are you today? I have a point of personal privilege, if I may.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Absolutely. Always in order. Senator Rose.

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you. Earlier this year, Pastor Ratts from Monticello, Illinois, did us an honor to give the prayer here before the Senate. His -- his son, Josiah, is here with me today. Josiah is a native of Kenya and Pastor Ratts had heard that Senator McCarter has been named the United States Ambassador to Kenya, so Josiah decided to come over -- here today to meet with Ambassador-designee McCarter. And if we could just welcome -- what grade are you in, Josiah? He'll be a senior at Monticello High School. If we could welcome him to the Senate, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LIGHTFORD)

Welcome to the Illinois General Assembly. Glad to have you. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committee meetings, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. The stands in recess.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senate will come to order. Rebecca Anzel, Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, requests permission to photograph. There being no objection, leave is granted. Adrianna Pitrelli, Chicago (Daily) Law Bulletin, requests permission to photograph. There being no objection, leave is granted. Will all Members please report to the Senate Floor? We're going to be doing final action, final action. All Senators. Administrative assistants, please have your Members report to the Floor. Senator Bennett, for what

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

purpose do you seek recognition? Senator Bennett. For what purpose you seek recognition, Senator?

SENATOR BENNETT:

For a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Proceed, Senator.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. On this last full day of Session, I wanted to welcome some guests from my district, my favorite constituents. With us, I have my wife, Dr. Stacy Bennett; my four-year-old twins, Sam and Emma, and hopefully they won't be too much of a distraction tonight. Please give them a warm Senate welcome. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Welcome to the Senate. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1814, offered by Senator Bennett and all Members.

And Senate Resolutions 1815 through 1817, offered by Senator Althoff and all Members.

They are all death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1818, offered by Senator Rose.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 275 Recommend Do Adopt; Senate Resolution 1797 Be Adopted; Motions to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 337, House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2344, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2544, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3404, and House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3411 Recommend Do Adopt; House Bill 4165 Do Pass; and Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1804 Recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Landek, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government, reports Motions to Concur - House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 211, House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2407, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2858, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3532, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3547, and House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3560, and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4331, and Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 4781 Recommend Do Adopt.

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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 34.

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 34.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2904, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 2999, with House Amendment 2; Senate Bill

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

3141, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 3085, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 3256, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 3452, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 3536, with House Amendment 2. All passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2018. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

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 35.

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 35.

Received like Messages on Senate Bill 1758, with House Amendment 2; Senate Bill 1979, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 2421, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 2540, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 2562, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 2641, with House Amendments 2, 3 and 4; Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 2651, with House Amendment 1. All passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2018. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

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 bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 4873.

We have received a like Message on House Bill 5344. Passed the House, May 30th, 2018. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4873, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

We'll now proceed to House Bills 3rd Reading. President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1804 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1804. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is Floor Amendment No. 2. I'd like to adopt it and discuss the bill on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 1804.

(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. By way of background, we have passed unanimously out of the Senate a bill dealing with the issue of carjacking. The House amended that bill and sent it over here, but there was still some opposition. So in an effort to remove the opposition, we reached an agreement with some of the opponents in coming up with this bill, which is very substantively the same. This bill will provide courts with more quidance when a person is charged with possession of a stolen motor The bill provides that knowledge that the vehicle was stolen would be inferred from surrounding facts and circumstances, which would lead to a reasonable person to believe that the vehicle was stolen. It also allows juvenile courts to give increased consideration to prior carjacking offenses when considering whether to detain a minor. With the exception of the American Civil Liberties Union, I believe everybody is in favor of this bill. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Inquiry of the Chair, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

It -- is -- just checking, is -- Floor Amendment 1, has it been adopted onto the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Still in committee, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 1804 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 Bill 1804, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 47... Senator McGuire seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 4781 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 4781. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Rose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rose, on the amendment.

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 2, as our Higher Education working group proceeded, one of the common problems shared by all of our public universities was the lack of data sharing as an opportunity to -- to recruit graduating seniors

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

from our Illinois public high schools. And we had a couple different stabs at it. As -- as the clock wore down, it became clear that we're going to need to put a task force together to look at this in more detail. That's what this does, but what the ultimate goal of it is -- we believe there's a population of students out there, perhaps first generation, perhaps low-income, who just don't think college is possible. They have no idea that in many cases, by the time you add in a Pell grant or perhaps a MAP grant, that they actually could afford college. And so the ultimate goal of this is to figure out a way within our -- our high school system to do a better job of coordinating with our universities and our community colleges to make sure that those students who may not go on, not because they don't want to or not because they're not capable of, but because they didn't know they could, and how to coordinate that better. And we believe there's a population of students we can then bring into the higher education system and propel onto a path to prosperity within the State of Illinois. So this would be a summer task force to study that further. We -- we had a -- an unfortunate dustup late afternoon Memorial Day, where some information came to light from the State Board of Education, and now we're -- I think we're going to have to transform this into a -- a summer discussion. But that's the ultimate goal. That's all it does. I'd ask for its adoption.

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:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4781.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McGuire.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As well explained by my colleague, Senator Chapin Rose, Floor Amendment 2 to this bill creates a thirty-member task force. There will be fifteen representatives of higher education, fifteen representatives of K-12. It shall be known as the College and Career Interest Task Force. Its task is to determine the process by which Illinois public high school student career or college data may be collected and shared with our Illinois public universities. I know of no opposition. Ask for a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 4781 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. House Bill 4781, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. WIS {sic} (WUIS) requests permission to photograph the proceedings. There being no objection, leave is

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

granted. House Bill 5593. Senator Harris. Out of the record. We will now go to Supplemental Calendar No. 1 on Concurrences. Senate Bill 1437. Senator Murphy. 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 1437.

Signed by Senator Murphy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to concur with the motion {sic} made in the House, which amends this bill to change the sunset date on tax exemptions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1437. 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, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 1437, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2662. Senator Murphy. 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 2662.

Signed by Senator Murphy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, in the House they elected to add this amendment and so it makes the underlying intent to create a task force to study State contracting with private not-for-profit human service providers and changes -- challenges faced by those providers. So the amendment transfers the requirement to provide the administrative support from the Office of the Inspector {sic} (Auditor) General to the Department of Human Services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2662. 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 on House Amendment 1 to 2662, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Murphy, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Apparently, my button was sticking and didn't record my vote on my bill. So I would ask to be recorded as an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Record will reflect an Aye vote on your bill. Senate Bill 2696. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2696.

Signed by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Senate -- the House amendment to Senate Bill 2696 just clarifies, so that many of the House Members were comfortable, that the land and buildings will revert back to the Department of Natural Resources if they cease to be used for public purposes. I believe that we had covered that in the original bill, but obviously not to that level. So I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2696. 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, the Senate does concur in House amendments to -- House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2696, and the bill is declared passed. We are having some technical difficulties up here. Give us a couple minutes. Senate Bill 3108. Senator Martinez. 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 3108. Signed by Senator Martinez.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Motion to concur, I -- the House -- House Amendment 1 deletes all and becomes the bill. It retains the original bill, but amends the definition of "involuntary servitude" and "labor trafficking" to be defined by the corresponding criminal defense. This tracks how sex trade was defined in the original bill. This bill passed out of the Senate 47 to nothing and a 115 over -- to nothing over in the House. One of the -- and during committee, one of the members asked me a question regarding the victim and I have indicated that I will file a trailer bill to address the concern over the third-party standing provision to require the victim consent to a third-party standing. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3108. 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} 1 to Senate Bill 3108, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2411. Senator Aquino seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 2411 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 2411. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Aquino.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

I ask for the amendment to be adopted and I'll explain it on $3 \, \mathrm{rd}$.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Aquino.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino, on your amendment.

SENATOR AQUINO:

I ask to adopt the amendment and I'll explain 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. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2411.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2411, Amendment 3, removes most of the reasons for which a person could have their driver's license suspended that have nothing to do with driving. About eighty percent of Illinoisans drive to work and a license is required as a condition of employment for many jobs. Often the primary consequence of a driver's license suspension is the inability to legally drive to work or take one's children to school or to the doctor. For each of the violations covered in this bill, there are existing penalties and consequences that remain. It just removes the driver's license suspension as an added penalty. We have narrowed the scope of this bill tremendously as a result of negotiation over the past year and a half with law enforcement, Secretary of State's Office, and the City of Chicago. The amendment brings all opposition to neutral, with the exception of the City of Chicago. This was our best effort to try to address the City's concern and -- while holding on to the primary intent of the bill. Municipalities -- excuse me, will still have the option of suspending driver's license for unpaid tickets for all drivers that have the ability to pay. I look forward to answering any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Senator Aquino, thank you for -- for the work that you have done on this bill. I -- I do agree with the underlying premise of it. But the question that I have for you is, right now, as the bill is drafted right now, will the -- the Secretary of State be able to still suspend somebody's license if the offense -- you know, if the offense that the person is convicted of is being convicted of criminal trespass to a vehicle if the person was not in actual control of the vehicle?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Senator Schimpf, so you're asking about carjacking. I -- so, if -- if the person is not in control of the vehicle, then the -- the -- they could no longer suspend that driver's license. If the person was in control of that vehicle and were convicted of that crime, the Secretary of State can still suspend the -- that driver's license of the person in control of the vehicle at that time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

But the -- so the distinction that you're making is just that the person was in control. But if a person is involved in the carjacking, but not in control of the vehicle, they would not be able to have their license suspended. Is that correct?

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

So, quite simply put, the -- there's other penalties that that person can get. They're -- what we're taking away is for that person who wasn't the driver of the car to not get their driver's license. But let me be more specific. This bill does not eliminate the suspensions as a penalty for carjacking or any other violent crime. We worked with the Illinois State Police and Sheriffs' Association to ensure that a conviction for criminal trespassing to a vehicle or for misdemeanor vehicle damage or tampering offenses can still be reasons to -- to suspend a person's license, if the person exercised actual physical control of the vehicle. This bill only removes suspension for offenses that have nothing to do with driving a car. So, for instance, if somebody was joy riding in a stolen car, then there is a public safety reason to take away the driving privileges, but if someone else is convicted of criminal trespass for stealing change out of the ashtray of a parked car, there's no reason to suspend that person's license on top of the other penalties that they'll already be facing. And so a person just in the car, would not be able to then suspend their license, but you can still convict 'em -- you know, there's still a criminal conviction that can happen. We're just taking the penalty -- the civil penalty of taking their driver's license away.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

And just in the -- in the interest of time, I'm not going to

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

go through the entire list, but just one more by way of an example. Is it -- is it correct that -- that, under this bill, we would no longer be able to suspend somebody's license for motor fuel theft? Is that correct, as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AOUINO:

Senator, once again, we're -- the only thing that we are taking away is for, yeah, someone's driver's license, but there are criminal convictions and -- and -- and penalties that they still have to face. The only one that we're taking away and -and it's because of the premise of the law -- or -- or this bill rather. It's that what we've seen is that the biggest impediment to gaining or retaining a job is someone's driver's license. what we're saying is that they have -- there's already penalties involved in all these things. The one that is the biggest impediment to gaining and retaining a job is their driver's license and especially in areas that are non-urban, so rural areas that don't have mass transportation and so forth, that is an important distinction to have, and so I believe that it's best to have people that are -- have a driver's license so that -- you know, keep people on the road, and safely and legally keep people on the road. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

To the -- to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I -- I think the short answer to both those questions would have -- would have been yes, and while I -- while I totally understand the premise behind this bill and I actually agree with the premise behind this bill, that we shouldn't be taking away people's driver's licenses for -- for offenses that don't have anything to do with driving, I think the list that you have is still a little bit too expansive. I think that we are -- you know, we have lists of offenses that do have a nexus to driving a vehicle. So because of that, even -- even though I do appreciate what you're trying to do and I under -- understand the rationale behind it, I'm going to be a No vote and I would urge the remainder of the -- the Senate to vote No as well. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Righter. Senator Aquino, to close. SENATOR AOUINO:

So I appreciate the -- the Senator's questions. I want to remind everyone here that there are, in the list of penalties here, there are criminal convictions that can occur. What we are simply saying is that we have seen that the greatest impediment for someone to gain and retain a job is taking and suspending their driver's license. So we're simply taking that one -- that one penalty, which, and compared to all the other penalties, might be small in nature in comparison, but it is the biggest impediment to keep -- keeping people at work and keeping our -- our -- our streets safe. So I -- I urge and encourage everyone to vote Aye. And -- and I -- actually -- very sorry about that - lastly, this was also negotiated with the State Police and Secretary of State and Sheriffs' Association that are -- all came to neutral, so this isn't something that hasn't been reviewed by law enforcement. They

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

have worked on this bill. They've put their fingerprint on it. I hope you would support it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2411 pass. All those, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 voting Aye, 17 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2411, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3190. Mr. Secretary. Recall. Senator Bertino-Tarrant seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 3190 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 3190. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, on your amendment.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to adopt the amendment and will explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

Floor Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, on your amendment.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you. Once again, I move to adopt the amendment and I'll explain 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 3190.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Chamber. Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 3190 deletes all, becomes the bill. The amendment requires each school district to quarterly report to the State Board of Education the following information: the amount of funds that each school district has in its reserves, the number of each school district's days cash on hand, and the amount of funds that each school district has in its investments. The amendment requires ISBE to publish and maintain the information in each quarterly report on its website. Happy to answer any...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR REZIN:

I'd like to commend the sponsor for working on this bill. I know we -- the bill went back and forth and there were some concerns, and I appreciate that you addressed those concerns in this bill, so I will be supporting the bill. Thank you for your work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Barickman, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

I just want to point out to Members in the Body that School Management I believe remains opposed to this as another unfunded mandate and would encourage a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, to close.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you. Just a -- a quick follow-up to that. This is information that to a -- maybe a skilled eye or someone familiar with the -- the website that you can find the information. We are just trying to get it into a more succinct area so people in the community have access to and can understand exactly how much money

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

is -- the schools have reserved. It is not punitive and this is a conversation we did have during the education funding meetings. And I encourage an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3190 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 44 voting Aye, 10 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3190, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 4165. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4165.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. We'll now proceed to Supplemental Calendar No. 2. Senate Bill 211. 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 211.

Signed by Senator Murphy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

...Mr. President. Again, I have a concurrence motion from the House and they have added an amendment on this bill. Senate Bill 211, to remind everyone, allows you to remain anonymous if you are

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a -- blessed to become a lottery winner over two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. And now the House amendment creates a scratch-off for homeless prevention programs. And it will create the homeless prevention refund plan {sic} (Homelessness Prevention Revenue Fund) so that all scratch-off moneys would be into -- go into this fund and the fund would be used for grants that will fund homeless programs. So I would happy -- I am happy to entertain any questions or I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 211. 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 50 voting Aye, 7 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 211, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 337. 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 337.

Signed by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I am -- I am sorry to trouble us again with a -- a difficult bill. The underlying bill, Senate Bill 337, is the Combating Illegal Gun Trafficking Act. We passed it a -- a few weeks ago. The House

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

did amend it and it is back on Concurrence. The amendments are good. It -- it has the fortunate effect of if you thought this was a good bill, it's still a good bill. The amendments don't compromise any of the things we were trying to achieve. If you thought it was a bad bill, then it is, as President Cullerton would describe, a better bad bill. The changes that were made were made at the suggestion of House Republican Leader Jim Durkin and members of his caucus, who ended up supporting the bill. The -- they reflect the interests of the Illinois Retail Merchants and others and it makes the bill a much more business friendly bill. But, again, it does not compromise the critical safeguards that were included in the underlying bill. I'd be happy to entertain any questions. I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR KOEHLER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Senator Harmon, and I supported this -- this bill and I will continue to support it, but I -- what concerns me is I've heard that -- discussion about this being some type of backdoor gun registration. Are private individuals required to do anything in terms of -- of registering or filing papers on this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Absolutely not. There is no requirement to register guns. If you'll indulge me to try to explain this. There is a provision in the bill, the underlying bill, that requires for the first -there's an existing requirement in State law that private sellers of firearms keep records. The underlying bill, for the first time, attaches penalties to the failure to do that. It was raised as a concern by opponents that people who innocently lost their paperwork could end up prosecuted. It was actually Senator Curran, who I -- and I thought was a bit of common sense, suggested that we create an alternative, where those sellers, those private sellers, could voluntarily file that paperwork with the State Police to ensure that when they moved or if they had a fire or a flood in their house, those records wouldn't be lost. It is completely voluntary. I will also tell you and the -- the Body that the House sponsor, in response to the same concern raised in the House, has filed a trailer bill that would strip out that language. So we'll -- we'll still have the -- the risk of not keeping the paperwork, but we won't have anything that opponents can contort and describe as a registration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Anderson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR ANDERSON:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

I know it may surprise many of you that I'm standing up talking about a gun bill. First of all, I -- I -- I want to say to the sponsor, I appreciate what you're trying to do. I really

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

do. I know your intention is good with this and I can appreciate I also, to the previous speaker's question about the registration, I -- I take you at your word with the trailer bill, and -- and I appreciate that. We fundamentally differ on the issue here. What we do in the State of Illinois is exactly what the people in Florida are asking for. What they're asking for in Florida for changes, we already do here. And when it comes to gun dealers, there is no state that -- that has more red tape already, without this, than the State of Illinois. We go through FBI, we go through ATF, and then we go through the FOID system. And for everybody in this room that doesn't understand how the FOID system works, you are literally -- anybody with a FOID - that would include FFL dealers - is literally background checked every day of the year. If you have a concealed carry card, you're literally background checked twice every day of the year. understand your intent and I appreciate your intent, but, again, the fundamental issue here we differ on and -- and that's how we fix this. In my mind, the best way to fix this is we need to start holding these criminals that commit crimes with guns accountable. And the way we do that is we hold the judges that allow them to plea out and give them lesser sentences, hold them accountable. It's no surprise that most of the gun crimes committed out there are by recidivistic criminals. They are criminals that commit a crime and get out and do it again, and then they get out and do it again. And it perpetuates this again and again. So let's go after the criminals and make sure we are sentencing them and punishing them as hard as we can and set an example. And for the judges that are letting these people out on plea deals and on parole, shame on them and they need to be held accountable too. I ask for

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I appreciate the speaker's position and I know that we disagree and I -- I don't expect to change your mind nor the minds of others. And just a -- a couple of -- of points. To the point on dealing with arrests and judges, we've done much of that - Senator -- Senator Raoul, Senator Muñoz. We passed a bill in the last Session to -- to try to deal with that. We don't regulate gun dealers. There is no red tape for gun dealers today. And there are a lot of things that are thrown out. The -- the notion that there's a background check done every day is a bit misleading. The -- the -- the database of FOID cardholders is run in a computer process against a record of arrests to see if any flags will come up. It's not a background check. It's just a computer update. So, I -- I appreciate that we have a difference of opinion. I just -- I always like to work from the common facts when we can.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Barickman, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to address an issue that - that we discussed at committee earlier this afternoon that arises
from Amendment 1, which is now adopted in this bill. And -- and

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I agree that some of this arises from simply a difference of opinion on this issue. But a previous speaker alluded to the notion that there is not a registry here, when, in fact, the amendment incorporates a requirement that the State Police will, in fact, establish a form on its website to collect data about transfers of firearms among certain parties. Now, that information, we don't know today how that information is going to be stored or maintained by the Illinois State Police - not addressed in the legislation. And the concern when you see an amendment come forward in such a quick manner, not addressed in the -- in the amendment or the -- or in this bill, is concerns about liability problems that may arise for parties who mistype, clerical errors, the information here, which leads to subsequent problems, but even -- even more importantly is the fact that people's privacy is not protected here. This -- this data that will be collected by the State is not seemingly exempt from FOIA requests and subjects people's privacy in a manner that is contrary to the public's expectations. So for -- for those reasons and -and others, I would urge the Body a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Raoul, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR RAOUL:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR RAOUL:

First off, I $\operatorname{--}$ I $\operatorname{--}$ the previous speaker referenced potential liability issues. I listened to that dialogue during Executive

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Committee and I was totally baffled. I mean, if you're going to be against the bill, just be against the bill on -- on the real merits, but that was just made -- that's an issue made up by the whole cloth and it's not a legitimate issue what -- what -whatsoever. With regards to the notion of -- of tougher penalties being the sole avenue of deterring crimes, you know, I, as one and Senator Harmon mentioned this - who has sponsored a bill on holding repeat gun offenders accountable, value the -- the -- the value of a tough penalty, but a tough penalty by itself does not solve the problem of gun violence that we face -- that I face in my community at home. We know that the guns that are being trafficked into the hands of the individuals in my neighborhood that are taking lives are being intentionally trafficked to them. So you can say that the individual pulling the trigger is the only person we have to deal with, but somebody is knowingly trafficking the guns to these individuals that are taking the most vulnerable lives. And so this notion that we can take care of it and we could use the old association's line, "Oh, we just have to hold those actors accountable", we have to hold all the actors accountable. You don't just say in drug trafficking, for example, that just that end drug dealer is the only person we should hold accountable. You should hold everybody accountable along that way. And so I appreciate the notion and I think I demonstrated I appreciated the notion of the value of tough penalties on bad actors, but we have to hold all bad actors accountable, and in order to do so, we've got to trace it to that original bad actor that's intentionally, intentionally, taking advantage of the fact that there are these bad actors out here that the only way they can obtain a gun is illegally. And if you have a gun dealer and you can trace guns

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

committed in -- guns involved in crimes back to that gun dealer, we need a mechanism to hold that gun dealer accountable. And if -- if for no other reason, these vulnerable lives that are being taken in -- in neighborhoods like mine all across the State, we should -- we should do this as -- as we passed it out originally. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Nybo, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR NYBO:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR NYBO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to make two points, one quick and the other a little longer. This -- this issue about the -- the gun registry and the State wanting to obtain information on who owns guns, this is a classic red herring. So initially the argument was with the -- with the private sales provision, that we were now criminalizing someone who might have sold the gun and had records in their basement and lost them through a flood or if the house burnt down and -- and that we shouldn't create a situation where we were criminalizing a records offense where somebody could -- could inadvertently lose their records. So we worked to try to address the issue by giving an individual an opportunity to store those records somewhere else, to give them to the State Police. There was no intent to create a registry and in fact it's an entirely moot issue now. And the -- the amendment to remove the provision that we're talking about would have been adopted in the House had they had enough time to move forward with -- with --

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

with adopting the amendment before they passed the bill. They did not, so it's coming back as a trailer. So that issue about the State attempting to create a registry, it -- total red herring, moot point. That is being resolved. But the bigger issue here, and I hear this a lot from my friends over here, my -- my good friends over here on this side, they say the solution is to go after the criminals, that we need tougher sentencing, we can't be too lenient, we need to hold them accountable for their crimes. But I think we need to remember - it's really important - when we catch someone with a gun that they're not supposed to have, there are two criminals, at least two criminals. There's the person who's not supposed to have the gun and then there's the criminal who illegally transferred or sold the firearm to someone who's not supposed to have it. Now, when we catch someone with an illegal weapon, well, we know who the criminal is, and -- and, Senator, my good friend over here, we should absolutely go at them with the full force of the law. But when we catch that person with an illegal firearm, many times, most times, the vast majority of times, we have no idea how they obtained that weapon, and what we're attempting to do with this bill is doing exactly what you asked us to do, is to go after the criminal by getting better information, more information as to how that criminal obtained a firearm, and we're doing it in two ways, Senator. We're doing it by making sure that retailers themselves, direct sellers, are not selling to people who they're not supposed to be selling to and we're doing -- creating a better system for monitoring private transfers of weapons. We cannot -- and, you know what, going after -- going after the criminal, the guy who -- who has the gun, the woman who has the gun, that's going to solve one small problem.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

The bigger problem is not just going after people that we catch, but stopping those transactions from happening in the first place, and that's what this bill is about. You know, Senator, Illinois does not have the most strict regulations and rules in place with respect to firearms transactions and guns dealers. In fact, we're — we're in the minority. Most states have something like this and in the states that have adopted rules and requirements like this, they've seen a significant decrease in weapons that — illegally used at crimes, weapons being traced to dealerships in their state. So if you want to go after criminals and you want to be tough on crime and you really want to stop gun violence, this is the measure to do so, because you're going to be stopping two crimes — the person who's possessing and the person who's giving. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Tracy, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR TRACY:

Thank you. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR TRACY:

Senator Harmon, does this law affecting gun dealers, does it just apply to Illinois gun dealers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Senator, in the Illinois General Assembly, the laws we pass apply only to Illinois residents and businesses.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Tracy.

SENATOR TRACY:

So it doesn't apply to Missouri gun dealers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

I admire your rhetorical flourish here. No, it does not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Tracy.

SENATOR TRACY:

All right. Fair enough. To -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR TRACY:

It does not apply to Indiana gun dealers. It does not apply to Wisconsin gun dealers. It does not apply to Iowa gun dealers, Kentucky gun dealers. I don't think we border Tennessee. But the surrounding states, it does not apply to them and I don't believe Chicago, Illinois, is that far from Indiana. I know Quincy, Illinois, isn't that far from West Quincy and I know Danville isn't that far from Indiana. I want to end this horrible violence and the deaths that are occurring in this State and country, but when we start understanding what's causing the violence, we may get somewhere, but I know all day long if a guy wants a gun in Quincy, Illinois, and we have this law, he will just go over to West Quincy, Illinois, a mile, one mile, and we have done nothing to stop the problem. I also know Indiana gun dealers have been selling a lot of guns to the criminals in Chicago. If we don't stop trying to -- put one bill after the -- another and not curing

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

anything. We need to end the violence. We need to get to the root of the violence. I will work with you all day long, but the common sense has gone out of the building, because one gun bill after another is not curing the violence. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Will the -- will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Tough to follow. Senator -- Senator Harmon, I -- I do appreciate your -- your indulgence answering all -- all these questions and I -- I -- I missed the -- the debate when we -- when we -- when we passed this bill out of the -- out of the Senate. I wasn't -- wasn't in that day; I was dealing with a family medical emergency. But, in a way, it is kind of fitting that you and I have a discussion, because we're going full circle, because if you recall when you first -- the first debate that was really on 1657 was you and I talking in the Firearms Subcommittee of -- of the Judiciary Committee. So the question that I have for you, and I -- I will be brief, is just could you explain to me how -- you know, is -- I -- I am being told that there is a -- that there is a cost cap for -- for retailers that -- you know, larger retailers, their costs are capped at a certain amount. Is -- is that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Yes, that is correct. If a -- a gun dealer is pursuing multiple certifications, the cap for the total certifications would be forty thousand dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Yeah, and my information then is that, you know, if -- if a -- if a small -- small -- you know, if the -- the certification fee for an individual gun dealer that is -- that is selling, you know, selling on the premises, that would be fifteen hundred dollars. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

We have a -- we have a graduated scale. For a -- a dealer with a retail -- with a retail location, a gun store, it can be no more than fifteen hundred dollars over a three-year period. For a -- someone who works from his or her home, it's three hundred dollars or a hundred-dollars-a-year cap.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

You know, so, Senator Harmon, I -- I do -- I do appreciate your sincerity and the work that you are putting in on this issue. What it really comes down to, I think -- it does go back to that

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

very first debate that we had, where your position was, you know, we have this terrible tragedy, we have to do something. position is, well, we shouldn't just be doing something, we need to be thinking about whether what we're doing is constitutional and whether it will actually work. Members of the Senate, this bill is -- you know, this bill is fairly simple when we analyze it. I'm opposed to it for three reasons. First of all, I do think that the -- that the big box stores still get better treatment than the small southern Illinois gun dealers. There are a hundred and thirty-nine Super Walmarts in the State of Illinois, probably almost all of them sell firearms. They get to split that forty thousand amongst all those stores, so they get a better deal than the small family gun dealer in -- in a southern Illinois town. I think that's not the way it should work. I think we should be treating our small businesses better than our large corporations. That's one reason I'm opposed. I'm also opposed to this because, bottom line is, this is a diminishment of our constitutional rights. And, lastly, this is an expansion of government. There are a lot of prosecutors in the room and you can't tell me that a prosecutor cannot find a way to go after these stores, these one or two or three stores that are problematic. It's because of those reasons that I would ask a No vote on this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Oberweis, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR OBERWEIS:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Illinois Senate, you've heard me ask you on numerous occasions to, if you think it's a good bill, vote Yes; if you think it's a bad bill, vote No - regardless of whether it's a Republican bill or a Democrat bill. And I've tried to do that. The problem for me comes when I get a bill that I just can't get my arms around to feel comfortable of whether it is a good bill or a bad bill. What I think we all know is there is a serious violence problem. I'm not sure this bill will do much to solve the problem. On the other hand, if it does a little to solve the problem, if it prevents one serious mass shooting, we ought to take the step. Previous speaker just mentioned two objections. Question of whether it's constitutional or not - and I would say that's not our job to decide. If we think it's a good bill, pass it and let the court decide if it's constitutional or not. The other question you raised tugs at my heart: Will it solve the problem? And I don't know. I will tell you this, I --I have decided I will not vote No. I'm still struggling whether I'm going to vote Yes or Present. It's really a tough decision for me, but I will say I'm -- I'm probably, after this discussion, leaning towards voting Yes. But I ask everybody, forget whether it's a Republican bill or a Democrat bill, do what you believe is correct. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Harmon, to close.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you all for the debate. Senator Nybo, thank you for your remarks. There's nothing like the passion of a convert. I am grateful for -- for you. To some of the other speakers, I confess, I wonder if I brought forward

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

here on the Floor a drug to kill brain cancer, if you'd tell me it doesn't cure lung cancer, so we shouldn't pursue it. To Senator Oberweis' point, this won't solve the problem, but it will potentially take a serious dent out of it. Other states that have adopted this have seen a dramatic reduction in the availability of illegal guns. I know we've spent a lot of time this Session talking about guns. We've talked about bump stocks. We've talked about assault rifles. Many of those have been in reaction to mass shootings in Las Vegas or in Florida. There's a mass shooting in and around my district every single week. It just doesn't happen all at the same time. So far this year, there have been over a thousand shootings in the City of Chicago, a hundred and ninetyeight deaths from firearms. In 2016, almost fifteen hundred people were killed with handguns and -- and guns across the State. This is a real problem. This won't end the availability of guns; but so many of the guns that are used in crimes trace back to Illinois gun dealers, it has to make a dent in the problem. That's all I'm asking you to do. I appreciate the indulgence. I ask you for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 337. 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 35 voting Aye, 20 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 337, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2368. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2368.

Signed by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment deletes all and becomes the bill. It changes the makeup of the Metro East Sanitary District, which is a levee maintenance district which runs from south of Wood River, Illinois, all the way into St. Clair County, which is Senator Clayborne's district. The levee system was built by the federal government in the mid and late 1940s to protect the munitions and the refining and the steel industries, which were essential to the war effort. It has protected this bottomland for decades. levees are maintained under the vague general supervision, I believe, of the Corps of Engineers, but the direct work of the Metro East Sanitary District. And for a number of years, the Metro East Sanitary District has been the subject of a number of, how should I say, difficult decisions and they've been -- the hallmark of the district has been political patronage, lack of competence, one bad headline after another. This was when the Democrats ran it. The Republican board chairman won two years ago and promised reform. He hired an executive director that doesn't live in the district. He can't get the current commissioner approved by the county board. It's been lying fallow for eight or nine months. The board continues to have various perks, such as personal insurance, health insurance. They continue to pursue ill-fated

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

public policy measures, such as creating illegal special taxing districts on the poorest areas of the district - and these are poor people - to tax them or establish user fees when this is beyond -- an ultra vires, beyond the scope of their authority. They have floated plans to take the levee tax, a quarter-cent tax, which we passed some years ago, which was my bill, to do various projects they claim to mitigate surface water, whatever that is, which is patently against the law to do so. They are involved in a law -- they were involved in a lawsuit over the taxing district. The local circuit judge said it was clearly illegal beyond their Now, this bill proposes two key things. And of course when we passed the levee bill in 2007, the way I drafted the bill, with the cooperation of Senator Frank Watson, was to exclude the MESD from participation in this process and that's what we did. As a result, the Illinois drainage association came out against the bill and worked strenuously against it. The MESD put pressure on local politicians to put pressure on me to abandon that, which we refused to do. So, in any case, what this bill does is to shake it up by putting on the board the mayor of the largest city in Madison County, Granite City. The entire city is dependent upon the functioning of this levee operation. And, frankly, I've lost confidence in it years ago. I still have a total lack of confidence I don't think the board chairman's actions create confidence. It's time to have someone on the board who runs for office, who's accountable to the people who depend on the levee system, and that's the Mayor of Granite City. It's time to cut the bond with a county machine, whether it's Democrat or Republican. It's time to establish accountability for those who hold these important offices. The levee reconstruction project is

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

coming to fruition. We're going to have a five-hundred-year flood protection on those levees and they'll -- this -- this flood protection board, created under that 2007 law, will slowly cease to exist. The quarter-cent tax will cease when the bonds are paid off and the levee maintenance will be turned over to the MESD, this operation, and we need them to be efficient, competent, and honest with the use of their power to maintain the -- the -- the -- the levee. We can't go back to a -- this system, this haphazard system of maintenance. So I would -- and this -- this bill also requires that the executive director live in the district, not on the bluffs, but in the district, which is directly affected by, a, the tax levy to maintain the levee and, b, face the consequence that if this levee is not maintained, they will face a -- a personal loss because of a -- flooding. There is an open seat on this board because of the failure of the county board to approve the chairman's -- this is a Republican county board, by the way, shocking to me, but it is. And -- so there is an open seat. So I would ask for an Aye vote and I stand to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR CURRAN:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR CURRAN:

Senator, that residency requirement, the residency clause in this legislation, does that -- when does that go into effect?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Senator. It goes -- it goes into effect upon signature of the bill by the Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Curran.

SENATOR CURRAN:

Senator, does that give the -- at that point, does it give the executive director time to comply, a period of time, six months or a year, to sell their current residence, find a residence in the district to move?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Curran.

SENATOR CURRAN:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR CURRAN:

And I -- I realize I'm new in this Chamber, but this year alone we have worked a lot, fellow Senators, on due process of employees in the workplace. We have talked a lot with the Human Rights Act and the -- and the very good reforms there. We have talked a lot on the sexual harassment task force, making sure employees have due process in the workplace. This is not a residency clause. A residency clause, for anyone that's ever seen

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

a union contract, first and foremost, typically when it's implemented, has a grandfather clause in it. Everyone currently in their position it doesn't apply to and it applies to new hires, Sometimes in the non-collective bargaining new employees. setting, you'll have a village, maybe when they hire a new police chief or a village manager, they then make a residency requirement part of the -- part of the employment. They always give time to comply, six months, a year to move in. You have a house to sell. You have to find somewhere to move your family into the district. The fact that this goes effective immediately, this is not a residency clause. This is a termination clause masked as a residency clause. Make no mistake about it, this is a termination clause. So this board that's being reconstituted and presumably has the authority to make an employment decision with regards to the executive director is going to pass on that and instead, you, the Illinois General Assembly, are going to make that employment decision and you're going to terminate this executive director. So I would ask you, before you cast that vote to terminate this person's employment, someone -- my district's very far from here. I know nothing of it, other than what the Senator has eloquently spoken about, but before you cast that vote to terminate this employment, I would just ask you to ask yourself one question, what just cause do I have, because that's the standard, "just cause", that this legislative Body, not only this year, but in past years, believes in and advocates for in the workplace - "just cause". What just cause do I have to terminate this individual? I think if you ask yourself that question fairly, your answer will be, I don't. And I would respectfully request, on that point, you cast a -- a No vote.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator McCarter, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCARTER:

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is -- this is where I live, in this area, the Metro East, and my history with this goes back to when I was on the St. Clair County Board and I was the only No vote for the levee and this is why. Exactly what the sponsor said, political patronage over decades and decades and losses year after year after year - since 2000, eight million five hundred ninetyfive thousand eight hundred and eighty-two dollars. What happened last year when the county board chairman, who happens to be a Republican for once in -- since who knows when in Madison County, puts new people on the board, they save a million dollars and they're in the black. So this is a great opportunity for you to get rid of patronage, do the right thing. Might the Democrats not have control of the sanitary district in Madison County? Perhaps, but all I know is year after year after year the taxpayers' money has been wasted. The gates have rusted open, literally. The pumps quit working. Pontoon Beach was almost flooded. Doesn't matter who the party is here, the track record shows it right here - 8.5 million dollars lost. Just do the right thing. You wouldn't apply these same rules to any of your boards or commissions. Changing the residency for the director, you wouldn't do the same thing to yours. Treat this like you would treat your own. I ask that the sponsor of the bill just -- just pull this. Let's move on with

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

things that are much more important and much less political. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Righter, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the gentleman's motion, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the motion.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been sitting here - I don't know much about this; this is not in my district - I've been listening to the debate. I've been listening to the -- what --Senator Haine in his opening and the comments by Senators Curran and McCarter. It is -- it's clear what's going on here. Nobody, nobody in this Chamber would sign off on a change in a condition of employment such as what is in this bill for anyone we know or respect. We wouldn't do that. It does not give them a chance to keep their job, relocate, make any kind of adjustment whatsoever. Senator Curran's exactly right. We -- this will be Springfield firing the executive director of a local board. Now, I -- my respect for Senator Haine is immeasurable. We all come here, sent here by voters, by our constituents, and sometimes, sometimes, we are asked to do things by our constituents that maybe we're not comfortable with or maybe we know that most of our friends and colleagues won't be comfortable with. My suggestion here - and it's a sincere suggestion - is, this is not what we should be doing. No one thinks this is what we should be doing. person, whoever they are, will have absolutely no redress for the way they're treated under this, because it's an act of State government. If the board did it to 'em, they would, but they don't

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

because we're doing it - but we shouldn't do it. Let's let Senator Haine go home and tell his constituents and the people who asked him to do this that he gave it a try. He tried, but that doesn't mean we have to do it, 'cause this isn't what we should be doing, particularly at a time when we're trying to come together on other issues. Let's not do this, 'cause you know what they'll say about this. This is not what we do. I urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Majority Leader Clayborne, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

...bill -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

You know, I -- I -- I represent this area and I'm a little surprised that some of my colleagues on the other side did not tell the whole story. There's a -- a publication in the newspaper that I don't necessarily agree with it, don't talk to. But they talked about this -- this special illegal tax district that this board and this executive director tried to implement on some of the poorest towns in the State of Illinois. Now if you read the article - East St. Louis, Brooklyn - two majority African American communities; Fairmont City, a majority Latino committee -- community; Washington Park, a predominantly African American community - they talk about the fact that they're imposing a -- an increase of four hundred -- an increase of four hundred dollars on these -- on the poorest communities, happen to be communities of

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

color. Now -- though the same increase - and that's all in St. Clair County -- County - the same increase in Madison County is only three hundred dollars. So they had to go to court and get that declared unconstitutional. That's why they're not losing money, I guess, because they want to put it on the backs of people who don't even use the services. It's in the paper. Read it. So now, when you talk about executive director or a board, shouldn't all those communities have representation? And I'm sure my colleagues on the other side would agree. So the right thing to do is to give someone in one of these communities, the largest mayor, the opportunity to have some say-so on the board. It's -it's -- it's all about having representation. Read the article. All you have to do is google Metro East Sanitary District. had to go to court. My colleague on the other -- other side gave his theory about employment. Well, the same thing. That's his opinion, go to court. If this person has done wrong, there is an outlet. It's not -- it doesn't stop with -- with the vote here. If something is wrong, they have the opportunity to go to court. I would ask those who -- who care about fair taxation, fair fees be implemented and not always be implemented on the poor and the -- the poor of our society, I would urge you all to support those communities that have an -- that don't have representation to have representation on this board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Haine, to close.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen. Thanks for those comments. To take the issue of the executive director first, this proposal came to me through a longtime member

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

of the county board, who supported the current Republican board chairman. That's where it came from. Number two, the executive director is currently a candidate for county clerk on the Republican ticket, nice guy. I've known him for years. He had a patronage job under Governors Edgar and Ryan with the Department of Human Services and he did very well. He worked at the Alton Mental Health Center. He was a Republican precinct committeeman. He's served as a Republican member of the county board, very close to the board chairman. Now if that isn't patronage, I don't know what is. Perhaps patronage is when a Democrat appoints somebody to the board that's running for county clerk that's a friend of his. I accept that, but I don't accept it here, because I'm one of the few, James Clayborne is the other, who knows what's at stake in the American bottom. We cut them out some years ago precisely because of one speaker's references to the bungling and the deficits. I have lost confidence in 'em years ago. Senator Watson and I crafted a bill which cut 'em out, as I told you before, and this -- this current situation with a myriad of proposals to take money from the levees, which is patently illegal, to establish illegal zones, to tax the poorest, because they -- they account for so much cost, involvement in lawsuits, failures to get people appointed to the board -- the reforms haven't happened, obviously. So this puts someone on the board that is accountable to the voters. This mayor will be accountable. There's a precedent for this in the Metro East. Three members of the Central Port Authority are mayors by statute. Three members of the Metro East Transit District Board are elected officials accountable to voters, a township supervisor, a mayor, and a county board member. I served in that position decades ago as a member of the county

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

board, chairman of the transit board. You're accountable to the voters. None of these people are accountable to the voters and no one knows who in the heck they are and they're spending millions of dollars and now they're going to be given a Cadillac system, a five-hundred-year flood protection levee system, and they don't show me any reforms or competence to handle it. Whereas the mayor has to see to it that it's well run, because if he doesn't, he's going to lose his position as mayor. And that's the key. He's going to be accountable to the voters who depend on these levees and I would respectfully ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2368. 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 36 voting Aye, 20 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} 1 to Senate Bill 2368, and the bill is declared passed. The Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet. The members of the Committee on Assignments will come to the President's Anteroom immediately. Senate stands at ease. (at ease) Senator Hunter in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HUNTER)

Muñoz back in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

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 3109.

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 3109.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 3115, with House Amendment 1. Passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2018. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

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 Executive Committee - Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 3806; refer to Transportation Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2, 3, and 4 to Senate Bill 2641, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 514; Be Approved for Consideration - House Bill 5166, Floor Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 109, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 3342, and Senate Bill 579.

Signed, Senator James Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

We'll now proceed to House Bills 3rd, page 6 in the Calendar. President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 109 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 109. Mr. Secretary, are there any

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, I would move for the adoption of the amendment and debate the bill on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, I move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move for the adoption of Amendment No. 3.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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:

House Bill 109.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar will present the bill on behalf of President Cullerton.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 109 contains several pieces. It most of all contains appropriations for the coming fiscal year 2019. So I think my approach will be to talk about the three pieces that comprise this bill, but before I do that, I — I feel it's necessary to explain how the bill came together. To say this was a — a bipartisan effort between the four caucuses in the General Assembly would be an understatement from my perspective. So as I have the privilege of presenting this bill to the Body today to my colleagues, I want to note that it is very much a reflection of the efforts of both the Republican Caucus and the Democratic Caucus here in the Senate and I think that's something that we should all today recognize and — and be proud of. This is truly, in my opinion, how budget—making ought to work.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I've been involved in that process, as you all know, for many years, going back to my time on staff. And I can tell you that the time that Senator Steans, Senator Hutchinson, Senator Sims, myself, Senator Rose, Senator Righter, Senator Althoff spent in a room was time well-spent. So from a very top level, this budget, I believe, is balanced. It is disciplined. It is pragmatic. It approaches managing government from a perspective that I think we all should -- should take and, for me, it's refreshing to see that, at a time when partisanship has reached a level that I think many of us decry, we were able to put this budget together in conjunction with our Democratic and Republican colleagues in the House. So let's start with spending numbers and -- and revenue numbers. So, first of all, the budget is crafted around a revenue estimate of 38.5 billion dollars coming into the State for the coming fiscal year. As you all know, there was some disagreement about revenue numbers, but I would just tell you that from both the perspective of the executive branch and the legislative branch, those differences were minor in nature. And so this budget and this spending package is based on a revenue number where there is a -- an agreement on what we can reasonably expect to bring in to the State in the coming fiscal year. The spending number is just shy of that number. And I should also note that these are just estimates, but I think these are conservative estimates that we can agree to, and if all things go well, we should end the year with a very small surplus. But the goal was always to make sure that revenues and expenditures balanced and that we could present to our colleagues here in the Senate and the House and to the people of this State a balanced budget beginning July 1. So the first big piece of the puzzle is an FY'18 supplemental.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

important to note here is, while it contains 1.3 billion dollars of all funds, not just general revenue funds, in spending, the biggest piece of the puzzle, I believe, for all of us should be to pay bills that are on hand at agencies. As you know, the Department of Corrections, for example, has approximately four hundred million dollars of unpaid bills sitting at the agency that are accounted for at the Comptroller's Office, but there is no appropriation authority existing today to pay those bills. So the supplemental would provide the Department of Corrections and subsequent agencies in State government the ability to pay those bills so that we can wipe that slate clean and we can move on. That's an important first step in this appropriation bill. There's also some other things in the supplemental. I would note that there was things brought to the table, for example, making sure that the regional safe schools and truant alternative education, which was left out of the evidence-based model in -- in terms of distribution, is taken care of in the supplemental. So while there are things for the most part that deal with wiping the slate clean on unpaid bills for the current fiscal year, there are things that I would describe as emergency in nature, things that we have to deal with before the end of the fiscal year. Again, we found compromise and agreement to come up with a list of those spending priorities for FY'18. Turning over -- turning the page to July 1st and after in FY'19, some of the hallmarks of this include our second step into funding equity. So this budget contains three hundred and fifty million dollars for the evidence-based model, which is year number two. It also includes an increase of fifty million dollars for early childhood education. education, the Higher Ed working group, another bipartisan effort

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

for -- for us in the General Assembly, brought together a proposal. It was intended and will, I believe, successfully keep students here in our great State in -- in higher education public institutions by appropriating twenty-five million dollars for the AIM HIGH Grant Pilot Program. In addition to that, there's a two percent increase over FY'18 for all universities and community Public safety agencies are largely appropriated pursuant to the Governor's recommendations that he submitted to us back in February, which, again, was a place where we could find a reasonable compromise. For the Department of Human Services, this bill provides for just shy of fourteen billion dollars of general revenue funds in addition to some changes in terms of rate increases for direct providers of services. Many of the programs that the Governor had eliminated in his introduced budget were restored as part of this balanced budget proposal. Moving on to Medicaid, the bill appropriates 24.2 billion dollars of all funds to the Department of Healthcare and Family Services for Medicaid and other associated programs that are run by the Department. Within this number are several moving parts. Again, programs that were proposed to be eliminated by the Governor were restored as part of a bipartisan compromise and other things were not implemented, for example, a four percent rate cut to Medicaid providers is not part of the number that I just -- that I just outlined. A couple of other things that don't deal directly with appropriations, but I think are worth mentioning before we -- I'm happy to take questions, is that we do enact cuts in spending and I think that's an important part of this mix. The number of direct reductions in appropriations when you compare next fiscal year to the current fiscal year is around a half a billion dollars, and I

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

should note, in an effort to be fair, that many of these cuts were outlined by the Governor in his budget proposal that he gave us back in February. So when you look at the Department of Corrections, for example, many of the appropriation appropriation lines are reduced because of savings that were identified by the Rauner administration early on in our budget making process. So, Mr. President, those are the highlights, the overview of what undoubtedly is a very large piece of legislation, but those are my opening remarks. I'll be happy to take any questions. I would again reiterate that we are here at this moment in May. Given many difficult years that -- that we've all experienced and that the State has experienced, I think in a moment that we should all -- we should all capture. This budget proposal is balanced, it is bipartisan, it is disciplined. I think it is a tremendous positive step in the right direction for our State by prioritizing things that are important, not just to one party or to one part of the State, but I think this provides balance, not just in spending, but balance in priorities for everyone in this State. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I don't remember exactly when it was, but sometime in

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

the last couple, three months when the budget negotiations were really getting starting in earnest, I remember reading a quote that said, "Compromise is the art of cutting the cake and passing it out so that everyone thinks they got the largest piece", so I want to start with thanking some of my fellow cake cutters on our side, Senators Rose and Althoff, and on the Democrat side, Senator Manar, Senator Steans, and Senator Sims. I don't want to walk through the numbers on this. Senator Manar's done an able job on that. I also want to add to the list of thanks a -- a group of people who are largely hidden from public view, but who are essential components to this process, and that is the young men and women who have collected themselves in the back corners of the Chambers on either side, and that's the Appropriation staffs from both the Senate {sic} and Republican sides, who served us in a highly admirable and impressively pleasant fashion, even when we weren't so pleasant debating some of the issues that we had. This budget reflects -- where we share priorities, this budget reflects that. Where we differ in our priorities, not in what needs to be done, but perhaps how it should be done, it reflects compromise. It is an impressive display. And I don't want us to get caught up in too much of patting ourselves on the back, but considering where we've been in the last twelve, twenty-four, thirty-six months, it is a bit of a turnaround and it's not been achieved easily. I think that those who -- and all of us - I mean, we're all politicians, so we all look in our own way at our own times to seek political advantage - there's been a real effort here to kind of cull those instincts and put away the loud voices and the sharp elbows in order to do something that we all know, whether we agree with the exact final product or not, we all know needs to be done.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

The last thing I want to say, Mr. President, is — is that this is the first step of a three-step process here and I would hope that we would all remember that this isn't a house of cards, but it's not — sometimes it's not much sturdier than a house of cards and that we need to be thoughtful in what we say publicly, thoughtful in how we respond to certain criticisms or comments, and remember that it is in our constituents' collective and long-term best interests to pass a budget that does not have a tax increase in it and can balance. Those are the two things, for myself and I know that many on my side of the aisle, brought to this in January, that we had to have a budget that was not going to raise taxes, was going to achieve balance, and I think we are there and hopefully we can get across the finish line. With that, I urge an Aye vote. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR STEANS:

Just to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR STEANS:

You know, I just want to add. I -- I know I'll be talking on the BIMP, so I'll be brief here, but this is really the budget framework, the appropriation bill. And to the -- the previous speakers, just want to say that this is the process. It's what it should be, it -- it really is. Senator Righter used an analogy that I am borrowing from him to share in the spirit here of shared values and all, that, you know, we live in a trust-challenged environment under the dome and it takes -- you got to give trust

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to get -- to get it back in return and take those baby steps. It's like having that frozen pond and not knowing - and this is the analogy he was using - whether it will hold or not, and you take a little step and you see whether it holds and you take another step, and there was a lot of that I think going around under the dome, both sides of the aisle, both sides of the dome, both sides of the aisle, and that pond held 'cause I think we really were giving and getting trust and really exchanging that. And I really hope it's a foundation for moving forward. You know, this budget does not solve Illinois' fiscal challenges. The one thing I think it really is lacking is they're not dealing with the backlog of bills. I wish we could have done that. We didn't get there. Things are a compromise, the way we go about things. Nobody got everything they wanted and that's the whole nature of compromise, but it is balanced. It is no new tax increases. I think that was important to a lot of folks. It is disciplined. We have reductions in State agency operations and the way -- what we have done with pensions, which is our huge area of unfunded liabilities and real future concerns for the State, and I think it's something which we can all join hands and say, you know, it is something that we have accomplished today. And I really also just want to acknowledge Representative Greg Harris and Representative Tom Demmer, who were such a part of this effort with us, and then really the four Leaders, Senate President Cullerton, Leader Brady, and the leadership in the House as well. They -- but -- but particularly here, I think Senate President Cullerton, Leader Brady, and his predecessor, Radogno, have set a tone here in the Senate that really helped do those initial steps of trust. And I just -- it means a lot that we were able to accomplish it that way. And I,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

for one, hope that we don't have any red buttons up there. I think everybody can feel that we are really delivering for the State of Illinois. My full belief that when you do a compromise nobody thinks is the best thing, it is by far a better product for the residents of Illinois, taxpayers, everybody who lives here. It's better because we did all this compromising and I appreciate that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rose, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR ROSE:

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR ROSE:

Senator Manar, for -- quickly, for purposes of legislative intent, is the 14.8 million that is at the Prairie Research Institute intended for any other purpose than those would be defined by the leadership and staff at the Prairie Research Institute?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

No, that -- that appropriation is intended for the stated purpose, which is the Prairie Research Institute.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rose.

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you. To the bill, please.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The bill.

SENATOR ROSE:

So a great mentor of mine, Representative Bill Black, had a great saying and he said, "This process works when you let it." And it really did here. We took the deliberative time to walk through it. No one, as Senator Steans says, is going to get everything they want. It's a deliberate compromise. But at the end of the day, when you take the time to do it right, you get to a fair product. There are a lot of people and I want to add my sincere thanks to the staffs. They have done an incredible job, and not just the Approp staffs. The -- the substantive staffs have done a great job this entire Session. But when you look at this work product, there are a lot of things that -- that we should talk about. Our local governments will get relief back home. That will help local property taxpayers. On the subject of property taxes, where Senator Manar and -- and Senator Barickman last year on the -- the -- the bipartisan school funding reform, the three hundred and fifty million dollars in this to fund, as Senator Manar pointed out, that next step, that's so important, because when you get back home, for every dollar the State doesn't send, it's a dollar that has to come out of local property taxpayers. So taking this step forward helps relieve that pressure back home. This budget is balanced with a lot of hard work and -- and, again, you know, a lot of effort from a lot of good people - Senator Sims picked up where he left off from the House, Senator Righter, Senator Hutchinson, Senator Steans, Senator Manar, Senator Althoff, Representative Demmer, Representative Harris, and our -our Leaders for sure. But one other thing I want to point out,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

because I think it's incredibly important, that came out of not just the budget process, but this entire Session, and it gets right back to my opening comment about the process works when you let The Higher Education working group, bipartisan, bicameral, spent six, seven months, almost twenty meetings under the leadership of good Senator McGuire. A lot of people worked very hard on that and we can't name 'em all. But to pick up where Senator Manar and Senator Barickman left off last year with K-12 funding reform, we have an excellent work product for higher ed and it's a work product that, frankly, at the end of the day, goes right to the heart of the brain drain that everybody's been reading about in the newspapers. It says to any citizen, any student in Illinois, any family in Illinois, we want you to stay here and get your education. The two key components of that, the four-year MAP and -- and the -- the institutional match, as was pointed out earlier, go right to that. That -- that arms our admissions officials, our recruiters with every tool they need to combat the out-of-state poaching of our best and our brightest and keep those kids here. We want those kids here. So at the end of the day, do -- does everybody get everything -- everything they want? No, of course not, but when you let the process work, it does, and so we have a -- a -- a work product here. There's a lot of things we can talk about back home. And most importantly, it is balanced with hard work. And with that, I would simply close by once again giving my sincere thanks to all the staff people, who do so much for all of us. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Oberweis, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR OBERWEIS:

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

To the bill, Mr. Senate -- or Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

First of all, I'd like to thank all the Members who worked on this bill on both sides of the aisle, as well as the staff on both sides of the aisle. I know people put in a lot of time and worked on a lot of different issues. I have to say the last two years here in the Illinois Senate have been very frustrating to me. If I were working on this bill, it would be a different bill if I had my way. I believe we need more spending cuts than we have in this bill. Yet, having said that, I think those who worked to come up with something that can pass did a -- a great job and a great service. And I would ask you all, those of -- first of all, I'm going to vote Yes, but those of you who are thinking that you'd like to vote No, think about one thing. Tomorrow there are going to be people out there saying, "Oh, I don't like this", "I don't like that", "I don't like whatever." The best message we could send to the taxpayers of Illinois is not that we got thirty Yes votes or thirty-six or thirty-nine Yes votes, but that we got fifty Yes votes or fifty-eight Yes votes; that we actually have come together on both sides of the aisle to work together and we're trying to change the direction of Illinois, which in my opinion has been pretty bad. But Illinois is a great State with great assets and if we can start working together to do some good things, we can turn this State around. For that, I'm asking everyone to cast a Yes vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Sandoval, for what purpose you seek recognition?

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

I just want to take a moment. I was moved by the spirit of the Chamber this evening. I wanted to recall this -- the -- a recommendation that our former Leader Senator Miguel del Valle shared with me some sixteen years ago. He said, "Martin, remember, as you start your career in the Illinois Senate, you cannot allow your local politics to interfere with governance." I reiterate and echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues that, for four years, the reason why we have not been able to see the compromise that we have been so accustomed to seeing in this Chamber is because we continued to campaign for four years. The ongoing mindset of campaigning poured into this Chamber and poured into the dome. The -- the ultimate win has been on everyone's mind on both sides of the aisle for four years during this administration. To my fellow Democrats and to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this is a real example. I want to shout out to my Leader on the Transportation Committee, 'cause, you know, no one really pays attention to -- to the work of the Transportation Committee, but Senator McConnaughay and I for years have demonstrated -- Senator -- Leader McConnaughay and myself have demonstrated for four years that if we can leave the campaigning at the door and if we can leave our politics at the door, and we've got two folks that come from totally opposite, totally opposite backgrounds, upbringing, geography, and we've been able to find compromise in the Transportation Committee. And for once, for

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

once in four years, both Republicans and Democrats left politics at the door of the dome and were able to engage in a mindset of compromise. It's about time. The political pundits will write tomorrow, "This wasn't enough", "It's short", "It's missing", "There weren't cuts, pension reform, workmen's comp, et cetera", but the headlines should be, the headlines should be, "They got it done." "They finally got something done." I applaud both my colleagues on my side, Senate President Cullerton, our Appropriation teams, Senator Steans and Senator Manar, and the rest of our team, as well as Leader Brady, for their willingness to leave politics at the door and engage in a mindset of compromise. I ask people vote...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rezin, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...bill, Senator.

SENATOR REZIN:

I'm sorry, is there a campaign going on? Just checking. Mr. President, and also Senator Manar and Senator Steans, Senator Rose and Senator Righter, thank you for your work on this bill. I know that you have been meeting for quite a few -- many months here, and with all of the staff in the back as well. And we do appreciate your ability to sit at the table and negotiate very difficult topics that we've been discussing for several months. We did talk about the increase in funding, Senator Manar, during our committee, and with the three hundred and fifty million new dollars coming into education every year and fifty million new dollars coming for

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

early childhood development, that's a step in the right direction. That's a great story that affects every single school district throughout the State. This is the first step to get moving the State of Illinois towards adequacy funding -- adequate funding for all school districts that will take place over the next ten to twelve years. So this is the first step and I do appreciate that. There's also an -- an additional hundred million dollars in this bill for our municipalities. We appreciate that, because we certainly hear from our mayors and the struggles that they have to balance their budgets as well. Ladies and Gentlemen, going through this budget -- I've been here now eight years. We've always been challenged when we were presented with the budgets in the past, but I can say that I'm standing in support of this bill, of this budget. There are things in -- or items in this budget that are good for Republicans in the bill. There are items that are good for Democrats. There are items that are good for my district, but what's most important is this budget is good for the State of Illinois. It's a balanced budget with no new taxes. I commend both sides of the party {sic} for coming together today to pass this budget and I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

So everyone has said this. I'm -- I'm finding myself sitting here smiling, because I -- all day long I've been telling people,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

I -- I feel unsettled, like I don't know if there's another shoe that's about to drop, there's something else we're going to hear, like this is -- I just know what it's been like for these last couple of years and especially exactly where we were last year and all of the ridiculousness that happened inside and outside of the building and what it is that's happening today and what a huge juxtaposition that is, that we can sit here today and talk about the strength of the institution of the Legislature. legislatively driven budget, as it should be. Rank-and-file Members across both Chambers and across both parties came together and crafted what it is we're supposed to do and under normal circumstances is a -- as a rote matter of business, it just happens at the end of the year. It hadn't been that way for us here in Illinois for a while, and believe me, on plenty of conference calls, I usually spend twenty minutes taking the jokes about Illinois. So I'm really proud today. I want to do one quick little thing too, because we've become this family, those of us that work on this budget, which we laid the groundwork for last year. But this is going to be my dear friend Senator Pamela Althoff's last budget that she's a part of working. And everybody knows that we're really good friends and everybody knows that we travel together and everybody knows that I'm going to miss her and a lot of us are going to miss her here, so I wanted to say thank you, Senator Althoff, on your last budget working with us, and I wanted to get a chance to say that before we started doing official goodbyes and whatnot. So, it's an example of who we are supposed to be when we do what we're supposed to do in this building. Everything else can be handled on the field, but when we're in this building, the only thing that we all have in common, no matter

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

where we come from, no matter what part of Illinois you live in, that we are all Senators and there's the word "State" that begins each of our titles. And we're going to lay the groundwork to pass a budget that benefits our State. I couldn't be more proud. the budget directors on both side - I know over here I have to say Becky Locker, Becky Locker, Becky Locker - we are truly grateful, all of us in this Chamber, for you men and women who don't get quoted in the newspapers and don't have pictures taken of you for the work that you've done and stay up and redraft and rewrite things when we change our mind in the middle of it, show up professional and courteous - I think, as Senator Righter says, sometimes when we're not. We can't be the best we can be as legislators in this building without the men and women who staff us in this building. You are all incredible on both sides. You are incredible and we owe you a debt of thanks for this. So we're going to pass a budget. Thank you, Senator Manar, for bringing this message forward. I can't wait to see how many green votes -- green lights there are in that -- on that board. This is what being the institution of the Legislature's all about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Sims, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR SIMS:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR SIMS:

Mr. President, I have stood on this Floor many a day as we've adopted budgets and we'd gotten away from bipartisan budgets. We'd gotten away from the ability for us to appear to our constituents,

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

to the people of Illinois that we could work together. But this budget proves to our constituents, it proves to the people of Illinois that we can work together. It proves that we are better when we can put our differences aside. We are better when we are able to talk about policy and not politics. But I've got to do a few things, Mr. President, because I -- I've got to thank the sponsor of this bill. I have seen the sponsor when his -- from his first day until now - his first day when he walked on -- walked into this building as a staff person. And I am just immensely proud of the legislator that he is, the individual that he has become, the husband, the father, because I see all of the young people who are standing in the back of the room and one day, not too long ago, that was us. So I am so proud of Senator Manar and the work that he's done, and Senator Steans, and Senator Righter, and Senator -- Senator Rose, and Senator Hutchinson, and our colleagues across the aisle. I made a joke in the Appropriations Committee that I'd like to think that it was my coming over here that got the bipartisanship rolling. But as we go back to our respective districts, we will be able to tell our constituents that we passed a budget that was balanced, that was fair, but also, most importantly, was bipartisan. That's what they are asking They are asking for us to work together and that's what today's product shows, that when we work together, great things happen. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Leader Brady, for what purpose do you seek recognition, as our last speaker?

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I -- I want to say

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

it wasn't until last, maybe twelve months, I realized how much work people put into this job, whether you be a Member of the General Assembly or a member of the staff behind us. We do owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to our staff, who help make us look good. We also owe a gratitude to our colleagues, who every one of us has put effort into this budget and everything else, and to the leadership of the budgeteers, to the leadership of President Cullerton. One of the other amazing things is the integrity -for me, the integrity to which everyone does their job. product came about because we were earnest and we were honest with each other. We developed a trust. I think everyone who knows me knows this isn't a budget that I would draft by myself, but it is a budget given the reality of the makeup of the General Assembly, it is a budget given the reality and the philosophy of our Governor, that I believe we can all work with. I think we also need to mention the Governor's budget staff. Those of us who worked in the inner workings owe a debt to them as well for their input and their help in -- in crafting this and the fact that the Governor's going to sign this budget after laying out his budget, but asking us to work in a compromising way under the auspices of giving him a product that he can work to balance, as well as a product that doesn't rely on future tax increases. And I compromise -- I -- and I -- I compliment Senator Cullerton and his leadership for his willingness to work on a product that doesn't rely on future tax increases and a product that can work for the people of Illinois. I really believe we've got the start of something special here, and if we continue to work down this path, there are great things we can do in a bipartisan way. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senator Manar, to close.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to close by -- I want to point out two things that -- that are not in this budget to offer any skeptic that's listening to this debate and the words that were just spoken by all the speakers about this budget bill, two things of many, but I want to pick out two that are not in this bill that proves -- that provides a little bit of evidence of discipline on our part and what bipartisan compromise can produce for the people of this State. Number one is, this budget fully funds the group health plan for State employees. Why is that important? It's important because it provides health insurance for our State's employees, which we should do, but it -- it provides for the full appropriation. So I would tell you, over the years, there has been times when there were efforts, on both sides of the aisle, to under-appropriate that line so that that would free up money in a balanced-budget scenario to be spent on other things. So it was -- it was moving bills to the next fiscal year before the fiscal year even begins and acknowledging it so that spending could go up elsewhere in the budget on things that legislators were asking for. All right, that was a tool, that was a tool. What it did was it allowed budgets to be passed, of course, but it also added to unpaid bills. So that was something that has been done over the years in varying degrees. This bill doesn't do that. This bill prioritizes making sure that we have enough money budgeted, according to revenue estimates that we've come to an agreement on, to make sure that we don't do that anymore. So that means that we're not going to push four hundred million dollars' worth of bills into the next fiscal year. So there's one

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

piece of evidence. Here's another piece of evidence. This one's way down in the weeds, but it's important. There's something in every budget spreadsheet, as I learned from my first -- my first boss here at the Senate, Senator Sims, called a lapse. A lapse is simply money from every appropriation line that doesn't get spent for various reasons. So think of it as a -- a -- a line at the Department of Corrections, where at the end of the year, because people moved on or they retired, they didn't hire them, so that money wasn't spent as anticipated. So when you add up that gap of what we appropriate to what is spent in every line in the twelvehundred-page budget, that's called the lapse. So this bill assumes a lapse of nine hundred and fifty-three million dollars. That's a lot of money, but in a thirty-eight-billion-dollar budget, that's a small amount. Now, in years past, that lapse number would go up, but it was never realized, and that gap between the real lapse and the fake lapse was used for spending elsewhere in the budget. That's not what this bill does. It's realistic. It was prioritized so that we wouldn't push bills into the following fiscal year. There's many examples like that in this budget document for fiscal year '19. Those are just two I want to offer everyone in the Chamber and those watching to -- to tell you that this was an effort that was not contentious. As one of the previous speakers said, which is absolutely true, when people come to the table and have honest upfront conversations, even in a partisan, political environment, compromise can be reached and good things can happen. The most contentious moment that I experienced in a budget negotiating meeting was Senator Rose throwing a Twinkie at me across the room. That's it. I wasn't looking and it hit me in the head. All right. That was the most contentious moment. We

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

had our disagreements, but we were committed to working it out. And we had a world-class staff on both sides of the aisle and in the Governor's Office that participated to help us do what we're doing here. So, for those reasons, I think we should all be proud to consider this balanced budget for the State and fiscal year '19 and I ask for an Aye vote, Mr. President. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 109 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 56 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 109, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 3342. President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3342 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There's been a change of sponsorship. Senator Steans. Senator Steans seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3342 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3342. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Koehler, on the amendment.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President. I move to withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans, on your amendment.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yep, I move for its adoption and I'll discuss it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3342.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. So this is the budget implementation bill. It's a -- an incredibly long document. Lots of hard work has gone into the development of it to implement the budget appropriation bill we just passed. I'll just give some of the highlights of it. It -- this is the area where we make changes to some of the regular statutory transfers

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

out that we get made out of GRF and some of the ongoing local government distributive funds and money that goes to public transit. In this case, we are doing a five percent reduction to what would otherwise go to them if we made no change to what was implemented into State law -- you know, was in State law two years ago. We also continue to make transfers from PPRT for use by the Department, local health protection grants to local health departments and for the community colleges. We also extend the lapse period for use of the supplemental that we passed in the previous bill to give the administration more time to implement that supplemental. We provide some -- you know, we do a lot of the implementation that's required for the pension savings that we're achieving in the budget. This is -- this merits a little bit of conversation. There's three different ways that we're -achieving pension savings in this budget. One is through a pension buyout for vested inactive members. So these are members that have served enough time to vest, are inactive in the current systems, but aren't yet retired, so they may be employed someplace else. And they will have a window of opportunity to buy out sixty percent of the value of their pensions if they so desire, and that has a savings estimate of about forty-one million. We also are providing an opportunity for buyout upon retirement of Tier 1 employees of the three percent COLA. They can instead get the value upfront of the difference between the three percent compounded COLA and 1.5 percent simple COLA and achieve that upfront, and that provides an estimated savings over time of about three hundred and eighty-two million dollars. And it also reduces the pension -- the -- the salary spiking cap from six percent down to three percent, meaning that any pension cost due to a salary

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

increase over three percent would be covered by local employers. Again, all of these pension changes are constitutional without doubt and are -- are voluntary. In the human services arena, the BIMP implements some of the rate changes that -- keeps in place the ones that had happened this year and makes a few additional changes, like an additional fifty-cent increase for DSP workers. In the Medicaid arena, we're creating a new pharmacy critical access rate to -- to help keep independent pharmacists in rural areas able to provide the care they do in their local communities. And we are also making a number of changes, such as keeping the online -- lottery program in place for another year, keeping the tax credit for for-profit hospitals available for another five tax years. I'd be happy to answer any questions. You know, this is never the sexy part of the budget, but it's important in terms of being able to help actually manage and implement to get to balance that's required.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 3342 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 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. House Bill 3342, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 4290. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

House Bill 4290.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

(Secretary reads title of bill) 3rd Reading of the bill.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. This is a bit duplicative, but we'd like to send another appropriation bill to the Governor that encompasses just the back pay for State employees. We've passed this bill once out of the Senate a few years back. These are updated correct numbers. We'd like to send this along to the Governor again in an effort to make sure that we live up to our promise. Many employees are owed wages for work that they did back to 2011. This bill will correct that. Be happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR ANDERSON:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

I just want to thank the sponsor, number one, for -- for -- for doing this - this is the longest standing bill we've had - and also for allowing me to be a chief cosponsor. You could view this a couple different ways. The way I view this bill is, number one, we are paying what is owed to people and, number two, we're paying off debt with this. So, again, I want to thank the sponsor and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Rezin, for what purpose you seek recognition?

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

SENATOR REZIN:

...bill, as well, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR REZIN:

Again, I rise in support of this bill. I do appreciate -this is something that we've been working on and -- and hearing
from our constituents for many, many years now, so I appreciate
the sponsor's and everyone's willingness to put -- appropriate the
money for the back pay in the budget. So thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...Manar, to close.

SENATOR MANAR:

I just simply ask for an Aye vote, Mr. President. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 4290 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. House Bill 4290, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar No. 3, House Bills 2nd Reading. House Bill 5166. Senator Lightford. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5166.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

3rd Reading. The regular Calendar, House Bill 4208. Senator Lightford. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4208.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment 5, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and of -- and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to adopt the motion {sic}, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. There being no... Mr. Secretary, Resolutions. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1819, offered by Senator Harmon, Syverson and all Members.

Senate Resolution 1820, offered by Senator Harmon and all Members.

134th Legislative Day

5/30/2018

Senate Resolution 1821, offered by Senator Haine and all Members.

They are all death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

...Secretary, Resolution Consent Calendar. Labor Subcommittee on Special Issues, tomorrow at 8:30 a.m. in Room 409. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on the 31st of May 2018. Senate stands adjourned.