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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB1613</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>202</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB2118</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB2121</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>203</td>
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<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3096</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>204</td>
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<td>3</td>
</tr>
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<td>HB3302</td>
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<td>HB3334</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
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<td>HB3462</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3503</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>204</td>
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<tr>
<td>HB3522</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3534</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
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<td>Page</td>
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<td>------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3576</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3586</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3590</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB3661</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0010</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0010</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0010</td>
<td>Vote Intention</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0024</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0024</td>
<td>Vote Intention</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0024</td>
<td>Vote Intention</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0025</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0025</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0029</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0037</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0054</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0061</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0068</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0068</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0071</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0075</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0075</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0102</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0112</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0115</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0119</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0119</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0122</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0145</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0147</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0147</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0161</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0162</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0168</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0168</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0177</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
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<td>SB0177</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
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<td>SB0177</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0182</td>
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</tr>
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<td>30</td>
</tr>
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<td>SB0391</td>
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<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0397</td>
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<td>143</td>
</tr>
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<td>SB0399</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
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</tr>
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<td>145</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>SB0449</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
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<td>SB0449</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Recalled</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Recalled</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0455</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0456</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0456</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0457</td>
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<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>152</td>
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<td>Recalled</td>
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<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0531</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0556</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
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<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0656</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0656</td>
<td>Vote Intention</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0657</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0657</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0658</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>187</td>
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<td>Recalled</td>
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<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0946</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB0996</td>
<td>Recalled</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1828</td>
<td>Third Reading</td>
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PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

The regular Session of the 101st General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Dr. Maryam Mostoufi, Islamic Society of Greater Springfield.

DR. MARYAM MOSTOUFI:

(Prayer by Dr. Maryam Mostoufi)

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

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

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Cunningham)

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

There's a number of entities that have asked leave to photograph and videotape the proceedings. That would include Lisa Yuscius, Blueroomstream; Rodney Correll, WLS ABC Chicago; Lee Milner, Illinois Times; Michael Lowe, WGN-TV; Brian Mackey, NPR Illinois; and Bill Ruthhart and Terrence James, Chicago Tribune. Is there any objection? There -- seeing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Journal of Wednesday, April 10th, 2019.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

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

Senator Hunter moves to approve the Journals just read by the Secretary. There being no -- I'm sorry, Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered.

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 341, offered by Senator McGuire and all Members.
It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 2118, offered by Senator Collins.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2170, offered by Senator Aquino.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2176, offered by Senator Martinez.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2301, offered by Senator Manar.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2386, offered by Senator Tracy.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2487, offered by Senator Murphy.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2613, offered by Senator Curran.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2719, offered by Senator Bennett.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3039, offered by Senator Tracy.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3040, offered by Senator Tracy.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3168, offered by Senator Schimpf.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3263, offered by Senator Curran.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3534, offered by Senator Castro.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3576, offered by Senator Barickman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
And House Bill 3676, offered by Senator Link.

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

I would ask everyone within the sound of my voice to please come to the Floor. We have a special guest who is planning on addressing us. So, Members, please come to the Floor. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR REZIN:

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

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

...your -- state your point.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Every year, I host a Youth Advisory Council. Today we are happy to have all of the members of my Youth Advisory Council, up here, over my shoulder. They'll be here
today. We have speakers explaining – go ahead and stand up – we have speakers here today to explain the process down here. They'll -- be debating a bill. I believe they chose the topic of whether we should legalize recreational marijuana. So that will be an interesting debate. And they kind of hit the jackpot; they're here the day where we have a very special guest, and they'd like to sit in the Chamber as well and hear our new Mayor speak as well. So I'd like a warm Springfield welcome for my Youth Advisory Council, up here, over -- in the gallery.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

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

SENATOR HASTINGS:

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

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

State your point.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Mr. President, I want to introduce a good friend of the Hastings family. His name is Mark Gazda. He's the CEO of Propel Sliding Door Automation. Mark's a close family friend and he -- he invented the sliding garage door, which is really neat. So you see 'em on barns across Southern Illinois. I just wanted to give him a warm Springfield welcome. He's a personal friend of our family and he's down here visiting today. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Welcome to Springfield. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention, please. Good morning. Before we get into our legislative business, I would like to introduce a special guest
and I'd like to say something before I do that. We - and by we, I mean every part of the State - have been through some tough times. We still face a lot of challenges, but we have a new Governor, focused on solving lingering problems, and now we have a new Mayor from Chicago, who brought people in Chicago together like anything {sic} I've ever seen. So, we're at a place in our history where we have tremendous opportunities to move the State, the entire State - Chicago, suburbs, and downstate - forward and make Illinois better. I think we all recognize that. So I look forward to all of us working together with our newest partner to accomplish great things. So it's my honor to introduce to the Illinois Senate the Mayor-elect of the great City of Chicago, Lori Lightfoot.

MAYOR-ELECT LORI LIGHTFOOT:

(Remarks by Mayor-elect Lori Lightfoot)

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Senator Koehler in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yes. Please state your point.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Good morning. Today I am pleased to welcome our guests at the Capitol for the tenth annual anniversary of the Illinois Muslim Action Day. Young people from across the State are here to advocate for important issues for and -- and -- and beyond their
community, and to learn about being involved in government policy. This annual event is organized by the Council of Islamic Organizations of Greater Chicago, which is located in my district. So please join me in welcoming the following individuals. And as I mention your name, can you please stand? Amina Farooqi, Hummah Rehman, Maryum Ahmad, Sara Sadoq -- Sadoq, Suheera Qureshi, Faiza Khan, Zainab Ali, Fatina Faizal, Ahmad Raza, Saurim Khan, Nisreen Salem -- Salem, Afnan Kadri, Nour Abdelsalam, Miriam Elayyan, Jood Nakira, Arbaaz Basha, and Rafa Hussain. And we are honored and we -- excited to have you all here with us this morning. Welcome to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yes. Will our students please stand? Let's everyone welcome them. Welcome to Springfield, the Illinois Senate. Senator Stadelman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR STADELMAN:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR STADELMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I would like to introduce my two Pages for the Day. Both students are here with their grandparents, Linda and Richard Hamlet, located in the balcony behind me, I believe. My Pages are Lily Freeman. She's a fifth grader at McNair Elementary in Winnebago, an active member in 4-H, and she wants to be a marine biologist. Eli Freeman is a fourth grader at McNair Elementary, also in Winnebago. He's on the basketball, baseball, and football team. He wants to be an NBA player when he gets older, and we know the Bulls certainly
need some help. So, a warm Springfield welcome for my Pages for the Day.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Will our guests please stand? Let's welcome them to Springfield. Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition? We're going to go to 3rd Readings. This is final action. We are going to go through the Calendar, pick out selective bills. Once we do that, then we're going to go back and go through the Calendar in order. So, when you are through, if you would be at your desk, we're going to start on 3rd Readings. So if you turn to page 31, Senate Bill 996. Leader Brady indicates he's ready. Please -- Senator Brady seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 996 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 996. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Brady.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Brady, to expect -- to explain your amendment.

SENATOR BRADY:

I'll discuss it on 3rd Reading, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)
3rd Reading. Senator, do you wish to proceed? He does. Please, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 996.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Brady, to discuss your bill.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an initiative of the Beer Distributors Association as well as the Craft Brewers. We're trying to negotiate terms to settle disagreements between contracts. As I told in committee yesterday, we're moving this over to the House for further negotiation and expect it back here for final action.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 996 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 Yeses, no Nays, no Presents. On that question -- so -- Senate Bill 996, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to Senate Bill No. 10. Senator Manar, are you ready for your bill? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Manar seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 10 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 10. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a small change to the bill that was approved by the Education Committee. I would ask for the amendment's adoption and then be happy to debate the bill on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 10. Sponsor indicates that he is ready. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 10.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to present your bill.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 10 would establish a minimum salary for teachers in the State of Illinois starting in the 2020-2021 school year. This bill is identical to a bill that was passed last year by this Body and by the House that was vetoed
by the previous Governor with one change. The amendment that was just adopted would direct the Professional Review Panel to give us a recommendation by the end of the year so that it could be put into place by the following school year, when the effective date of the bill kicks in, to help bridge the gap for school districts in Tier -- predominantly in Tier 1 to cover the cost of what the bill would put in place. I'm happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

To the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR WEAVER:

I just want to give folks a heads up on this bill, just a few things that may concern people, so if I can have your attention on that. It's an important bill, and first -- first, Senator, thank you for your work on this. We're all very passionate about our teachers, want to make sure, especially in light of the teacher shortage, that we're doing all we can with regard to hiring and being able to get the best teacher we can in the classroom. We do have some concerns on this bill. First, it's a significant unfunded mandate. If I can have your attention on this, please. If I can have your attention, please. If I could have your attention, please. Thank you. This is a significant unfunded mandate, and we all know labor's -- biggest cost for school districts is -- is labor and it's the biggest impact especially in downstate and rural areas. It's a local control issue as well. I want people to understand this one number. According to 2017-18
Illinois Teacher Salary Study, there are five hundred and twenty-five school districts, or about sixty-one percent, that have starting salaries below the number that's proposed in this bill. And school districts just don't have a lot of choices. They don't have the ability to raise taxes. They'll be forced to lay people off. So I'd like people to take a serious look at this bill as they make their decision. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any other discussion? If we can please keep the discussions down a little bit. Leader Lightford, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee (sic), I rise in support of this legislation. It's critical that we take a look at why there's such a huge teacher shortage, why the profession is not attracting young people. And one of the main reasons is because, quite frankly, we're just not paying teachers enough. We're not allowing teachers a fair shot also to the American dream as they raise our children. Forty thousand dollars, a starting salary for a teacher, is not a lot of money. It's just not a lot of money to live on. But, yet, it would allow them the decency and the respect to not only raise up all the rest of our generations to come but allow them to have a fair life as well. I think it's important that we note that this is also a phase-in, so I don't know that any of these districts are going to go out of
business or belly-up because they're phasing in a teacher's salary up to forty thousand dollars in a -- over a four-year period. So I find this legislation to be an additional effort of Senator Manar that's totally in the right direction that we ought to be going in and I wish we could actually pay our teachers more than the minimum salary that the Senator has set. And I want to be mindful to the school districts as well - doesn't mean you have to be at the minimum; that's just the floor. I think you ought to allow for your teachers to do just as well as you like for your school districts to do, from administration on down to the child in the seat. I encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

    Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    To the bill.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

    Yes, I agree with -- I agree with almost everything that's -- that -- that's been said, especially by Leader Lightford about how we should be paying our -- our schoolteachers more. The thing is, I also tell the members of my community that school board elections are the most important election in the State. And you've heard me say this before, all of you that have been here, but some of the new Members, we are not a fifty-nine-member school board in this -- in this Capitol. If we want to empower our local school boards, we need to give our community leaders the ability to make decisions about what is best for their school districts. And while I absolutely share Senator Manar's goals with this bill, I want to
empower our local school boards to make the decisions. This is their responsibility, not ours. So I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

I served on the fifth-largest high school district school board for four years in the south suburbs. And, Senator, I respectfully disagree. There are school boards across this State that do not make good decisions for their teachers. Some of 'em don't pay 'em an adequate wage. Forty thousand dollars for a teacher - to send our kids to school on a day-to-day basis for forty grand is not unreasonable, and it's almost an embarrassment that our teachers don't get paid more. We spend thousands and thousands of dollars to send our kids to day care every day and some of our day care facilities make more than some of our teachers do. I think that's absurd. I don't think this bill goes far enough. I think this bill should be applied to paraprofessionals as well who teach in our school system, those that provide one-on-one assistance to kids with special needs, those that provide assistance to those that need English as a second learner {sic}. There's a lot of different people in the school system that get paid below minimum wage in my opinion. And I want to say thanks to Senator Manar for all his hard work on this bill. Teachers across Illinois deserve a fair working wage and so do paraprofessionals in their school. And I urge an Aye vote. Thank
you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

To -- to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. I'd like to commend the sponsor on this bill. Enjoyed his work over it -- regarding this bill in the past year. So I'd like -- for this Body, I'd like to also mention that this forty-thousand-dollar floor includes pension payments -- or the cost of pensions. So, when you're figuring out where you are on this bill, it does include -- the forty -- to get to the forty thousand dollars, the cost of the pensions is included in this bill as well. And I do ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to close.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to take a moment and I -- I want to talk about what this bill is and what it isn't, because -- I -- I appreciate the debate on this bill. We had a robust debate last year. This bill is a little bit different than the one that we voted on last year, in that it utilizes the formula embedded in the goal of equity to get us where we want to go - in this case, to raise the wage for the profession of teaching in this State. We should be very clear that there are teachers in Illinois today that live below the federal poverty level and work full-time. That is a fact. It happens today in this State, not
in all parts of the State, but in many parts of the State. You could just go to any newspaper in this State and you would see that districts are struggling to fill vacant positions. District 186, here in Springfield, has dozens today. Decatur public schools has around fifty vacant classrooms today, where kids are not being taught what we expect them to be taught. So that requires us to change public policy. That's what this bill does. It is reasonable. It's phased in over four years. It starts at thirty-two thousand dollars eighteen months from now, not right now, eighteen months from now, and then we ask the Professional Review Panel to come back to us and give us a recommendation on how we bridge the gap for underfunded districts to pay for this. So this is a step in the right direction, I think from any angle you look at it. And it comes down to this, do you think a teacher is worth thirty-two thousand dollars a year eighteen months from now? That's the question. That's a resounding "yes" in my book. We expect teachers to solve the problems of the world when children bring all of the things they bring with them into a classroom and we hold them accountable for it. We expect teachers to solve the problems of the world and we hold them accountable for it, so it's time we pay them for it. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 10 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 45 Yeas, no -- 11 Nays, no voting Present. Senate Bill 10, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll go to Senate Bill 24. Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, please read the
bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 24.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, on your bill.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This requires that freight trains be operated by a crew of at least two people. The law would remain in effect until the federal rule or law was adopted that addresses how many people should operate a freight train. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You know, there's still kind of a noise level in the Chamber. Mr. President, thank you for your efforts in that regard. Senator Link, what empirical data study can you point to that's been performed by really anybody, much less an objective entity, that would tell us that the two-person crews are safer than the one-person crews, as would be mandated under your legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link.
SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Senator, for that question. It's probably the same facts that were proven that it's -- one is not any safer than two. I -- I don't think that's a question, but there are a lot of facts on this. And the fact is, there's a lot of accidents that have happened unfortunately to where if there wasn't two people on that, the devastation of that accident would have been immensely higher than what it was at the two people, because, for example -- I'll use an example, there was a recent accident with two people on. If it was one person, that engineer could not leave his post to save people's lives, like what happened when the second individual was out there redirecting traffic, decoupling a train, and helping saving lives. This is the important factor of it. But the thing is, the funny part of it, the opposition of this bill doesn't disagree with us. They agree that there will be two people on the trains until the federal law is changed. They agree, so I don't know why they're opposing us codifying into law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, not everyone agrees with that, Senator. I mean, if you'll recall from the Executive -- well, you just said that, everyone -- no they don't. If you recall from the Executive Committee hearing, there was a railroad company that testified that runs through -- does a lot of business in my district. They run one-person trains. And after they testified, despite an attempt by a union involved in this to muddy the water on their safety record, it -- it's clear that they have an excellent safety record. So that's not really true, Senator Link. Here's my next
question, is, the federal regulatory agency, so the federal government agency that administers railroads, says there is no information, no data, which would demonstrate that two-person trains are safer in this context than one-person trains. I'll ask you one more time. Do you have anything other than general references to anecdotal stories - which everyone can come up with an anecdotal story to support their point of view at one point or another on an issue like this - do you have anything other than that to contradict what the FRA has told us is the facts about safety?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Yes. Here's a fact and the same thing -- I'll answer it the same thing {sic} that I answered it in Executive Committee. When they were trying to show a -- a graph of it, it went from five down to two and the -- the safety was inclined to be safe as could be at that. They neglected to say, between 1981 and 2009, the railroads, which I commended them for, expended five hundred and eleven billion dollars of capital improvements to maintain tracks and equipment. I think that's a factor of safety. They went from five to two. And as far as here, even in their own Indiana railroad company, over the past ten-year period, there have been forty reportable incidents of grade crossings. The problem is still going on, and with that one person in there when these accidents happen -- cannot leave the train. So if there's an accident that happens, who is out there trying to help those that are injured until we have the safety -- the first responders come in to help?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

First of all, Senator Link, I want to thank you for helping me make my point. You're exactly right. The railroads over those period of years have invested half a trillion dollars in safety, because they negotiate these issues. That's the point. That's the point. They do that because they have the flexibility to decide whether or not they want to have one-person or two-person. And you know what? They invested that money in safety without a State mandate from Springfield saying, "We know we don't have any studies that say for sure that two-person trains will be safer than one-person trains, but this is what the union's asking us to do so we're going to do it". That's what this is about. There is not one study that says two-person trains are safer than one. This is a union coming in. And, hey, I don't blame 'em. They're here; they're doing their business. Okay? That's what this is about. That's all this is about. Just once, just once, let's look at the empirical data, let's look at the investments the railroads have made, and say, "You know what, we're just going to let these people figure it out at the negotiating table", which usually is what labor says they want. I urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to close.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I always enjoy these debates with
my colleague over here, but I want to correct him on a few things. Nineteen other states are currently pursuing two-person crew legislation, with Colorado just enacting it into law. It's not Illinois and Illinois alone. I -- I'd like to be first on a lot of things, but I want safety first in this State. And I want to correct one other thing. The railroad people stood up there in committee and said, "We are going to keep this at a two-person until the regulators in Washington codify it". So, what is the opposition if we're just codifying it in law in Illinois? What's the opposition in Colorado and the other nineteen states? They want safety for people of the State of Illinois and their states also. That's all I'm asking for in this bill, safety, safety, safety, and an affirmative vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 24 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 Yeses, 19 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 24, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I want to welcome our special guest, Attorney General Kwame Raoul. We're going to jump now to Senate Bill 161. Senator Curran is ready on his bill. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 161.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
SENATOR CURRAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 161, as amended, codifies the Worker Protection Unit within the Attorney General's Office and gives the Attorney General's Office clear statutory authority to enforce violations of wage theft and workplace rights violations. A similar law was proposed last year by then Senator Raoul, now our Attorney General, and passed this Chamber twice. I'm thrilled to be carrying this bill this year, working with the Attorney General on a worker -- workplace protection unit. It's an -- a very important endeavor of our State to enforce the wage laws and the employment laws that this Chamber sets. So I know the Attorney General has worked hard in modifying what was proposed last year, as -- as our new Attorney General, to form an effective unit. And I -- I know of no known opponents to this bill and I would ask for an Aye vote and be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SENATOR REZIN:

I'm sorry. I'll speak after this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 161 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? On that question -- take the record. There are 57 Yeas, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 161, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harris, for what purpose do you seek
recognition?
SENATOR HARRIS:

Yes, I would like to be recorded as an Aye on the -- Senate Bill 24.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The record will reflect that. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR REZIN:

Yes, I would like to be recorded as a Yes as well on Senate Bill 10. I stood up and spoke in favor of the bill and then we forgot to vote my switch.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Your intentions will be so reflected. Thank you. Senator Van Pelt, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR VAN PELT:

For purposes of introduction.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please make your introduction.
SENATOR VAN PELT:

I have here today with me the President of Malcolm X College, David Sanders. They have gained so much under his leadership. The enrollment is up three hundred and forty-three percent and we're excited about him. And I'd like everyone to welcome him, but let's hold that for a moment because I also have here Suheera Qureshi. She resides in Downers Grove in -- in Illinois, attends the Islamic Foundation School. She has been awarded the President's Award of {sic} (for) Educational Excellence and AP scholar's award. She is going to Benedictine College when she leaves the Foundation School. And I'd like you all to welcome
both of them with a warm welcome from the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yes, welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Sims.

SENATOR SIMS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR SIMS:

I'd like to be -- like the record to reflect that I'd like to be recorded as an Aye on Senate Bill 24. I pressed...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The record will so reflect your intentions. We're going to turn now to Senate Bill 104. Senator Sandoval, are you ready for Senate Bill 104? Senate Bill 145. Senator Muñoz, are you ready? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 145.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The bill amends the Election Code to provide that no candidate for President or Vice President of the United States shall appear on the official ballot for the primary or general election if that candidate has not released his or her tax returns. The candidate must file their federal Internal Revenue Service tax returns for
the five most recent years with the Secretary of State. The United States Constitution gives states the power to regulate the election process with reasonable political neutral regulations. This regulation furthers the State's interest in providing information to the voters as well as helping to expose corruption and conflicts of interest. This bill was passed and sponsored by Senator Biss in the 100th General Assembly. The -- this is an amended version. Expands the requirements to the primary election. Specifies that the Secretary of State's Office handles the filing and posting of tax returns and requires the Secretary of State to redact social security numbers, addresses, and telephone numbers. And I will attempt to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? And, please, let's hold the conversations down. It's hard to hear in here. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Muñoz, what's the purpose of this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

To provide more information to voters.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.
SENATOR RIGHTER:  

Given that general rationale, wouldn't it be better if the bill included candidates for the U.S. Senate, candidates for the U.S. House, candidates for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Treasurer, Comptroller, maybe high-ranking legislative officials? Why aren't any of those people in this?  

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  

      Senator Muñoz.  

SENATOR MUÑOZ:  

      I'm not saying we can't put 'em in. We can do a trailer bill or we can work on it in the House and we can add as many as you like, Senator.  

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  

      Senator Righter.  

SENATOR RIGHTER:  

      I don't mean to laugh. And, Senator, the -- in committee, there were two U.S. Supreme Court cases brought out in the testimony, really directly on point, that made it clear that these kind of qualifications are unconstitutional. In other words, the Constitution lays out this is what you have to be in order to get on the ballot; beyond that, the State can only impose what I would call electoral requirements, like petition signature requirements and deadlines and things like that. Have you been able to find, since the hearing, something that would contradict those cases or distinguish those cases from this bill?  

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  

      Senator Muñoz.  

SENATOR MUÑOZ:
These two cases that you're referring to are different. We're not adding any other information.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm sorry, Senator, maybe I didn't hear it. I did not understand that response.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

We are not adding new qualifications.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, I have to disclose my tax return, and if I don't, I can't get on the ballot. How is that not a qualification under the United States -- the United States Supreme Court decisions? Explain that to me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

That would be up to you to choose if you decided to run for that office, if this bill were to become law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.
SENATOR RIGHTER:

Actually, it's not a choice, Senator. That's why -- that's the point of your bill, is to mandate it. It wouldn't be a choice. You know, I guess I want to stop the questioning there, Mr. President. We could go round and round and I could ask more questions about the Supreme Court decisions that are crystal clear on this issue. This is, quite frankly, with all due respect to the sponsor, an embarrassing waste of the Senate's time. This is being pushed by a far leftist organization out of the City of Chicago that want to be able to get up and chirp about the President of the United States. We ought to be better than this. Let's help everyone be better than this and let's all vote No. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

       Senator Rezin. Any further discussion? Senator Muñoz, to close.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

       Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I always welcome my colleague's comments, whether it's for my bill or against the bill. But for a colleague to say that it's an embarrassment or a waste of the Senate time, I think that was uncalled for. Mainly, we have fifty-nine State Senators in our great State. Everyone has their own mind and choose how they run different bills. You know, they're doing this in twenty-five other states, whether you agree with it or not. I look at it this way, we're not saying whether you're Independent, Democrat, Republican. If you decide to run for Vice President or President of the United States, I think the taxpayers of our great State should know who is the individual doing that. It's not against anyone. If you
want to run for Vice President/President of the United States, hey, what's wrong with providing your tax returns for the last five years? If you've got nothing to hide, you shouldn't worry about anything. That's how I see it. If any one of my colleagues in the Senate would like to add any additional constitutional officers or any other federal elected officeholders, hey, let's work on the bill in the Senate. I ask for an Aye -- in the House. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 145 pass. All those in favor will say {sic} Aye. Those 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, 19 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 145, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition? All right, we're going to go to Senate Bill 177. Senator Harris. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Harris seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 177 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 177. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER

Senator Harris, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR HARRIS:

...to adopt the amendment and talk -- speak on it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
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 KOEHLER)
3rd Reading. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 177.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Harris, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HARRIS:
Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Floor Amendment 2 is -- is discussions that myself and CMS has had to get this bill over to the House and continue negotiations with the omnibus bill regarding -- regarding this legislation. I request an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 177 pass. All those in favor will say {sic} Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 voting Aye, 10 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 177, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We will now turn to Senate Bill 222. Senator Castro, are you ready for Senate Bill 222? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Castro
seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 222 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 222. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator -- Senator Castro.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Mr. President, I'd like to adopt the amendment and discuss it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 222.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your bill.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is very similar to a bill that we passed last year that was vetoed by the Governor.
Senate Bill 222 is an initiative of the State Treasurer's Office. It pretty much bans fees on rebate cards. There was a lot of work on this bill. The amendment actually made the bankers and also the credit unions neutral. I ask for its support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SENATOR FOWLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just like to make my Republican Caucus aware of the opponents on this bill, which is the Community Bankers Association of Illinois, the Illinois Bankers Association, and the Illinois Credit Union. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Castro, to close.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Actually, I want to correct the last speaker. They are neutral on the bill -- on the amendment. They are actually -- in committee filed as neutral, in committee on the amendment. So, again, I ask for its adoption and a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 222 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 voting Yes, 17
voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 222, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to move to Senate Bill 4-4-9, 449. Senator Lightford, are you ready on Senate Bill 449? Senator Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 449 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 449. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Lightford, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. It has some technical changes. I'd be happy to negotiate 'em on 3rd, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 449.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Lightford, to explain your bill.
SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The purpose of Senate Bill 449 Senate Amendment 1 is to ensure that elementary and secondary students who are parents, expectant parents, or victims of gender-based violence can stay in school, stay safe, succeed academically and complete their education. Despite a bill we did back in 2007 - it was a law requiring training for teachers and counselors and other school personnel on issues relevant to student parents - some personnel has responded and many hasn't. This bill sets forth five provisions to fix that. We wanted to make sure there was confidentiality; excused absences related to pregnancy, parent, and gender-based violence; resource personnel to serve as advocates for students and connect them to in-school and community services; and accommodation, such as change in classroom or more time to make up homework or exams. There's a lot of statistics and things that I could share. I just want the Body to know that this bill needs some more negotiation; it needs more work. I do have an amendment that I was looking to file, but since we're up against the deadline, I'm unable to file that amendment in time. I'm hoping the Body will allow me a chance to send the bill over to the House for further negotiations. The opposing side is still very much opposed. They're in my office right now. We were talking about all of the things that could be negotiated and resolved in the House. And I look forward to that bill coming back over to the Senate for concurrence. So I'm open for questions and I'd be happy to receive a Yes vote with the understanding that the bill will be continued to be worked on in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. First, thank you for your courtesy on this bill and your willingness to work on it. And I'm just going to mention two things, but I don't know if this is in normal protocol or not. I'm going to ask my side to all -- all vote No and for this reason. When it gets to the House, I want them to have a heads up - "Wait a second, what's going on?" - just to keep some negotiating leverage on. And I hope that doesn't offend you that I'm approaching it that way. You have been fantastic at working with us, the other day when you came over after this, and I appreciate that. So just a couple of things that troubled me on this. First, it said that it provides for declaratory and injunctive relief, compensatory damages, and punitive damages against schools or districts who fail to exercise due diligence in responding to a student who is a parent, expectant parent, or victim of gender-based violence whose status is - and here's what I want to note you - that they know -- "knew or should have known about" the problem. And what it also does is it allows the student to go to a different district; that other district's required to waive tuition. So there's a lot of things that need to be worked on. Like I said, you've been fantastic. Hope you're not insulted by my challenge in this, but I think we want the other side now, when it goes across to the other Chamber, to understand there's still a lot to work on on this. So thank you very much. I'd request a No vote from our side on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:
Thank you, Mr. President. I have to say, you really try hard in this Body not to take things personally, but sometimes it really -- it really bites at you. Yesterday, we heard about a bill, a speech mandate, that is going to add a -- a full year's credit and I spoke up and said there was concerns with the higher ed, and your colleague said, please help me pass it over so we can continue to -- and we can work that out in the House. And that seems to be fine. Again, it's -- I -- I -- I appreciate the dynamics of what is happening here. I guess it's a matter of who we trust these days. She has committed to me. And, again, I have concerns as well. I have concerns as well. The Leader addressed them. She said she would work on 'em in the House. This is something that is important to all of us. We understand the importance of the bill. We know there's concerns. But, again, we -- there are times we try to help each other and we have to have faith in each other. So, I appreciate what our -- our Leader is doing. This is a good bill. We do need to protect students who are -- are facing these issues. Much like we supported our colleague on the right side of the aisle, I'm asking that we please support our colleague on the left side of the aisle. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I guess in the spirit of the comments that were just made, I think that we all recognize -- I mean, let's just put this issue aside for a second. I think we all recognize that there are issues that are relatively minor that we say, well, we're going to send 'em over there and work on them, and then there are issues that have a laundry list of issues that
maybe fall in a different category. And I would suspect that anyone who has served in this Chamber for more than a year or two has exercised the discretion and the difference between something that looks very objectionable and you're not sure it can be fixed and something that probably can be. So let's maybe just get off the high horses just for a second and let's just talk about what's in front of us. Will the sponsor yield, please?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Lightford -- and -- and, Senator Lightford, thank you, 'cause I know you're willing to actually discuss the merits of your bill. The -- my understanding is, your bill requires that the school district at least make some determination of whether or not there has been an occurrence of gender-based violence. Is that -- is that fair to say?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes, um-hum.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. On page 40 of the bill, starting at line 8, there is a list of individuals that the school district is not allowed to contact in its effort to make a determination of whether or not the incident actually occurred that would obviously trigger the statutory right of the student to go to any school district they want to go regardless of tuition. My question is,
and this will be the question that I will get from the school administrator, is what -- what are they to do to try and confirm that this incident actually occurred if they can't talk to the people who were involved in the incident?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

    Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I think that if you read the -- in context, it's kind of -- it's the safety measure that's needed. We're talking about gender violence. We're talking about, in some cases, hate crimes. We're talking about prejudice against a group of people for being who they are no matter what. So it's kind of like when you're in a domestic violence situation; you really don't want the perpetrator to know where the woman has taken her children or where the man has taken his self or his family as well. So this is no different. If you read the language, it says "in the case of" - and this is not all of the cases that were described, but of gender-based violence - "a school district may not contact the person named to be the perpetrator" - that's important. Why would the school district contact the perpetrator if the student is trying to get away from that situation and the perpetrator and find themself in a safe learning environment? It makes no sense that you contact the perpetrator. If you want to find out information, I can see you contacting that particular school district perhaps, finding out whatever case may have been left there, finding out if the police were informed, but I don't see you or that school district contacting the perpetrator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Righter.
SENATOR RIGHTER:

Why? I -- that's -- I don't understand why they can't talk to the alleged perpetrator or the alleged perpetrator's family or any other person named by the youth or youth's parents or guardian. I mean, why can't they talk to these people to try -- I mean -- and I'm -- this is a sincere question, Senator, because the -- the mandate involved here is significant. I mean, I think that even if we're not to -- willing to admit that, we'd hear that from our people back home. And so the district needs some kind of tool to be able to nail that issue down, so I'm -- why can't -- why can't the district go to the alleged perpetrator and ask them the question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Basic common sense. Basic common sense. If you have been inflicted harm, enough for you to leave a school district and move into an entirely separate system, you don't want the perpetrator to know. So this school district contacts the perpetrator to ask them about a case of the person, that's -- right away, they know where the -- where -- where the person is going. You've taken away the confidentiality, the safety that is required for people in domestic situations - and this is a child. This is the way we want to protect gender-based youth, gender-based youths who have been put in a situation, Senator. I think that all of the other measures that are in this bill, if you take a look, you will see that this is just that class of people that we're trying to protect on the safety piece. That's it. It doesn't say that for everything and everybody. We're talking just gender-based and that's the
LGBTQ community. And we ought to do what we can to protect that community.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

  Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

  Thank you, Mr. President. Briefly to the bill, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

  To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

  Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator Lightford, thank you for your answers to those questions. I -- I earnestly -- first of all, I believe that we should be working to protect all children regardless of -- of the specific characteristics that you lay out. To the point of a mandate, I -- I think that it would be exceedingly difficult for any district to make a determination on this, like what's being asked that they determine under this bill that triggers the mandate, if they are not allowed to have conversations, including with the person named to be the perpetrator. I mean, let's use an analogy with the police. I mean, if someone says my -- my -- my -- something was stolen from me, I mean, the person's going to be given a name or description and then they're going to go talk to the alleged perpetrator, because that's how you find out whether or not it happened, or least that's where you start. And I think that to tell the school districts they're not going to be able to do that, yet you're going to have to make a determination, and then that they're going to trigger the mandate, it is unsustainable for the school districts. Respectfully, I rise in opposition. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Leader Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want the Body to be reminded that these are victims - these are victims. And, Senator, you -- you pulled out the gender-based violence piece. You told me to turn to page 40 of the statute. I didn't identify any group. We're also talking about teen pregnancy, expectant families, all of that in this bill. You took me to gender-bias. That's the only group that we're trying to protect because they were victims and it's spelled out in the statute. I would hope that you would allow this bill a chance to go over to the House. I thank Chairman JBT for just even speaking up and acknowledging that this is something we do for each other all the time. If you choose to put red lights on the board, I just hope that when the bill comes back - as long as it gets thirty - I'm hoping that when the bill comes back and we get a chance to concur on the changes in the House that you find it to be a better bill and vote green on the next go. Thank you. I encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 449 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, there are 40 Ayes, there's 17 Nays, there are none voting Present. Senate Bill 449, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go to Senate Bill 453. Senator Aquino. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Aquino seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 453 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 453. Mr.
Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Aquino.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Aquino, on your amendment.

SENATOR AQUINO:

The -- I'll -- thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to adopt the amendment and explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 453.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Aquino, on your bill.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 453 reduces barriers for civically engaged parents and community leaders to serve as LSC members, local school council members, in Chicago Public Schools. LSCs are hyperlocal elected bodies that approve the school budget and school-based academic plan and hire and
evaluate the principal. Effective schools' LSCs reflect the diversity of their school and their community. The bill allows CPS to amend the LSC candidate eligibility so that a -- so that a parent and community member, classified as Level II volunteers -- while ensuring that LSC candidates are screened against the Sex Offender and Violent Offender Against Youth Databases. Level II volunteers and LSC members do not have unsupervised contact with students. This is an initiative in response to community requests, about which CPS, the Chicago Public Schools, tweeted out in August after a meeting that we -- quote, "We are supportive of a legislative change that would allow the district to revise our volunteer policy to classify Local School (Council) members as Level II volunteers", unquote. That was something from CPS. CPS, Chicago Public School Districts, the City of Chicago are all neutral to this bill. There was a misunderstanding in -- in committee about -- the disqualifying offenses for LSC members. The -- specifically, it has to go -- and I know my colleague on the other side is going to bring this up, but I'm going to talk about it right now. He -- he mentioned about Controlled Substance (sic) (Substances) Act. He asked if it was -- if we were taking that provision out of the law. We took out duplicative language. However, if someone has served time and -- and -- and -- and -- under the Controlled Substance (sic) Act, in this bill, it makes it a seven-year bar that they cannot be an LSC member once ending their sentence after -- for another seven years. However, the Chicago Public School Board of Education, in their rules, has it that it's a ten-year. Our -- our legislation would just -- says that it's seven years; however, it's not going to supersede what the rule of Chicago -- the Board of Education in Chicago has,
which, again, is ten-year. The only thing is that if they, by rule, want to make a change, they can only reduce it at the very least to seven years. And I repeat, the City of Chicago and Chicago Public School District, CPS, is neutral. They are not against this bill. And so I'll -- I will answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

To the bill, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Yeah, and thank you, Mr. President. I just want to read these specific disqualifiers right now. These are Class X felonies - some with at least six to thirty years prison sentences, some are more - but what we're specifically taking that's now against the law and allowing it to happen. Under this new law, it's seven years. Under Chicago Public Schools, they say ten, but we supersede with regard to the ten years. Controlled substance trafficking, criminal drug conspiracy, street gang -- gang criminal drug conspiracy. We just believe that this bill goes too far. You know, I -- I want to make a clarification here 'cause someone said this to me the other day - we need to let folks that have served their time, you know, have the ability to get out and perform well in society. I don't think anyone in this room disagrees that's definitely the case if we're talking about a person getting a job. We need to let 'em get their records cleaned up, get 'em back working. There's really, I think, a higher
standard of people who are stepping in our community as leaders. We want to make sure that there continues to be a deterrent. And -- but, right now, at least for my position on this, I think this bill goes too far too fast. And I'd request an Aye -- a No vote on it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Aquino, to close.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Yeah, I just want to reiterate that, again, this bill has a seven-year ban towards it. People have sentences of whatever, at the end of their sentence, this bill says that they cannot serve for seven years to be -- to be active in their child's education. Again, Chicago Public Schools and the City of Chicago, which is the only place that we have local school councils in, are neutral to this bill. And they asked us in a tweet to actually change the level for people to be able to be a Level II volunteer as LSC members. And so I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 453 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 35 Ayes, 19 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 453, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 455. Senator Castro. Senator Castro seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 455 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 455. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:
Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Castro.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR CASTRO:

I ask for its adoption and I'll discuss on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 455.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your bill.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. As amended, Senate Bill 455 would allow a school nurse or school administer (sic) to administer or supervise self-administration of medical cannabis infused product to a student who is registered -- a registered qualifying patient of the Medical Cannabis Pilot Program. The bill outlines requirements for parental notification, training on administration, and product storage. This is an initiative and
kind of a trailer bill for Ashley's Law. We have been working not only with Ashley's family, but also with the school district that it impacts, given to some of the concerns that currently only one person can administer that product at one particular school. So if there was another student that wanted or had a medical cannabis -- was approved for medical cannabis, the school would be stuck because they would have to only take care of that one student. There are a lot of -- I know the School Management Alliance was opposed to the bill. The Representative, Bob Morgan, said he will continue the negotiations and negotiate the bill further. But we ran up against the deadline. And I ask for a favorable motion {sic} to move it to the next Chamber.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Senator, I -- some of these questions could have come in committee, but I wasn't there, so I apologize if you covered some of this in committee. But you ran a bill last year; I don't remember specifically what it did, but it sounds eerily familiar. Can you walk me through the difference of what we did last year? I think some of us on this side of the aisle supported what you did last year. So can you walk me through what that was to this?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:
Thank you, Senator. Yes. The -- many of you did support the original Ashley's Law. And really what it was, it was a response to a federal lawsuit brought by Ashley Surin's parents because she was approved for -- she uses a patch and she used CBD oils, and so federal -- the federal case allowed for her to be using the product, but it was not administered by school officials. She had to have a registered guardian or her parents administer it. So this isn't to address that. Because, currently -- there were some restrictions about her using that on school grounds. So we clarified that and we -- thank you, I know you supported it and you voted for it, and there were a lot questions about it. But we got it out and it -- it was passed and signed by the Governor. Ashley's parents and the school administration have come and identified challenges to that, because, one, it restricts them to just Ashley and they have gotten requests from other parents who have children who are registered for the Medical Cannabis Pilot Program who might -- who want to be included. And so some of the things was -- that came up was storage, because if Ashley were to have -- you know, because she has severe epilepsy, if she were to have an incident, they don't have it on site. It's not allowed to be on -- on site because it's prohibited by law. So that -- she loses valuable time in getting treatment. And so -- also, we've included nurses, because, right now, if a nurse -- or one person's registered, they can't touch anybody else. They can't touch other students. And the administration actually asked to be considered too to be another source. So if the nurse is uncomfortable, they could do it. Now, granted, this is the administration talking and, obviously, there'll be -- there's a lot of difference of opinion on whether they want it or not, but -- so this is a -- a
bill that needs a little bit further discussion and clarification. And like I said Rep -- Bob Morgan's very versed in the issue and he was going to continue the discussion as we move forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Okay, so -- so this measure allows for more student usage, but those students would be licensed - right? - medical cardholders. It -- it enables others to administer it, like the school nurses. Can you address a little more specifically how you deal with the storage component? And also explain -- you said that School Management is opposed in its current form. Can you give us a little insight to -- to those two issues, storage and the -- the opposition?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Senator. So the storage, it will be stored just like we store any other student medication. It's locked - correct - just like any -- like EpiPens and different things. It would be specific to the student. Just like right now, it's locked up, and it would be only for that particular student. You are correct; it is only to students who have a registered card, have been approved, and doctor's, you know, approval. Not anyone can access it; it would be locked on campus as always. The student -- the School Management Alliance was just the concern about adding the administer -- administrators on it, but they were open-minded to like let's have a continued discussion and they understood we ran out of time and I said I was more than happy to allow that
discussion to happen in the House. 'Cause I think last time with Ashley's Law, I think we kind of worked on that as well. But the administration where Ashley's at says they run into -- they're starting to see requests, again, of children who have been approved of the program and that's -- they have to find a way to address that as we go on, so...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...the bill.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thanks, Mr. President. And thanks to the sponsor for that detailed elaboration. I'm -- I rise in support of this legislation. I -- it -- you know, it sounds as if there is some further work that does need to be done, that should be done in the House. I supported a -- a very similar measure last year. We debated that measure at length in committee. I found that to be good legislation. I understand there may be those on this side of the aisle who may still not support this because of the school management opposition. But I do rise in support of it. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a couple questions for the sponsor, if you don't mind.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Indicates she will yield.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Yeah, great. Thank you. We've had good conversation on this and I appreciate that. Just -- first, I want to compliment you. The CBD that you have -- were able to accomplish last year for the young lady that was here, I think it was important to her and -- and you did a good job with that. I understand what you're trying to accomplish with the convenience with regard to her parents. One question for you, are there any limitations on THC in your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator, the answer to that is no and here's why, because when you talk about THC levels - and we -- we had a good discussion in committee - it -- it -- it varies beyond patient to patient. So THC levels are determined by a medical professional, just like any other - and we had this discussion - of any other medical prescriptions you would get. We -- we defer to the medical professional to determine what is the proper amount of THC levels for that individual person. And in Ashley's case, because she had severe epilepsy, her doctors tried to identify and have identified the right THC level for her. So when you talk about THC levels, it all depends. I mean you have to think of body weight, age, I mean, different -- all kinds of different aspects to determine what is the right THC level.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:
To the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to be a No vote on this and there's a couple of things that trouble me. First, no limitations on THC. And I understand while -- there may be times that there may be some minimal part -- amount of THC that may be required, even with CBD. The fact there's no limitation on THC concerns me. And there's particularly two things about that. One of them is, I still have concerns about who's prescribing the products. Just my concern, but -- but nobody else has to feel that way. The second thing is, I still have very serious concerns about how well -- well we are able to actually monitor these products with regard to how they're coming from -- the facilities they're coming from, because it's so new in this State. I think there's a lot of unknowns about it and I think we're just getting way out ahead of ourselves with regard to allowing what could be high amounts of THC in a school setting like this. I also saw a really good report. You know, one of the biggest problems we're having with -- my concern on recreational marijuana, and it ties back into this point, is there's no steady State data you can go back to. Everything is so new. But I did see a really good article that -- going back to the seventies, measuring perceived risk versus use by teenagers, and as perceived risk goes down, use goes up. And I think the more we have this in a school setting, the more perceived risk goes down, the more use goes up. And I don't think anybody can disagree with the fact the younger a person uses these products, the more likely they are to have long-term
products (sic). I'm very concerned about perceived risk in a school setting. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

I rise in support of this piece of legislation. I think it's important to point out here that for a long time, there has been a stigma with marijuana, and specifically medical marijuana, that it's bad, because of what we've been fed for years. We have to realize that this is medicine. And the same people that are getting prescribed medical cannabis in our schools that are being locked up, secure, with administration, administration is also locking up prescribed opioids. So let's be very clear that we need to release ourselves from the stigma that marijuana is just to get high and all this, you know, all this nonsense that, you know, kids are just using this to -- to get high and -- and medical is a way to get -- get around it legally. It's not. This is a medicine. And for all those that are thinking about voting No on this, again I'll say this, the same schools that are going to be locking up medical marijuana for these students that have seizures and other disorders, they use it medically, they are also storing prescription opioids for other students with other ailments. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to close.
SENATOR CASTRO:

You know, I want to thank, you know, Senator Barickman and Senator Anderson for talking about this. This has been a very, you know, good discussion and a very respectful discussion and I appreciate their support on this, knowing that we're going to continue to work on this. I look for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 455 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? On that question, there are -- take the record. There are 52 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 455, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going go to Senate Bill 481. Senator Manar. We're going to go to Senate Bill 516. Senator Link, on 516. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Are we -- Senator Link seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 516 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 516. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Yes. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask for the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 525 {sic}. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. 5 -- please read Senate Bill 516.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 516.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to explain your bill.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is actually a very simple bill. It allows all existing riverboats to move to land-based facility. It allows riverboats to move from its current dockside location with approval of the Gaming Board, basically. And it takes off the agreement that this would have three boats on waterways in the State of Illinois. I know of no opposition to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:
Senator, this -- by moving this piece of the legislation, it's not taking away from the -- your support or your belief that there needs to be a full gaming package that we have done before; that this would just be, again, a -- a piece of it but not addressing the real gaming issue that needs to be addressed in this Session?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Maybe, with the exception of Rockford - just kidding. No this does not dilute anything. This is basically just a cleanup thing. When the City of Aurora sought to move their location, we just felt maybe it was time to clear it up for all of this. Take those three existing boats off of water. Let everybody -- the ten existing boats to go to land-based if they should decide. It was just basically cleanup over the situation of Aurora.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yeah, with that, I -- I think it's important. This was something that we talked about, again, with the large package, and as long as it doesn't, again, delay or -- or lessen the importance of the full gaming package that is needed for -- for the State of Illinois and for communities like yours and -- and -- and mine and Chicago and -- and Danville and other areas throughout the State. So with that in mind, we're happy to support this. Again, I just want to make sure our Members know this doesn't take -- can't take the focus off the -- the need for the full gaming package that's needed this year. Thank you.
Senator Link, to close.

I would just ask for an affirmative vote.

The question is, shall Senate Bill 516 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? On that question, there are -- take the record. On that question, there are -- 44 Ayes, 5 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 516, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We are now going to Senate Bill 637. Senator Muñoz. Oh! Senator Lightford, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have an opportunity now, a proud moment, to introduce to you Mrs. Illinois. She is a wonderful person, who actually is in the hospital industry at The Loretto Hospital on the West Side of Chicago. So just to show you all the beauty that comes from the West Side. Marnie Robinson is Mrs. Illinois International 2019. Marnie will be competing for the title of Mrs. International 2019 in July in Charleston, West Virginia. She is the national spokesperson for the Physicians Committee. She -- I'd like to introduce Mrs. Illinois. Marnie will be competing for the title of Mrs. International 2019 in July in Charleston, West Virginia. She is the national spokesperson for the Physician's Committee for Responsible -- for Medicine in Washington, D.C., spearheading the message about how plant-based nutrition can be used to treat, cure
chronic illness. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, please welcome Mrs. Illinois to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SENATOR WEAVER:

Matter of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Great. Honored to have Representative Sommer over here with us today and he brought along a group of guys. Guys, I just want to say that you were pretty quiet until Mrs. Illinois got up on the screen. All of sudden, I saw you all pointing up there and talking. So, Senator Lightford, you got their attention. But these are the guys from Washington, State Wrestling - the Washington High School. They're the High School State Wrestling Champs, the last four years in a row. Proud of you guys. And their coach is Nick Miller, and I hear you got more great guys coming up behind 'em as well, but you're doing a fantastic job of coaching. That's all about leadership. And, guys, we're honored to have you down here, and one thing about wrestling is you are out there by yourself. It's not like a team that can cover you when you're having a bad time; it's all by yourself and that's great stuff that'll help you in life. So we want to welcome you here. And could you join me, please, in welcoming the High School State Wrestling Champions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yes, please -- welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Muñoz.
Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Muñoz seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 637 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, Senate Bill -- is Senate Bill 637. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Mr. President, I would ask for its adoption and I will explain on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of -- of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 637. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 637.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
As amended, the -- the bill requires the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to reimburse for custom prosthetic and orthotic devices at the Medicaid rate minus six percent and prohibits HFS and MCOs from providing less favorable coverage for prosthetic and orthotic devices than coverage for other medical and surgical benefits.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? I'd ask the Chamber to please hold your conversations down. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yes, question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, I supported -- I supported this when it came out of committee just so it -- discussions could continue, but the concern is, at a time when our -- our Medicaid budget is struggling and we have -- we have so many individuals asking for rate increases, that it becomes more difficult. This is one that there may be a need for this, but the concern is that we're -- we're stepping in and setting -- setting a price of what -- what Medicaid or what a Medicaid managed care company would pay for equipment even if they could obtain that equipment at a lower price than what this would be. And so I guess the -- the -- the question is, what's -- is this coming from a particular group that is having a struggle competing with -- with those groups or what is the -- what's -- what's driving the need for this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.
SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Senator, I had a meeting with -- Theresa Olson (sic) from HFS as well as some of the MCOs who had showed some concerns. When we did the amendment, it took everything out and we're not doing a rate right now. And I think if this were to become law, I think it might be, think, 2.5 million. We're not exact -- sure on that. But, for right now, we -- there is no money for that. And you're right, their doing the Medicaid negotiations right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSE:

Has -- maybe I missed that then. So the amendment takes out the rate, the -- the -- the rate that was set in here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Correct. Only for managed care, it takes it out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSE:

For -- okay. So it -- but it still -- the -- the legislation still exists for the fee-for-service portion of it, just not the managed care portion?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

That's correct, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.
SENATOR SYVERSON:  
Then why are we doing it for just the fee-for-service side?  
Is that -- has there been a different rate than what has been --  
MCOs have been getting?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:  
We don't set rates for managed care in statutes.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:  
Do we set the rates on the -- on the fee-for-service side for  
the Department?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:  
It depends on the service for the Department.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:  
Does the -- does the Department support this legislation as  
it stands right now?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:  
Yes, they do.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:
Okay. I had -- again, I had heard they're -- that they were neutral, but -- so, in the end, what you're saying is, if this becomes law as it's written right now, it would set what the reimbursement rate would be at a Medicare plus number and that number was -- is estimated to be at two and a half million more than what the fee-for-service is currently getting -- or paying for that same equipment now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Okay. Thank you. Again, that's -- I -- I appreciate that and appreciate the fact that the Department's gone neutral. I guess I always -- the concern is, at a time when we get all these small amounts, whether it's three million or ten million, when we -- if we start -- keep adding up all these different ones, it starts to have a major effect on -- on -- on our Medicaid overall budget. So I would just ask Members to be mindful of -- that this is a -- an increased cost to the budget and to the Medicaid budget and they just have to vote how they -- how they feel, if this is a priority. Thank you, Senator. Thank you for your -- taking the time to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz, to close.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
Senator, I -- I agree with you one hundred percent. This was brought to me. And initially, Senator Steans, who's part of that -- negotiations, as well as on your side of the aisle, I had just asked if there is money, and when they sit and talk about it, that we can do this for people who need the special prosthetics. Certainly, you know, our State only can do what they can for right now. And, again, this is subject to if the money is in there. That's all we're asking for this. We're not mandating it. We don't have the money yet. And the negotiations are still going on from all Chambers. And I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 637 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 42 voting Aye, 4 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. On that -- Senate Bill 637, having received the required constitutional amendment {sic}, is declared passed. We'll now go to Senate Bill 946. Senator McClure. Senator McClure seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 946 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 946. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Yes. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator McClure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator McClure, on your amendment.

SENATOR McCLURE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask to adopt the amendment and then I'll address that on 3rd Reading.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading.  Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 946.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 946.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator McClure, on your bill.

SENATOR McCLURE:

Thank you, Mr. President.  This is a piece of legislation that is brought on behalf of the family of Jonny Wade.  Jonny Wade was a seven-year-old who lived in my district, in Jerseyville, who was diagnosed with cancer and he lived almost a year after that diagnosis before he passed away.  And the family has -- has brought his fight all over the State and all over the country to try to stop this horrible disease that -- that affects so many kids.  Now what this bill does is it allows for the Department of Human Services to create pediatric cancer awareness decals.  It's going to raise awareness about pediatric cancer and it's also going to raise money for pediatric cancer.  It was on the agreed bill list in committee and I know of no opposition.  And I'm happy to take any questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 946 pass.  All those in favor, vote Aye.  Opposed, Nay.  The voting is open.  Have all voted who wish?  Have -- you guys got to be quick.  Have all voted who wish?  Have all voted who wish?  Take the record.  On that question, there are 56 voting Yes, none voting Nay, none voting Present.  Senate Bill 946, having received the required constitutional amendment, is declared passed -- majority, is declared passed.  Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.  I had had my light on.  I had a couple questions I wanted to ask Senator McCann {sic}, but I guess if -- if -- if this -- if it's already passed, we'll address it the next time.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...your point.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.  My intention on Senate Bill 177 was to vote No and I would like the record to so reflect my intention.  Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The record will so reflect.  Senator Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR ROSE:
And so, having voted on the prevailing side of Senator McClure's first bill, perhaps we could just start this thing over and treat it properly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yeah, we'll get back to you. Now on Senate Bill 1124, Senator Link. Senate Bill 11 -- 1226. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 1226.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. This bill is going to abolish the State Charter School Commission, removing the ability of any State entity to overturn the decision of a local school board to deny a charter school application. The initiative would create a charter school application process where only local elected school boards and parents could decide if a charter school's good for their community. The legislation places all currently existing charter schools authorized by the Commission under the authority of the Illinois State Board of Education beginning June (sic) of 2020. No existing charter schools will be harmed by this bill. This is not an anti-charter school bill. Quite simply, this is a bill saying charter schools should be approved by locally elected school boards and supported by the community before they are allowed to open. I would ask for an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill -- Senator Weaver, I apologize. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:  
Thank you, Mr. President. And I understand you're trying to move us quickly. Just have a -- a couple questions for the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR WEAVER:  
Great. Thank you. Is this true, that this bill's also moving right now in the House?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:  
Yes. There's a very similar bill. I'm not sure if all the amendments are tied together. I think they are pretty close, if not. I mean, they will be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)  
Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:  
I -- I could've accomplished this in one question instead of two. But it's my understanding those negotiations are moving very well. They're trying to come to a good conclusion. And we just feel that this bill's getting out ahead of that. Is there a reason why we have to move this bill today as opposed to waiting, letting that bill move its course? This is a very important issue. Of course, you know what happened with it last year. And it's something that if we can come to a good conclusion, we want to,
but I don't see the purpose of moving this bill at this time. Would you like to explain that to me, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes. The -- the sponsor of the House bill and I are in the same negotiations with people and these changes have been done on both bills. So we're moving ahead because whichever one we can move first, we should move first. But they are going to be the same bill. We will end up concurring. So it looks like this one is moving slightly ahead. We might as well move this one and be done with it. And if we move it, the House will sit back. But all negotiations have been done jointly on these bills. They are the same bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Just to the bill, please, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...bill.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Great. Thank you. So there's one thing that's interesting about this bill that concerns us. The charter school -- the charters would have no recourse, even if the local school boards don't act within the timelines written in the law. You know, when we look at where these -- how these commissions have functioned in the past, we -- we all understand the politics that can happen on the local school board level and sometimes the best decisions aren't made. In fact, it is good to have some other group of
people that could take a look at 'em in a less biased perspective. And a lot of these actions that happen at the local level, they get denied at the local level, so many of 'em don't even go for appeal because they shouldn't go for appeal. But of those that have gone for appeal - I believe the number is forty-eight that have appealed so far - only six were passed. The guidelines for how they get passed are very clear. It's not abused by the Commission. The Commission's trying to do the best things for kids, avoiding what be -- may be happening on a local school board election with the politics of local school board. This has been an extremely good process. We hear great things about it and there certainly has not been abuse by the Commission. When you think of only six schools that actually won their appeal out of forty-eight, I think that's just a really good guideline that's been in place in the past. It's one that should continue. So I'd request a No vote on this bill going forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. And, you know, I -- while I have the greatest respect for the sponsor of this bill - I think her and I have had some discussions about this - I represent a lot of charter school districts -- schools in my district and these are great schools that are Level 1 schools that are in a bind. We don't have an elected school board in the City of Chicago and I think this is the only entity that is right now available to them for any kind of appeals. And I think taking this out right now without even check -- you know, making sure that the Governor's folks are involved and making -- and -- if this is going to be
signed into law or that there's some more -- there's going to be some more amendments that might be -- that might come in that will make this maybe easier for a lot of us who are charter schools; that we support our charter schools like we support our neighborhood schools. But it's kind of hard when we don't have an elected school board in the City of Chicago. This is a way that they can go and appeal this process. And I think until that happens, I think we should just let the Commission alone and let's continue to work with them, because at the end of the day, that's the only system that right now is in play for people to be able to go and appeal if there is -- you know, if there's an appeal process. And right now, in lack of the fact that we don't have an elected school board, I think that's the only answer that we have right now for the charter schools, so I -- you know, for someone like myself and many people that have charter schools in their district. This is all public education and I really believe that we can all work together to make sure that our neighborhood schools, our charter schools, all of our schools that receive public education dollars are doing the very best for our children. So I'm going to be a -- a -- a No vote on this for the simple fact that I think we can continue to work on this bill and -- and -- and try to just -- this elimination of the Charter School Commission for the past three and four years, I think we have to really just take a look at what's going on and work together for a better -- you know, for something better for our -- our charter school that works.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hastings.

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

I know we spoke on this before, Senator Holmes, but I also too have a charter school in my district and not that I support all charter schools, but there is one question that was posed to me by my community, was in the event that this is abolished, will the existing charter schools be subject to the State Board of Education for oversight for existing charter schools?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes. Oversight will be by the State Board of Education.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Van Pelt.

SENATOR VAN PELT:

I have a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

She indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR VAN PELT:

Senator, have you talked to the people at the Commission to try to figure out a way to get a bill that they can agree on with you on this? Instead of abolishing it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

May -- may I -- may I just say, and many of you have seen this bill before, and the reason you've seen it before is I've
only worked on this for six years. We passed it out of both Chambers last year. The only difference was, was the Governor did veto it last year. So, yes, we have had numerous talks. One thing I do want to say is, the reason I am such a proponent of this, we had this issue arise in Aurora where a charter tried to come in, much to the dismay of our local community. So I do believe - I'm a huge local government advocate - I do believe that we elect our local school boards so it is elected people that are held accountable for what the community wants, and I want to make sure that still stands. Also, for the record, I do want to state that the State Charter School Commission has overturned local school boards nine times. Quite honestly, those are locally elected people; that's a locally elected board. That is nine times too many.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Van Pelt.

SENATOR VAN PELT:

Yes, so it's been nine times in how many years?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Disregarding what the local elected people want for their community should not happen once. Nine times too many. It's been how many years? It's been a number of years.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Van Pelt.

SENATOR VAN PELT:

You do not know how many, though? How many years it's been.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

I can find out. I don't know that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Van Pelt.

SENATOR VAN PELT:

Let me say, just coming from a impoverished community, growing up in an impoverished community, I know local control does not always equal justice. It doesn't always equal fairness. And it does not always take in concern -- take in -- into account what the people in the -- that community or that area are suffering through. Two of my high schools, the last time I did the research, had -- one of 'em had a hundred percent chronic truancy. The -- another one had eighty percent chronic truancy. When you got situations like that, you need somebody else that you can appeal to, to try to get you access to -- to equity and justice. I support the Charter School Commission largely because I think when you look at what's -- what is happening in our education system in Illinois, we really need to try out different things. And one of the things I know about charter schools was that charter schools were created -- were created as a experiment so we can try to see what does work, what can work, and what changes we can bring into our local schools to make them better. Eliminating the chance for people to be able to appeal or a group -- community groups to be able to appeal the system that they are forced to live under, I think it's overstepping our boundaries as a government. So I urge -- I urge my -- my Senator to really reconsider this bill and try to work something out. I don't -- whatever it is you're trying to get to, you know, I can support us making some changes, but
abolishment to me is overstepping our -- our -- overstepping the desires of the people in the community. In fact, there are fifteen thousand people in Chicago right now signed up to get in a charter school, just waiting. So abolishing an opportunity for -- for people to appeal, for communities to appeal, I think is wrong. And so, therefore, I cannot support the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Oberweis. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I stand in strong support of Senator Holmes -- Leader Holmes' legislation. I come from the same impoverished community and I know how charter schools have taken advantage of the fifty school closings that took place in Chicago because of a lack of resources going into our public school system. They still use State dollars to go to these charter schools and, of course, many schools have been decimated because the charter schools use public monies to advertise that they're better than the neighborhood schools. You cannot have a stable community when you close down fifty schools and then set up these schools. There's no guarantee that the charter schools are any better. Matter of fact, the latest data indicate that they do not do as well as some of the neighborhood schools that supposedly were closed. So I stand in strong support of that. In my community, a Charter Commission came in, overriding the area's local school council and the Chicago Public School Board in reference to setting up a charter school; they later had to close it because they found out it was by the Turkish government. It was being run by Turkey and -- and no community teachers were involved and it was complete outside
control of the CPS. I stand in strong support. We need strong neighborhood schools. If you're coming up in a community, you want your child to go to a school that has all the resources to provide all the advantages. Charter schools were started as an experiment, but they have taken it where -- they were supposed to take the best of -- best practices and put it back into the neighborhood schools and they failed to do that because they're using our schools as a -- our students as commodities. I'm tired of these experiments on our students. They need to have strong neighborhood schools where they can stay in a stabilized community. I ask for a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator Holmes, does this bill allow for the State Board of Education to review appeals?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes, it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you. I forgot to ask if the sponsor will yield, Mr. President. I was...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

I think she will.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

...ready to dive in. Thank you. Because I think part of the
point that's missing is that the charters' commission is being abolished with the responsibility to go back to the Illinois State Board of Ed, which is where it was when we, the government, established them in the first place. So it's all governments' business to get involved in this issue because there was a overstep of boundaries of what the Charter School Commission was supposed to do. They began to identify with the national charter school people, brought in this guy, who you can pull him up on the webpage and see that he's the President of the National Charter School Association. He's involved in closing down schools. The Charter School Commission should be level. It shouldn't be someone that's party to favoring charter schools or against charter schools. I'm not against charter schools. I used to believe that they were the worst thing that could happen. There are some signs of some good charter schools. Not all charter schools are performing at the levels that they should be and they're good; neither are all public schools providing the services that they should and that they're all bad or good either. We have to fix our school system. Now the thing for me is that this isn't a new issue. This is not a new issue with the Charter School Commission. They've overstepped their boundaries before. They've shown it time and time and again, and this is the best way to do it. Any school district or any group that wants to go into a school district can still appeal it at the State level, but the responsibility will go back to us, the State Board of Education, where the responsibility should be, because they're the ones who should be overseeing all of our schools in the State of Illinois and not creating separate. It should all be equal. It shouldn't be a separate entity that's biased and unable to make level decisions. Anyone can come to
them to appeal a charter, knowing that the school district and the
community doesn't want it, but if they want to come, they shouldn't
be coming to an entity that's funding charter school organizations,
that's funding giving them money for startup charter schools. This
is what the testimony has been over the years and the proof has
shown over the years. I rise in strong support in this -- of this
legislation. They should be able to appeal but not to a board
that we created that overstepped their boundaries. They should
appeal to a system that we govern here in the State of Illinois
and that will be the State Board of Ed. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

I was just -- I was originally going to -- I was going to
vote for this bill. I had my mind made up and then my -- my
service academy colleague told me about how school boards do
terrible things sometimes. But then I also remember that there is
a mechanism to correct the mistakes that school boards make - it's
called local school board elections. We just had some vigorously
contested elections back in my district. All I ask is just that
we be -- that we try to be consistent. I think we owe that to the
people that sent us here. If you believe in local control, I think
you need to vote for this legislation. And I would urge an Aye
vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Holmes, to close.

SENATOR HOLMES:

I want to say thank you to my colleagues on both sides of this opinion for their lively discussion here. I do want to say, CPS does support this legislation. And to the last speaker's point, if you're not happy with what your local school board does, you do vote them out of office. It's like saying, if you're not happy with what those of us that are elected to represent certain districts throughout this State, if you don't like what we're doing, you certainly have the option at the next election to vote us out of office. And the last thing I did want to say before I go ahead and ask for the vote on this is a local appeal route for charter schools does already exist. Local voters can also petition to have the question of establishing a charter school placed on the ballot of the next regularly scheduled election. I want to thank everybody. This really is an important issue I've been working on for about the past six years. I'd appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1226 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Ayes, 11 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1226, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We are going to Senate Bill 1240. Senator Link. We're going to Senate Bill 1255. Senator Hastings. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 1255.
3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hastings, on your bill.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1255 provides, with the 2019-2020 academic year, the Illinois Veteran's grant may be transferred to qualified dependents between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six. I'll answer any questions. There's no opposition. This bill is only with a committee amendment on it. And I'll answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1255 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Yeas, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1255, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go to Senate Bill 1453. Senator Link. Senate Bill 1473. Senator Hunter. Senate Bill 1536.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 1536.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to explain your bill.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Illinois Municipal
Code. Provides that -- that the imposition of -- of term limits by referendum, ordinance, or otherwise must be prospective, and apply to the same category of the office. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, for those of us who have been enjoying the debate and discussion over local control, this will be a fascinating topic to discuss. Senator Link, as I understand your bill, it would, by State statute, change the meaning of referendums passed by a group of municipalities after 2016 with regards to their term limits language. Is that accurate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

I'm sorry, I -- I didn't hear the total question, Senator Righter. I apologize.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Link, as I understand your bill, it would, by State statute, if it became law, take a set of municipal referendums that were passed on term limits that made term limits not only prospective, but retroactive, and mandate
they'd be applied prospective only. Is that a fair characterization of what the bill does?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Why do you feel as though we here in this Chamber or -- or in the Capitol building should be changing for those residents the referendum they intentionally adopted saying they wanted term limits not only to apply prospectively, but for years they had served in the past as well? Why are we doing this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Senator, you know, it's a good -- a great question and -- and I mean, the point is that there may have been reasons why the local municipality did it and it may not have been the positive way of doing it, and what we're doing is we're making this prospective. And the reason is, if they want to have term limits on aldermen - I'll use that for an example - God bless that they have -- they can have term limits on aldermen. They want to have term limits on mayor - God bless them, they should have it. But they shouldn't have a term limit just saying if you were an alderman for seven/eight years, you were ineligible to run for mayor. I don't think that's what term limits were ever designed for in any municipality, any states that have term limits. In states that
have term limits for the General Assembly, you can run for so many years as a State Rep, but you also then can run for so many years as a State Senator. I have no problem with them enacting this locally if they did it in that manner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

    Senator Link, on the previous bill, which you voted in favor of, on the charter schools thing, the argument was local control. These residents of these municipalities exercised their right to say we want term limits and this is how we want our term limits to apply. Explain to me how you or I or the other fifty-seven Senators in this Chamber are better equipped or able or entitled to say what those municipalities do with regards to term limits and the voters in those municipalities. Reconcile that issue for me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

    First of all, I don't want you to put words in my mouth to say the reason that I voted positive on that last was because of local control. Reason I voted positive on that bill, I don't think charter schools in my particular area are working. There's facts and figures as -- showing that they're not working and they're jamming it down the throats of the locals. So that's the reason I voted the way. As far as this, yeah, I think we do know a little bit more about election laws than most locals do. I've been working on election laws for, oh, forty years. So, I mean, I think I know a little bit about election laws and I think that this is the -- is the intent of a -- a referendum. Of putting it on to
say that you can't run for any office after you've served so many years, I don't think that was ever the intent for referendums on term limits.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You know, first of all, Senator Link, I -- I apologize for putting words in your mouth on that issue. You're right. We should talk about this issue on the merits. Last year, this bill, on the merits, failed in this Chamber and here's why, because this bill doesn't take all municipal referendums that were approved by voters that said we're going to have term limits apply retroactively and prospectively; it only selects those that were passed after 2016. And there's a very good reason for that and that is because we are looking at one municipality and one legislator, a Democrat in the House of Representatives who wants to run for mayor in his community again, but his community passed term limits including a retroactive provision that prevents him from doing this. That's why we are having this debate. If there was such a philosophical opposition to term limits that are retroactive, then why are we only talking about the municipalities {sic} that were adopted after a certain date? We voted this down last year because enough of us said, you know what, this is absolutely not what we should be doing - telling the voters in those communities, you know what, thanks for expressing your
opinion, but we don't really care what you think 'cause we got a
guy over here, across the -- across the hall in the House, who
wants to run for mayor of one of these communities, so we're just
going to change your view. Oh! This is not what we should be
doing. Please vote No. Thank you, Mr. President.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to close.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, there's more than
one person involved in this. And the other thing is, this is a
different bill than what we passed last year -- or was defeated.
It was passed in the House with ninety-nine votes, so it was a
bipartisan vote in the House that voted for it. But this is
different; it's prospective. We didn't blow up the referendums.
I have no problem -- I'm not for term limits, but if a municipality
wants to have a term limit on their aldermen or a term limit on
their mayor, God bless 'em, they can do it, but it shouldn't be
together in saying that if you were an alderman for so many years,
you can't run for mayor, or vice versa. I think this is rectifying
a situation with -- which misled the voters and I think we should
get this consistent with State statutes on election laws. I would
ask for an affirmative vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1536 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 30 Yeas, 19 Nays,
none voting Present. Senate Bill 1536, having received the
required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going
to -- with leave of the Body, we're going to go back to Senate Bill... Yes, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I would like to verify that most recent roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

There's been a request for a verification. Mr. Secretary, would you please put votes -- ring the bell and put the votes on the board. Senator Righter has requested verification. Will all Members please be in their seats? Mr. Secretary, please read the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:


PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Does Senator Righter question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is Senator Bush in the Chamber? Senator Bush in the Chamber? Mr. Secretary, please strike her name. Senator Righter, do you question the presence of any other Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Senator Bennett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett? Senator Bennett? Mr. Secretary, please strike that name. Senator Righter, do you question the presence of any other Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

No, Mr. President. I think we're done. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Having failed to receive the required constitutional majority... Mr. Secretary, please add Senator Bush to the roll. On a verified roll call, there are 29 Yeas, 19 Nays, none voting Present. Having -- having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1536 is declared failed.

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Mr. President, I would ask that we put this bill on Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, please place this bill on Postponed Consideration. With leave of the Body, we're going to return to Senate Bill 1473. Senator Hunter. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 1473.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hunter, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HUNTER:
Thank you, Mr. President. 1473 allows an individual who has had their license suspended the second time for failure to pay child support may have that suspension lifted if they have entered into a payment plan approved by the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. This is an initiative of the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Healthcare and Family Services. And I know of no opposition of this bill. It was negotiated jointly by those two Departments and I would ask for a favor -- ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the Senate -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 1473 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 Yea, 10 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1473, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go to Senate Bill 1592. Senator Sims. 8 -- Senate Bill 1828. Senate Bill 1828. Senator Bush, on 1878 (sic). Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Oh, Senator Bush seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1828 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1828. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments to be -- approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask that we adopt the
amendment and I'll explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

Now on the Order of 3rd Reading... 3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1828. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 1828.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. SB 1828 is the Overdose Prevention and Harm Reduction Act. This is a bipartisan bill that builds on past State and federal efforts to combat the opioid epidemic and save the lives of the thousands of Illinoisans who are struggling with opioid addiction. As you know, the crisis continues to ravage all parts of our State, from the rural areas to the suburbs to the City of Chicago. Few people remain untouched by this epidemic and, unfortunately, it shows no signs of going away or improving here in the State of Illinois. Almost three thousand Illinoisans died of a drug overdose last year and Illinois has experienced the highest rate of increase in overdose deaths of any state in the
Midwest in recent years. We must do more to slow it down and ultimately -- reverse this crisis. So this is a recommend -- what it includes is recommendations that the State should promote in the Drug Overdose Prevention Program administered by DHS and additional ways to support existing programs. Creates the syringe -- syringe access program under IDPH, and lastly, it creates an annual report on the opioid epidemic to include not only information about overdose deaths, but annual updates on the inventory of our treatment capacity, including medication-assisted treatment. This is an effort that certainly -- I represent parts of Lake County. This is -- we've certainly seen a lot done in Lake County, I know as many of us have, to deal with the opioid epidemic that has just been a -- an unbelievable crisis across the country. I know of no opposition. I appreciate the bipartisan support we have on this bill and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do rise in support and commend the sponsor for her work on this very important issue that touches every one of our districts throughout the entire State. So, again, I rise and I commend her and we ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.
SENATOR SYVERSON:
Thank you. A question of the sponsor.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Sponsor indicates she'll yield. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:
Senator, there's a number of things that are in -- in this that I understand and makes -- and it makes sense. There's one provision and I've talked to the Heartland people about it as well, but there's one provision that I -- I -- I just want to clarify. In there, it -- it talks about that a individual -- as it -- as it expands, like the needle exchange program, to do a few more things. So, in -- in there, there's a provision that says that an individual can bring their -- their drugs into one of these facilities, whether it's a needle exchange, a -- a stand-alone program, or to the health department if they're doing the needle exchange, they can bring their substance in and then the staff would test those drugs to determine the composition of those drugs and then give the drugs back to the individual, letting them know that the drugs are -- are, I guess, of the proper substance or may not contain a other significant problem, Fentanyl or anything else, in there. So can you give me a little -- an idea of what the -- what the rationale was to have county health departments taking -- taking drugs from residents, checking on the purity of it, and then giving those drugs back to the residents?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:
I -- I certainly wouldn't describe it that way. What I would say is that we're dealing with people that have addiction issues.
And what happens certainly - I -- I know you know, Senator - is, you know, this changes your actual brain structure. And we're really trying to help people, so we're not asking a health department or anyone else to take those drugs. What we are allowing by this, what would be allowed if you set up one of these programs, a health department or someone like that, is someone could come in with the drug that they are addicted to, they could ask for and receive a test strip to look at it themselves, or if they needed help doing that, someone there could provide assistance in testing it. And I also want to be clear. It sounds like we're allowing people to come in, test drugs, use them, and then leave. This is not the case. You're not using the drugs there. We're just trying to make sure that they have access to clean needles, that -- that when they are users that there is a place they can leave and drop off sharps and we can take care of those things. But -- but, most importantly, we're trying to keep people alive and there are -- hopefully, there's help there. It is the intent to help these people once they get there, to talk about what are the programs that are available for them to deal with their addiction issue and figure out how to live a full and productive life, and have that support. So I would disagree that that's what we are asking a health department -- or allowing a health department to do. They deal with these individuals today. This is allowing for the creation of - and this is done in twenty-five states, I believe - allowing the creation of this kind of program for a health department that wants to do that. And I know you also asked, Senator - and I -- I know that Heartland did get back to you - I know you had some concerns about the liability. So I just want to make sure to indicate that staff and participants are
immune from criminal prosecution for possession of drug consumption supplies, any residue of used supplies, drug testing supplies, and any residue. It does not provide immunity for possessing drugs themselves.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

The -- I guess my -- my question -- and -- and the giving individuals the -- the test strips, that I can understand. I guess my understanding was that this does allow them to provide the substance to the staff that would do -- that could do further testing than just providing the test strips to those individuals, and then, again, my concern would just be what -- what potential liability exposure does it put on county taxpayers if they're -- if they're taking in these -- if they're taking in the drugs and they're testing 'em and then giving 'em back and, if there was a reaction or something happened to that individual, does it open up -- potentially open up the county to problems of the family coming back and -- and suing because they said, well, the drugs were -- were pure enough and a -- and their son or daughter still died from this. So, I guess I just want some clarification on that. It seems like it's more than just giving test strips; that it's actually allowing an organization to take -- to take the drugs and test them for more than just the test strip would do for Fentanyl. Am I missing something on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

So, thank you, Senator Syverson. I thought that -- I had
understood that your questions had been answered. Maybe they haven't been. Happy to maybe dig in a little bit more deeply on that. You know, we believe that there is no liability - that's our understanding. And -- and happy to see if we can find something. I don't think I can answer it any more succinctly for you right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Syverson. Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

    To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    To the bill.

SENATOR MORRISON:

    As a fellow Lake County legislator, I rise in strong support of Senate Bill 1828. This is modeled after some of the very good work that's taken place in Lake County and it -- promotes best practices in overdose prevention and programming, evidence-based treatment, overdose education, distribution of naloxone, and syringe access programming. A lot of people's lives have been saved. This is a template for other communities to use and I strongly support this measure.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Bush, to close.

SENATOR BUSH:

    Thank you, Senator Morrison and Senator Rezin. I truly appreciate your support. And, Senator Syverson, I understand and -- and will try to find really succinct information for you. I would just ask for an Aye vote. This is just -- it -- it's one more step in what we know has to be a much more holistic way that
we are looking at addiction and mental health. Frankly, these are diseases and we need to begin to look at them the same way that we look at diseases that we recognize. You know, someone who is a diabetic, it is a lifetime of care. And those are the things that we need to begin to look at if we are to believe that we can finally start to address some of these crises. And I would ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1828 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, there are 46 voting Aye, 3 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1828, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to return to -- page 5, Senate Bill 75. Senator Villivalam seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 75 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 75. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Villivalam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam, would you please explain your amendment?

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

Senate Floor Amendment 2 would add the definition of "sexual assault" per the request of the casino industry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 75. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 75.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam.

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 75 would require hotels, motels, and casinos to provide employees who work in isolated spaces with safety devices or electronic notification devices for use if they are sexually harassed or assaulted. Additionally, it requires hotels, motels, and casinos to have anti-sexual harassment policies. A 2016 report in the Chicago -- said, in the Chicago area, fifty-eight percent of hotel workers and seventy-seven percent of casino workers have been sexually harassed by a guest. It's time to act. No worker should feel unsafe in their work environment. I know of no opposition. The Illinois Gaming Board is in support, amongst other labor and women's groups. The Illinois Hotel and Motel (sic) (Lodging) Association, Illinois Casino and -- Gaming Association, the Illinois Chamber are neutral. And I would ask for an Aye vote, respectfully.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

I just want to rise in strong support of this bill. This was something that we talked about in the Sexual Harassment Task Force last year and Senator Villivalam was very interested in the topic and -- and agreed to run this bill and did some wonderful work with the Hotel Association. I know they're in agreement and -- and, really, they're just doing fabulous work out there. It is really heartening to see the business community coming forward and working with us on pieces of legislation that will protect women and men and gender -- other gender identifieds as -- and protect them from sexual harassment. So, I just want to say thank you for this. I -- I certainly hope we have a unanimous vote. Thanks, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Tracy.

SENATOR TRACY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Questions of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR TRACY:

Yes, Senator Villivalam, does your -- your -- I'm trying to go through your Amendment 2 and see what all it addresses, and what I want -- because originally when the Hotel Association was in town, the smaller downstate hotels were vehemently opposed. And does your legislation, whether it be Amendment 2 or as a whole, does it address the size of the facility?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam.
SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

So -- thank you for your question, Senator. A couple things. One is we worked incredibly closely with the Illinois Hotel and Motel {sic} Association, which represents hotels and motels across the State. We did a couple things. One, we pushed back the effective date to make sure that they had time to accommodate this -- this new legislation. Two, we expanded the definition in terms of the type of device that could be used, whether it's a safety device or electronic notification device. That was a concern, specifically to your point, where downstate and central hotels and motels may not have the exact same technologies as urban centers, and so by expanding that definition, we were able to accommodate part of their concerns. Again, we worked hand in hand every step of the way with the Illinois Hotel and Motel {sic} Association. Let me be clear, they're doing amazing work with their five-point plan to get to where this legislation goes. And we -- we tried to address all of their concerns and that's why I think they're neutral.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Tracy.

SENATOR TRACY:

And also, what is the effective date?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam.

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

July 1, 2020.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator... I'm sorry.

SENATOR TRACY:
And also, as far as, say, a bed and breakfast, is that also included?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam.

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

So, yeah, and -- they -- they -- they would be included if they meet the definition of a hotel and motel, one; two, if they have workers in isolated spaces, which is what this legislation specifically refers to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Tracy.

SENATOR TRACY:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill itself.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR TRACY:

Yes, I -- I -- it sounds like you've done an incredible amount of work, Senator. When the Hotel Association was in town, say, a month ago, they made specific -- they -- they very specifically were very concerned about this bill. It was their -- one of their very top priorities. And I wish I had heard from them, as we're voting on this, because even with the changes that you've made and what -- their concerns to me as the ability to do this and -- and the thought that it -- it just wasn't a risk factor within their smaller hotels or motels, and certainly in a bed and breakfast, that they would not be okay with this. And so, since I've heard from many constituents that work in this industry that have not gotten back to me, I cannot support your legislation. So I -- I understand within the hotel -- in the Chicago area, they're already
in the midst of doing this, but I still haven't heard from my
downstate hotels that they are okay with this change because it --
it still doesn't address all the concerns that they had that they
brought to me. So, thank you, though. I appreciate your
answers and comment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam, to close.

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

Yes, and I -- and I would -- I -- I thank the -- the Senator's
comments... I -- I thank -- I thank the Senator's comments from the
other side of the aisle. I just want to stress, once again, we
worked hand in hand with the Illinois Hotel and Motel {sic}
Association every step of the way. We accommodated them on the
effective date. We accommodated them on the type of technology to
be -- as inclusive as possible for every type of establishment.
They are neutral. In fact, they're doing this to some extent and
-- in terms of their five-point plan. We -- we worked with the
casino industry, Caesars Entertainment. They're -- they're doing
work on this as well. I -- I -- I know of no opposition and I --
again, I would like to thank Senator Bush for her leadership on
this issue and I would respectfully ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 75 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 issue, there are 51 voting Yea, 3 voting
Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 75, having received the
required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Now to page
37. Senate Bill 1829. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, please read
the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 1829.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This is a bill that I -- I'd really like to thank so many people for all the work that's been done on this. You know, last year we had a task force that really just did some yeoman's work on sexual harassment discrimination and -- and we passed some pretty strong laws that impact what happens under the Dome. The task force ended, we released a report, and in it were some recommendations about what should be done in the private sector. And that's what this bill reflects. This is an omnibus bill. It represents a compromise. Thank you. The amendment represents a compromise between the business community, employee advocates, and the Department of Human Rights. The amendment strengthens the definition of "harassment" based on someone's actual, excuse me, or perceived gender; provides protections against discrimination in sexual harassment for nonemployees; provides additional civil remedies and protection against child sex abuse for youth athletes playing at the -- at athletic facilities throughout the State; creates limitations on NDAs, nondisparagement clauses, and arbitration clauses in cases involving sexual harassment, discrimination, retaliation...
Excuse -- excuse me, Senator. Can we have it a little more quiet in the Chamber? It's very hard to hear.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr. President. Requires employees (sic) throughout the State to disclose the number of settlements and adverse judgments against them involving sexual harassment; requires mandatory sexual harassment training for all employees throughout the State; and expands VESSA to include victims of sexual harassment. I could certainly go on. I want to thank the -- truly the business community, who were at the table. The Chamber is neutral on this bill, the Illinois Chamber, and, frankly, was just at a press conference with us and stood with us to talk about how important it is that we deal with sexual harassment in a proactive way. So proud of the work. So proud of Ashley Stead, who many of you know. She's an attorney that I can't even imagine how many hours she spent working on this bill. So I want to say thank you to her. I'm happy to answer any questions. Again, thank you, to my cochair last year, Senator Tracy, for her work on the task force. And I'm happy to answer any questions. I look forward to getting this out of the Senate, over to the House, so we can call it for a vote and create a new law in the State of Illinois called the Workplace Transparency Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Curran.

SENATOR CURRAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR CURRAN:
I -- I rise in support of this legislation. I want to compliment the sponsor. I was a member of the Sexual Harassment Task Force. She has -- Senator Bush has worked tirelessly for two years on this issue, but has really done a great job in bringing all sides to the table, having a very open process, with one goal in -- in -- in -- one goal in mind, which is taking a big step forward, which I believe this legislation does, in this State in providing a safe, harassment-free workplace for all. And -- and that is very important. That is something we endeavor to do. I really -- I'm very proud of the work that this task force did under her leadership and Senator Tracy's leadership. And this bill, while an omnibus and -- and a lot of components collectively, it empowers employers to provide that safe, harassment-free workplace. So I compliment her on this bill and -- and very proud to support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I just wanted to also rise and second Senator Curran's response -- or comments on this thing and say a warm thank you to my sister colleagues, Senator Bush and Senator Tracy, and their leadership on this task force, and remind folks that this was an outgrowth that happened last year and when the Senate women decided to come together and to create a caucus, we were the only ones in this building that did it in a bipartisan way. And that was
something that we need to remain proud of, especially when it comes to issues of import like this that means so much to so many people. And while people have been working on this across the country - so, in my role as NCSL President, I seen these -- these baskets and omnibus pieces of legislation happen and percolate across the country - I am extremely proud that we were able to do this this year, taking our work from governmental side and under the Dome to the private sector. So I would urge an Aye vote and I wanted to say thank you for everybody who worked on this on all sides of the aisle, across the spectrum, our friends and business and labor that came to the table and the incredibly brave testimony we heard from all the people across the State that wanted us to really just do something - and this is a big something. So thank you, everybody, and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator DeWitte.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this initiative as well and would be remiss if I did not credit my predecessor, Senator Karen McConnaughay, who did a lot of work on this bill as well. I know she was very passionate about this mission. It was one of the reasons she stayed on until last September before she moved on to other issues. So I'm proud to stand on behalf of Senator McConnaughay in support and I urge an Aye vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to close.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank -- thank you for those comments and thank you, Senator
DeWitte. I have to -- have to say, last year, I remember at the last day of Session when we passed a -- a bill that a lot of people didn't think could get done, it was truly with the help of Senator McConnaughay, who -- and -- and I have to say Senator Lightford, Senator Hutchinson, so many women who said to me, but, in particular, "Don't stop. We've got to get this done." So thank you for that and thanks for reminding me of the incredible work she did. But, truly, I just want to thank everyone. I wish everything we did under this Dome could be as bipartisan as this has been. It -- sexual harassment isn't a Democratic or Republican issue. It's an issue that we all know hasn't been dealt with for years and we know that it has to be now. And I'm just so proud of everyone. I feel like I just helped shepherd things. It was all this incredible individual work that I want to honor and all of these people that knew so much more in areas than I did, and I want to thank you for that collaborative effort. So I just ask for an Aye vote and thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1829 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 Yeas, no Nays, no -- none voting Present. Senate Bill 1829, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go to Senate Bill 1909. Senator Castro seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1909 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1909. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
  Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Castro.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
  Senator Castro, to explain your amendment.
SENATOR CASTRO:
  Thank you, Mr. President. I ask for its adoption and I'll talk about it on 3rd.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
  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 KOEHLER)
  3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1909. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
  Senate Bill 1909.
  (Secretary reads title of bill)
3rd Reading of the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
  Senator Castro, to explain your bill.
SENATOR CASTRO:
  Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Chamber. Senate Bill 1909 calls on the State to improve health care for pregnant and postpartum individuals. The Illinois Department of Public Health revealed last year there are significant differences in the pregnancy-associated and pregnancy-related mortality rate for women based on their race, ethnicity, age, education level, and
insurance type, among other factors. Black women had the highest rate of severe maternal morbidity – three times higher than the rate for a white woman. Women on Medicaid were 2.5 more -- percent times more likely to die within one year of pregnancy than a woman with private insurance. From 2016 to 2017, hospitals incurred 107.5 million in charges that related to deliveries with severe maternal morbidity. This bill seeks to eliminate these unconscionable disparities in health care treatment so that our -- our Illinois moms can live as a -- happy, healthy parents for their babies. We've worked diligently with the opposition to reach an agreement on this issue and I'm happy to answer any questions and I ask for its support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. Just to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Appreciate -- appreciate the work the -- the Senator has done to -- to try to address some of the concerns raised by the -- by the insurance industry on what -- on what -- how this would affect that, so I appreciate that. There's still the concern about -- that -- that we have, I just want to raise, about the potential cost. I think the estimated cost is twenty million for Medicaid, which would be ten million State costs, and maybe some of those costs could be mitigated throughout this process. But, again, this -- this is a difficult issue because it does address some good things. But, again, the -- the concern is about expansion of
another Medicaid program. So I just want to make our Members aware of that and they can vote as they see fit. So thank you, Senator, for your work on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Number one -- or to the bill. To the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

To the bill. I wanted to rise in -- in full support. Obviously, I'm a chief cosponsor on this. I know that there are plenty of times when we have to make very significant cost deliberations as it relates to the money that we spend in this building to handle issues that we care about. And I also recognize that it is extremely difficult for a woman like me who was blessed enough to have all the health benefits and insurance coverage that I needed when I was birthing my children to make sure that -- to make sure that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Excuse me, Senator. Can we hold the discussions down a little bit? Thank you.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

...to make sure that if there were any issues or problems that happened in relationship to either the pregnancy, the delivery, or in that year after the baby was born -- all three of my children were born that I wouldn't fall or succumb to something tragic. Now knowing this and knowing what the research is on this, knowing
that American women, women in the United States, are dying now at five times the rates of women everywhere else in any other industrialized part of the world. We are the only industrialized country for whom infant mortality and -- or maternal mortality and morbidity rates are rising. We are the only country in the industrialized world where maternal mortality -- mortality and morbidity is rising, and then if you look at that one step lower, African American women are dying at six times the rates of our counterparts in this country, which means -- and I know this may not be very important to very many people, but it is really important to me -- I know that that means that women who look like me are dying at third world country rates. That is worth the money that we spend in Medicaid. Because I don't know how to put a price tag on the life of all these families that we're trying to save and all these women that we're trying to save. And especially to my friends who have concerns about making sure that we have healthy babies and healthy mothers, then we should put our money where our mouths are. Thank you for the work that you've done on this bill. Thank you to all the people who recognize how significant and serious this issue is. Thank you for being ideologically consistent when you talk about birth and the ability to take care of healthy babies and healthy mothers. I would urge an Aye vote from the bottom of my heart on behalf of all the women who look like me who need you to step up today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to close.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, back to the -- one of the concerns that was brought up about cost. You can't put the -
- a dollar amount on the cost of a life. And this is a national epidemic that we are facing and a constant issue that is being brought to national attention, so much so that even our federal legislators are bringing it to light. It needs to be addressed. And I don't know what the federal government will do, but in this State, the opportunity to address an issue as important as maternal morbidity can be done and will be done. When seventy-two percent of the pregnancy-related deaths and ninety-three percent of violent pregnancy-associated deaths were deemed preventable, then we need do -- to do what we can to -- to prevent it. That is our jobs as legislators. We can prevent this. We can change things. And I would appreciate everyone think about that and vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1909 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 question (sic). On that, there are 55 voting Ayes (sic), 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1909, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go to Senate Bill 2075. Leader Lightford. Leader Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 20 -- 2075 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 2075. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:
Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment has a little bit more than a technical change. It changes the date of the age that -- of the term that the child will be when they begin kindergarten. I'd be happy to debate it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 2075. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2075.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford, to explain your bill.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2075 is an initiative of the Illinois State Board of Education. It will lower the schools' compulsory age from six to five beginning with the '20-'21 school year. It requires each school district to establish kindergarten for the instruction of children who are five years of age, instead of six, or older. The amendment that we just adopted, becoming the bill, now requires for a summer birthday of a student. The parent may decide to hold the child back for one school year, as provided by current law.
So we move the date back - instead of September 1, the child would have to turn five by May 31st. This does not have anything to do with establishing full-day kindergarten as a mandate. This is to ensure that we keep up with what we've been trying to do with universal preschool. For the last four years, we have put over two hundred million additional -- dollars in universal pre-K, and this is in an effort to make sure all of our three- and four-year-olds are ready for kindergarten. Now we're at the point that we realize -- when we lowered the compulsory age from seven to six about five years ago, we began to increase adding more dollars so we can get the preschool numbers up even higher, have them more prepared, and it's time for them not to wait till they'll -- six year {sic} old to start school but five years old. And if parents feel that their kids who turned five over the summer months aren't prepared, then they have the extended year to have their children ready. I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR WEAVER:

I just want people to have a heads up on this bill. There's a couple things that trouble us. And, you know, I've had probably as many calls on this as I've had on any other bill recently. Just parents are very concerned about the State taking the decision away from them. You know, there's a lot of kids that aren't prepared to go to school at age five. This bill makes that
mandatory. It's taking that right away from parents. And sometimes, if that child's not developmentally ready, we're putting them in a position to be behind for time coming after that. We still think that's a parent's right. We do understand there's a difference in different districts with regard to, you know, how the State needs to engage to make sure these kids are getting into a school district, but -- or -- or into school, but we feel that for many of the people we represent that parents should still have that right. So I'd be requesting a No vote on this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR KOEHLER)

   Senator Righter.

SENIOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENIOR KOEHLER)

   To the bill.

SENIOR RIGHTER:

   Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. My -- first, my -- my sincere thanks to Senator Lightford. She's been plugging away on this issue for some time. I know that -- that she's sincere in her belief that this ought to be the -- the -- the statewide rule. I had the opportunity earlier to visit with a lady who is a principal of a parochial school, who I think testified in front of the Education Committee. Her school administers a readiness test. So when a parent brings a child forward and says we'd like to enroll 'em, they do a -- they do a readiness test. And what she told me was that the five-year-olds, some perhaps are ready; some perhaps are not ready. So, to me, there's two issues here. I think that age five is a critical development period and I think the -- both sides could make a good
argument that -- that the child may not be ready to be enrolled at that point. The second point, and I'm going to pick up on what Senator Weaver just said, is that at some point, you got to give the parent the ability to say, "No, you know what, my child's not ready yet." And I think that we are taking one step too far down the rung here on ages by requiring this by State law. So I respectfully rise to oppose the legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Leader Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like to remind the Body that we've been working really hard in the area of early childhood education all the way through higher education to make sure our school system is prepared and ready to educate our children. Here's an example, what -- we have put more than two hundred million dollars directly into early childhood education to prepare three- and four-year-olds, not for them to stay at home until they're six years old to start kindergarten. I think it's important that they do start at the age of five, prior to their -- making sure that their birthday is prior to May 31st but making sure that they are more socially engaged and that they're ready to begin first grade on a full day, prepared and ready to go. So this is still just another step in the direction of the State Board of Education, lining up with the intent of the P-20 Council and what we highly support from the universal preschool community. I encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2075 pass. All those in
favor will vote Aye. Opposed, No -- will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 voting Yea, 16 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2075, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll go to Senate Bill 2128. Senator Aquino seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 20... I'm sorry. We're going to go to Senator Harmon, on Senate Bill 2128. Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 2128 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 2128. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENIOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to adopt the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENIOR KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENIOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 2128. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2128.
3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd like to start by reminding you this is a bill I passed over on 3rd Reading yesterday when I was in the Chair and it is not on the list of more controversial bills we've been taking up thus far today. So everyone can breathe easy. This is an -- an effort to include voice recorder -- voice writer reporters on par with shorthand reporters as court reporters here in Illinois. I am not aware of any opposition to the bill in its current form. I -- I do want to say that the -- the court reporters have been extraordinarily gracious in -- in their willingness to include a new method of competing in their space and negotiations are ongoing, so it may be that they'll amend the bill in the House and send it back to us. But I am not aware of any opposition to the bill in its current form and I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there -- seeing -- any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2128 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 Yeas, none Nay -- voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2128, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll return to page 5, Senate Bill 37. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 37.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 37 requires a unit of local government with five thousand or more inhabitants that is a secondary employer of a firefighter to contribute to the pension fund maintained by the firefighter's primary employer where the firefighter is earning service credits. The secondary employer must contribute a percentage of the total wages and salaries paid to the firefighter pension fund maintained by the firefighter's primary employer. Secondary employer must also retain 9.45 percent of the wages paid to the firefighter. It also permits the State Comptroller to deduct any delinquent money from the State payments. What I want to say is this is a bill that's been really heavily negotiated, particularly this year. I've had this bill for a couple of years and this year - this is an initiative of the AFFI - and this year we were negotiating with the fire chiefs for -- really since January. We were hoping to have a second amendment to the bill that would quantify basically two things -- three things, but the population level at which this would be enacted - we were at five thousand; and also the amount of additional dollars that a firefighter could earn in that secondary job. I think we're at seventy-five hundred now, but we're also looking at that number still. So, in order to move the bill forward, I would ask for an Aye vote. We're going to continue
to negotiate those items in -- in the House till we are at agreement with the firefighters and the fire chiefs' organization. They are neutral at this point as they know that that's what we intend to do. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I want to be clear though -- want to just say a couple things for the record, if I could, 'cause I want to make sure you understand what my intentions are. We made a lot of progress during the negotiations. We've included a minimum population and salary threshold to ensure cash-strapped volunteer departments aren't unduly burdened. We're also trying to determine a fair contribution rate for the secondary employers to ensure that they're only paying their proration cost of the additional liabilities. Both the Illinois Fire Chiefs and the AFFI have agreed to continue the negotiations in the House. Of course, that means it's coming back over for concurrence. I also want to make sure to include that we did have a piece of language that the Comptroller wanted in the bill which would be that a unit of local government would be changed to municipality when referring to the primary employer. So those are things that we know will be in this second amendment and we will be negotiating on what those actual numbers arrive at.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Anderson. There any discussion? Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...the bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

I want to commend the sponsor on her work on this bill. This is a -- this is a big issue, and with that being said, I think
there is some room for -- for compromise and negotiation that needs to go forward. With that being said, knowing that there is going to be some more work done in the House, I would like to urge my side of the aisle to vote Aye on this because we do need to move this forward, knowing that there -- there still does need to be work done to address this -- this very important issue. So thank you, Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Wilcox.

SENATOR WILCOX:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR WILCOX:

As a representative representing one of the largest all-volunteer forces, I just want to express our opposition to this. There's a belief that volunteer forces maybe are a majority made up of firefighters working on the second job. For the McHenry (Township) Fire Protection District, it's about a third of the firefighters are working on a second job. And so there's a fear that this is actually going to eliminate the ability for career firefighters to come back and support their home community, and we don't want to see that as the ultimate result. So based on that, I will be in opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator DeWitte.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, want to commend the sponsor for her work on this bill. I know you've been at this a long time.
And I also want to reiterate my support to assist in continuing to move this forward. Unfortunately, this bill did not come back to committee amended, as we had hoped. And we had hoped that it would be -- some of the concerns that have been addressed by opponents could have been dealt with. But, at this point, I rise in opposition. This is an unfunded mandate that puts the burden on employers to cover pension costs for secondary employment, and that is voluntary second employment. The bill could very well lead to property tax increases to local governments and communities for units that can't afford 'em and could eventually cut services or privatization for those who can't. Smaller volunteer fire departments are afraid they just aren't going to be able to handle this. And a list of the opponents are indicative of the agencies that have these concerns, including the Barrington Area Council of Governments, the Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts, the Illinois Municipal League, the Northwest Municipal Conference, and the South Suburban Mayors and Managers. I rise to oppose this bill in its current state. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to close.

SENATOR BUSH:

I want to thank you for your comments. I'd like to address the situation in McHenry. I want you to know that I've met repeatedly with the Chief from McHenry. We have a wonderful dialogue and he certainly is part of -- of negotiations and negotiations going forward. Those are one of the kinds of departments -- would be certainly more impacted by this kind of legislation. But, you know, his words yesterday, that he's looking forward to the continued negotiations and he knows that the fire
chiefs have been at the table and are assuring that we get to a place where this is not just negotiated, but really agreed to. I'd also like to address the comments about the bill not coming back to committee. We are on deadline. We had an amendment to -- and did file the amendment. I didn't call the amendment because it's not done. Certainly could have. Could have passed that amendment, frankly. Believe we would have the votes to do that. I wanted to continue the work because it wasn't quite there. I would much rather continue the work and get to a place where -- I met with the -- the smaller departments certainly that have concerns. That's why we're continuing to look at what's that population number so that we make sure that those small volunteer departments that are in the southern part of the State are protected. You know, what's the amount of money that a second job -- your -- as a volunteer paid on call you can make before you pay into this? And I want to be clear, this isn't about building a bigger pension for someone. This is -- doesn't add to a benefit for a firefighter. This is really about sharing in the liability issues when you're a firefighter or a paramedic, because if you are hurt at this point, the primary employer is taking all of the responsibility for that. So I just think it's really important that we -- that you understand that; that this is a genuine desire to continue some negotiations in that -- in those areas. And I would say the other piece that's so important is we want to get to an agreement between the AFFI, you know, the people that are doing the work, the firefighters, the paramedics, and the chiefs and their -- basically, their administration, because if we don't get to an agreement, there are fire departments -- Aurora's one of them; there are three other large departments -- that have literally
negotiated it where a firefighter/paramedic cannot do part-time paid-on-call work. We don't want to get there. We want to make sure that we have a good piece of legislation that we can move forward that protects those small departments, those rural areas where they need to have that ability and, at the same time, making sure that communities are not paying for -- they're taxpayers. These are not private dollars. We have taxpayers that are paying for the next-door neighbor's fire department on the backs of their tax dollars. It's not fair; it's not right; it needs to be fixed. There's more work to be done. I have said that over and over again. And the bill will come back with those negotiations as part of the overall bill and we will get to a place where we are in agreement with the fire chiefs. So I would appreciate an Aye vote, and the bill will be coming back over here after the negotiations are completed in the House, of which I intend to be at. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 37 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 39 Yeas, 10 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 37, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to now go back to the regular order, starting on page 4, starting with Senate Bill 25. Senator Morrison. Senator Morrison seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 25 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 25. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Morrison.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Morrison, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MORRISON:

I ask for the Body to adopt and discuss on 3rd.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading.  Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 25.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 25.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Morrison, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President.  This bill permits Interactive Telecommunication System examinations to be used to determine if individuals should be involuntarily committed to a mental health facility and can only be used when a psychiatrist is not on-site within the time period set in statute.  I know of no opposition.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any -- is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the
question is, shall Senate Bill 25 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 25, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 29. Senator Bush. Top of the page 5. Senator Bush. Senate Bill 30. Let's go to Senate Bill 40. Senator Anderson. Senate Bill 42. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 52. Senator Hastings. Senate Bill 54. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 54.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. When I introduced this bill, I thought I was solving a relatively simple problem. Like many families in Illinois, we have become fond of ordering our -- our groceries for delivery, and it turns out that in some communities, when you order your groceries for delivery, if you ordered beer or wine, they can't deliver it to you because of a -- a local ordinance. So I introduced this bill in an effort to create a -- a seamless web across the State that the rules would all be the same. Apparently, there are a lot of people interested in liquor here in Illinois and I have convened some of the largest working groups I have ever convened. We have faced a variety of opposition, but I think we're coming in on --
on -- on a landing here. This is an -- an effort to balance local control with consumer access. The bill in its introduced form I'd like to send it over to the House. We are honing in on an agreement. I'm sure it will come back to us for a final consideration. But the framework is this: We would maintain local control so that a municipality could say to a liquor retailer in their community you may not deliver to a customer in our community; but they could not prohibit delivery outside of their community, nor could they prohibit a resident in their community from receiving a delivery from outside of the community. That's the broad framework. I'm happy to answer any questions, but I assure you, we will see this again for final action after amendments in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 54 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 53 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 54, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to Senate Bill 61. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 61.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HOLMES:
Thank you so much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 61, as amended, makes various changes, including removing a permit fee of twenty-five dollars for foster homes, increasing fees for licensing of animal groups, and allowing licensed animal groups to return or release feral cats after sterilization and microchipping. Currently, foster homes are limited to caring for no more than four animals. Senate Bill 61 allows foster homes to care for more than four animals if there's a litter under twelve weeks of age, since so many litters are often larger than that. This bill, with the amendments, I -- my proponents of this are the Best Friend (sic) Animal Society, Humane Society, Department of Ag, and we also added an amendment here working with the State Veterinary Medical Association. After several amendments, I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 61 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 61, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to Senate Bill 68. Senator Morrison. Senator Morrison seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 68 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 68. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Morrison.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Morrison, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MORRISON:

I'd like to adopt this amendment and discuss the entire bill on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading.  Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 68.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 68.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Morrison, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President.  This bill creates the organ donation tax credit that allows private employers to take a tax credit against withholding taxes due if the private employer grants all of its employees the option of taking a paid leave of absence of at least thirty days for the purpose of serving as an organ donor or bone marrow donor.  This -- this bill has been negotiated and looked at for many weeks and I believe is in good form to ask for your Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion?  Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 68 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?  Mr. Secretary, take the record.  On that question, there are 58 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present.  Senate Bill 68, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  We will go to Senate Bill 71.  Senator Manar.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 71.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, please explain your bill.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President.  This bill allows up to a seven hundred and fifty-dollar natural disaster tax credit in the tax year 2019, just for one year, for individuals and small businesses in counties that were declared a State disaster area by the Governor in 2018 due to tornadoes.  Be happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Any discussion?  Senator Rose.

SENATOR ROSE:

Just to the -- to the bill, if I may, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR ROSE:

Senator Manar, I want to commend you for bringing this
forward. It's been -- every one of us at some point in time is going to have this happen, and because of the way the federal formula works, Illinois is largely left out of any natural disaster claim, because they look at the -- the size of the State and then, particularly if you're a downstater, it is always too small of a deal. Well, if it's your house, it's the whole deal -- it's the whole deal. So we've all been affected over the years. We've all had the problem with the federal rules. I know our local congressional team that you and I represent is working to change those rules. But I just want to say thank you for bringing this forward. We don't get a chance here very often to do something bipartisan and say thanks, but with heartfelt gratitude, I appreciate you bringing this forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to close.

SENATOR MANAR:

And I appreciate those kind remarks, and ask for an Aye vote, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 71 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 71, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll go to Senate Bill 79. Senator Mulroe. Senate Bill 102. Senator Sandoval. Senate Bill 112. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 112.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 112 amends the General Assembly Compensation Act to -- to provide any Member appointed to the Illinois House or Senate after May 31st of an even-numbered year may not receive additional salary for service as a chairperson or minority spokesperson for the remainder of the General Assembly in which they were -- were appointed. It also makes changes to make -- to make chairman gender-neutral to chairperson. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 112 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 112, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to Senate Bill 115. Senator Manar. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 115.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to explain your bill.
SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the -- excuse me, the Auditor General's annual transfer bill that would provide funding for the Office to conduct the audits necessary pursuant to law in the coming fiscal year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 115 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 115, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Going to Senate Bill 119. Senator Castro. Going to the next page, page 6. Senate Bill 122. Senator Hastings. Skip the next two. Senate Bill 140. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Mr.... No? Senate Bill 147. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 147 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 147. Mr. Secretary, are there any amendments do -- approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to adopt the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 147. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 147.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 147 creates a legal framework for trust funds for child performers. I believe we've worked out any concerns with the bill and I'm not aware of any opposition. I ask you for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 147 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there's 57 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 147, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 162. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 162.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 162 provides that coverage of diagnostic mammography will be covered at no cost to the patient. Under current law, screening mammograms are covered without copay, as are ultrasound screenings for women who have dense breast tissue or a family history of breast cancer. The one missing piece in Illinois' otherwise excellent coverage for women with breast cancer screening is diagnostic mammograms. That's ordered when an abnormality is seen or suspected on a screening mammogram. In most cases, it's a subsequent mammogram just taking additional views. About ten percent of mammograms require this test; however, it is the most important test in the screening process. In Illinois, the average copay for a diagnostic mammogram is between six hundred and seven hundred dollars, a price point which may discourage women from getting a second look. This has been amended with language suggested by the insurance industry to address the high-deductible policies that have health savings accounts as well as to provide a definition of a diagnostic mammogram that was not part of the bill as introduced. This was an initiative of the Susan G. Komen Foundation, the Illinois Public Health Association. We have no known opponents. I want to take a moment to thank Senator Syverson for all his work on this as we -- as we dealt with getting the correct language in here and also to my many supporters in the Senate Women's Caucus. I'd ask for an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 162 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, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 162, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll return to page 5, Senate Bill 119. Senator Castro. Mr. Secretary -- Senator Castro seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 119 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 119. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Yes. Floor Amendment No. 3, by Senator Castro.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR CASTRO:

I look for its adoption and I'll explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 119. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:
33rd Legislative Day 4/11/2019

Senate Bill 119.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your bill.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 119 requires that any person who engages in third-party network transactions in excess of a thousand and greater than three transactions must file a federal Form 1099-K and any information required by Section 6050W of the Internal Revenue Code with the Illinois Department of Revenue. We worked tirelessly with the opponents and proponents on this, and we worked out this amendment and the -- the opponents went neutral. I look forward -- hope -- asking for an Aye vote and will answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 119 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 119, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll now go back to page 6, top of the page. Senator Hastings, on Senate Bill 122. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 122.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hastings, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe there's a Floor amendment on the bill as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

One second. We'll check. That Floor amendment has already been adopted, so go -- go ahead and proceed.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment -- I'm sorry, Floor Amendment No. 1 with Senate Bill 22 (sic) (122) becomes the bill. This requires CMS to certify that a business that's a service-disabled veteran-owned business or a veteran-owned small business in Illinois is certified through the Vets First Verification Program of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. It requires CMS and the Department of Veterans' Affairs to conduct two veteran business outreach programs per year to teach veteran-owned businesses the State procurement and certification process. And Senate Bill 122 requires CMS to maintain an electric (sic) (electronic) portal for completing and submitting certification applications for veteran-owned small businesses. This bill is a result of three years of negotiations. If anyone has ever gone and got a -- a business certified, whether that be a DBE, WBE, in this situation a veteran certified business, everyone will know that it's a very complicated process. This streamlines and simplifies the process for veteran-owned businesses. There's no opposition. I ask for an Aye vote, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 122 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 122, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 4, the bottom of the page, Senate Bill 29. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 29.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Bush, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

    Thank you very much. Basically what this does is it creates an Energy Transition Zone. So there are communities where they don't really meet any other criteria to become part of an enterprise zone or things like this, so it creates an Energy Transition Zone where they can apply to be part of a zone, which -- which just creates an -- economic development opportunities. And this applies to any kind of energy that were transitioning to different energy. So it could be someplace where there's a shuttered nuclear plant, which is something I have in my district, or where we are closing down coal facilities or coal mines. It provides for economic help, basically. It creates a zone, similar to an enterprise zone, where those communities can use -- become part of an enterprise zone to get help with economic development.
dollars for attracting new kinds of green energy. Happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition and I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 29 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 29, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Let me... We're going back now to where we left off in the order. It's Senate Bill 182. Senator Morrison. Senate Bill 187. Senator Villivalam. Senate Bill 190. Senator Morrison. Senate Bill 195. Senator Hastings. Senate Bill 209. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Senator Bertino-Tarrant seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 209 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 20 -- 209. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask for its adoption and I'll explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

...further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 209. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 209.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you once again, Mr. President. This is a negotiated bill that requires when a district wishes to withdraw from a special ed joint agreement to provide a detailed plan of the continuum of service and notice of intent with no less than twelve months from the date of the proposed withdrawal. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 209 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 209, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. At the bottom of the page, we'll go to Senate Bill 218. Senator Tom Cullerton.
Tom Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 218 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 218. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Cullerton, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

I'll explain it on 3rd. I'd like to adopt and explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 218. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 218.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Cullerton, to explain your bill.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 218 is an initiative of the DuPage County State's...
Attorney, requesting that the -- that DCFS request the State's Attorneys to file a petition or motion for termination of parental rights and appointment of a guardian with the power to -- to consent to adoption if the parent is criminally convicted of criminal sexual abuse in violation of various subsections. I ask for an Aye vote. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 218 pass. All those in favor will say 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 Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 218, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we accidentally skipped over -- skipped over Senate Bill 168. Senator Fowler. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. It's a recall? On the -- Senator Fowler wishes to -- seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 168 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 168. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Yes. Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Fowler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Fowler, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR FOWLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to adopt and explain on 3rd, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
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?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:
No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 168. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:
Senate Bill 168.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Fowler, to explain your bill.

SENATOR FOWLER:
Thank you, Mr. President. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale is prepared to transfer ninety-four acres of property to the City of Carterville for future economic development. The City plans on annexing the property into its corporate limits and then donating the property to the Regional Economic Development Corporation, REDCO, and then will market the property for business and industrial development. This was on the agreed bill list in committee and not aware of any opposition. I request an Aye vote, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 168 pass. All those in favor will say Aye -- 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 Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 168, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cunningham, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

For the purpose of an introduction, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please make your introduction.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm joined by some guests today that are sitting up in the President's Gallery. They are participating in a student exchange program from the AFS-USA, hosted by a constituent of mine, Barb Kelly, who lives in Oak Lawn. We're joined by Duru Sancak, who's from Turkey - if you could please stand up - and Aya Elfiky, who is from Egypt. They're here the next couple of days watching the legislative process here in Springfield. I'd like to ask all my colleagues to join me in welcoming them to the Illinois State Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate. On page 7, we're going to the top of the page, Senate Bill 245. Senator Villivalam. We're going to go to page 8. In the middle of the page, Senate Bill 391. Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 391.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to explain your bill.
SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This, as amended, is the Abused and Neglected Children's (Child) Reporting Act. It specifies that a child shall not be considered abused on the sole reason that the child was been diagnosed with or been treated with positive Elders symptoms (Ehlers-Danlos syndrome). It specifies the child's parents, sibling, or grandparents have been diagnosed with it and passed -- tested positive for the symptoms. I know of no opposition to the bill. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 391 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 Yeas, none voting Present -- none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 391, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're now going to Senate Bill 397. Senator Sims. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 397.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Sims, to explain your bill.

SENATOR SIMS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Lady and Gentlemen of the -- Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 397, as amended, makes
various cleanup changes to the Court Reporters Act and removes outdated industry practices. And some of the changes: It removes the following -- removes some of the factors that must be considered in determining the number of court reporters the circuit may have; removes the designation which only allows a single county circuit to appoint supervisory personnel; and removes other outdated language. I know of no opposition and would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 397 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 397, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Moving down the page to Senate Bill 399. Senator Murphy. Mr. Secretary, please -- Senator Murphy seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 399 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 399. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Murphy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Murphy, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. That'll get everyone's attention. Senate Bill 399 amends the information that can be submitted to the court during a child custody hearing under
the Uniform Child-Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Law. Let me tell you simply what happened here. There was this child that was in...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator, we're just on the amendment right now.

SENATOR MURPHY:

    Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hear that part. Probably when the microphone -- I -- I -- I move for adoption, please, and I'll explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    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 KOEHLER)

    3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 399. Mr. President -- or, Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

    Senate Bill 399.

            (Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Now, Senator Murphy, on your bill.

SENATOR MURPHY:

    Thank you, Mr. President. I'll just continue. We had a child in a -- in a protective care environment in a safe home and a judge wrote a court order that had listed the address of this safe home on the court order. So this bill simply will prohibit a judge
from entering that into the public record. So I know of no opposition and I would entertain any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 399 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 399, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on page 9, we're going to go to Senate Bill 414. Senator Crowe. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 414.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Crowe, to explain your bill.

SENATOR CROWE:

...Mr. President. Senate Bill 414 creates a mid-level offense for endangering the life or health of a child where an individually -- an individual knowingly and willfully deprived a child of necessary food, shelter, supervision, and health care and that deprivation substantially harms the child's physical, mental, or emotional health. I know of no opposition and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall
Senate Bill 414 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 414, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on down the page is Senate Bill 416. Senator Cunningham. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Cunningham seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 416 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill -- 416. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Cunningham.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Cunningham, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

The amendment becomes the bill. I move for its adoption and I'll discuss it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 416. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 416.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Cunningham, to explain your bill.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 416, as amended, provides that if a jail inmate is ruled to have committed acts of battery or public indecency against jail personnel, the jail warden and disciplinary board can revoke up to three hundred and sixty-five days of good time credit from that inmate. We passed a very similar bill to this last year. It ran into some opposition in the House. The changes we have made, addressing this through the disciplinary process, has removed the opposition to the bill. I'd appreciate the Chamber's support.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 416 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 416, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're on page 10, middle of the page. Senate Bill 447. Senator Crowe. Senator Crowe seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 447 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 447. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Crowe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Crowe, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR CROWE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask the amendment be adopted and be happy to explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 447. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 447.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Crowe, to explain your bill.

SENATOR CROWE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is an initiative of the Illinois Academy of Family Practitioners (sic) (Physicians). It expands the Medical Student Scholarship Program to include general surgery, emergency medicine, and psychiatry (sic) as eligible specialties to fulfill the obligation of the program to practice for a minimum of five years in a high-needs specialty in a
designated shortage area. I'd ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 447 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, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 447, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator -- Senate Bill 448. Senator Villivalam. Senate Bill 450. Senator Jones. Senate Bill 456. Senator Martinez. Senator Martinez, on Senate Bill 456. Senator Martinez seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 456 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 456. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I ask for its adoption and I'll be happy to discuss it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)
3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 456. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 456.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martinez, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 456, as amended, requires criminal background checks be performed by school districts to -- every five years. The bill institutes audits of professional development hours and outlines consequences if the audit has findings. Furthermore, the bill provides alternative sanctions, other than suspension, what was previously the only remedy for violations of teacher's service contract. Lastly, the bill provides that the State Superintendent has the sole power to merely suspend a licensed applicant until adjudication is complete. This is a -- a -- a -- a work in progress. We still have some things that are going on with the House bill. Then we're going to be putting together a big -- a big final bill. I want to just thank -- Jennifer Bertino-Tarrant, Senator, and Senator Cullerton in helping us work with this -- with these negotiations. We're hoping to have this bill back here with a perfect solution to some of the issues that are going on in our CPS schools.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 456 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 -- take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 456, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're at the top of page 11. Senate Bill 457. Senator Stadelman. Mr. -- Senator Stadelman seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 457 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 457. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Stadelman.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Stadelman, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR STADELMAN:

Mr. President, the amendment becomes the bill. I'll explain it on 3rd. I -- I move that it be adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 457. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 457.

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Senator Stadelman, to explain your bill.

SENATOR STADELMAN:

    Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 457 amends the University of Illinois Act. Right now, the University offers a limited number of scholarships to children of veterans, and there are a number of categories and preferences that help guide the University as far as who may be eligible. What this legislation does is expand the number of categories and preferences by one. It will now include children of veterans who were killed in the line of duty when they've been performing as a police officer or a firefighter. This legislation is inspired and a response to the death of McHenry County Sheriff's Deputy Jake Keltner, who was killed several weeks ago outside a Rockford hotel while serving an arrest warrant. This is something we can and should do to help children of those who have been killed in the line of duty. Happy to ask -- answer any questions. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the -- I'm sorry, Senator McConchie.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

    To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    To the bill.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

    I just want to commend the sponsor. This is, I think, an important thing for us to ensure that we have to take care of the
children of our fallen officers. And just want to thank the sponsor for bringing it, and hopefully we can get it into law this year to be able to provide this certainty going forward. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Stadelman, to close.

SENATOR STADELMAN:

Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 457 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 457, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on Senate Bill 458. Senator Steans. Senator Steans seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 458 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 458. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, I move the amendment and will speak to it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)
3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 458. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 458.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Steans, to explain your bill.

SENATOR STEANS:
Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill's addressing a issue that impacts -- special education providers, schools or therapeutic day schools. With the new evidence-based funding formula, things have changed dramatically, and the way CPS was no longer receiving the ISBE block grant to provide therapeutic day schools services has had a dramatic impact on these schools. This bill would require the Illinois Purchased Care Review Board to accept amended student enrollment data for the schools for the last two years to provide some stability to these specialized therapeutic day schools that are, you know, taking care of our -- our hardest-need kids. There is -- it costs about six hundred and sixty thousand dollars. CPS would be able to apply for reimbursement from ISBE and get eighty percent reimbursement, and the pot that they apply to is a hundred thirty-nine million dollars. And I'm told by ISBE, it would have a negligible impact on any other schools. Would urge your Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 458 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 458, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to the middle of page 13. Senate Bill 528. President Cullerton. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 528 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 528. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

President Cullerton, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, I'd like to adopt the amendment and then explain the bill on 3rd Reading. It's not that complicated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill
528. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 528.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
3rd Reading of the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
President Cullerton, to explain your bill.
SENATOR J. CULLERTON:
Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill changes the way the Senate's appointments to the General Assembly Retirement System board work. Currently, the President of the Senate is a member of the General Assembly's Retirement System board and he or she may designate a member to serve in his or her place. The President also appoints one member of his or her caucus and one member from the minority caucus. The House does it differently. The House appointments are constructed in that the Speaker's allowed to appoint two members of his or her caucus and one member of the minority. So this bill simply says that the Senate's appointments will be done the same way that the House's are. So it's a very important bill. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 528 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And -- and Senate Bill 528, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon in
the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Let's turn to Senate Bill 529. President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 529 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 529. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

President Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This amendment deals with an exception to the Government Severance (Pay) Act. And I would like to adopt the amendment and become -- the amendment becomes the bill and I'd like to pass the bill then on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

President Cullerton moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 529. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 529. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 529.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Members of the Senate and Mr. President. Last year we passed a bill called the Government Severance Pay Act, which went into effect January 1st of 2019. This provision that we passed dealt with a unit of -- a unit of government-employed folks - that their severance pay would be limited to no more than twenty weeks of compensation. This bill allows for a very narrow exception. When the -- the person is employed by a college or a university's department of intercollegiate athletics, they would have an exemption from this service limitation. It would only apply when the compensation is funded by non-State-appropriated funds and revenues generated by athletic events or activities, gifts, or donations. The reason for the bill came to us from the University of Illinois. It turns out that an unintended consequence with regard to the Government Severance Pay Act was that in negotiating contracts for coaches, it's typical - and there was a lawyer at the Executive Committee that explained this - sports lawyers, that they would -- as part of their negotiations, they would allow for a severance that would exceed this twenty weeks of compensation. So, in an effort to have a level playing field in the negotiations for obtaining of intercollegiate colleges {sic}, I agreed to -- I sponsored the bill and hopefully it'll help the University of Illinois' Athletic Department, which needs some help. So, with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Mr. President. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Earlier this week, we had a full discussion on this legislation, and I think a little -- a little background is appropriate and I thank President Cullerton for explaining with -- with great clarity what the bill does. A -- a year or two ago, this Senate and the House and the Governor enacted a law that was a reaction to some malfeasance, if you will, in one community college in one part of the State. It was the College of DuPage. And the reaction to that -- one of the reactions to that situation was that we said that institutions for higher learning could no longer offer a severance package to an employee of any longer than twenty weeks. And as the Senate President has laid out, the University of Illinois has discovered that when it comes to recruiting, I think particularly coaches for the bigger name sports, such as football, that it's difficult to negotiate and be competitive in those negotiations with other schools with lots of money because now they can't offer that severance package. So the bill before you would provide a carve-out to that severance limitation if the severance package can be paid for with nonpublic dollars and the employee receiving the severance package has not been dismissed for misconduct. A couple things that -- that we learned during
the hearing in Executive Committee. One was that University -- the University of Illinois Athletic Foundation is so large that all three hundred of their athletic department employees are paid for out of the Athletic Foundation. I believe they are the only State university, or perhaps one of two, for whom that is true. And what that means in the context of this bill is that this isn't a carve-out for university athletics -- and the -- and the Senate President didn't characterize it that way -- this is a carve-out for the University of Illinois and the University of Illinois only. Because the other universities can't afford to do this. The second issue is, the severance package carve-out will be allowed if the coach, or whoever it is, is not dismissed for misconduct, but let's say, is resigning after a set -- or an allegation. And we've seen that not at the University of Illinois, but we -- we saw that -- or that -- that issue come up at Ohio State University, I think in the last year. So all of us have to answer the question -- to me, it's twofold -- one, are we good with continuing to limit the College of DuPage and Lakeland College in Mattoon and Lincoln Trail College in Robinson and all the rest of 'em and most of the four-year universities in this manner, while letting the University of Illinois do something different? And second, are we comfortable with allowing these severance packages to go forward -- which obviously are going to be worth quite a bit of money, otherwise we wouldn't be looking for past twenty weeks -- are we comfortable with allowing these severance packages if the employee, while not being fired, might be resigning and stepping out to avoid a controversy while collecting a check of larger than twenty weeks on the severance package? I suspect this bill is going to pass if for no other reason than the sponsor. As someone who represents
a four-year university that does not have that kind of wealth and as someone who, while I voted for, had reservations about what was - and we should all be willing to admit this - a massive overreaction to the College of DuPage situation, I am going to vote No. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Senator -- President Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, I was trying to see if I can work into my comments something about Eastern Illinois University and their football program that produced Tony Romo and Garoppolo as a -- as a quarterback and coaches such as Mike Shanahan, I believe, and Payton. So they've done very well. All I'm suggesting is that the law has been, up until January 1st, that these severance packages could have been negotiated when they negotiated these contracts, and I don't think that it was contemplated when that bill was passed that this would limit the ability of the University of Illinois' coaching -- athletic director and the coaching staff. So when he came in and talked to us about it -- of course, the goal here is that these severance packages will never ever be -- be utilized, because they'd hire coaches that stay their -- their contract and do a good job. So, trying to help out the University of Illinois. I hope this -- I don't want you to vote for this bill because I'm the sponsor. I hope you'd like to vote for the bill because it's a nice way to kind of correct an inadvertent consequence of a previous bill and help the University. So, with that, I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Mr. President. The question is, shall Senate Bill
529 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 52 voting Aye, 3 voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 529, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Supplemental Calendar No. 1 has been printed and distributed to the Members' desks, and on that Calendar is the Order of Postponed Consideration. Senator Link indicates he wishes to proceed. Bear with us. We're ensuring the paperwork is in order, Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, Senate Bill 1536, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1536.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Again, this is the Order of Postponed Consideration; therefore, there will be one speaker in favor and one speaker against the bill. Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

...Mr. President. As we spoke before, this is a bill of correcting something I think is an obvious mistake in the way it was presented, term limits. I would just ask that we look at this. It's not affecting -- saying that we don't want term limits by a local community; it's just prospective and not retroactive. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR RIGHTER:  
Speak to the bill, please, Mr. President.

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:  
Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we voted on this really not that long ago. It was a bad bill then. It only got twenty-nine votes. It's just as bad now. Just a reminder, this is us deciding that the voters who adopted these term limits referendums either didn't know what they were doing or we've just decided that we're more important than them in decision making of what happens with their local officials. That is unseemly and arrogant. I don't think any of us want to go home and say, "You know what, we took care of one of our own over in the House of Representatives." That is -- that is unseemly as well. I would ask that everyone continue to oppose this bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)  
Thank you, Senator. Senator Link, do you wish to close?

SENATOR LINK:  
I would just ask for an affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)  
The question is, shall Senate Bill 1536 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 31 voting Aye, 19 voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1536, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR RIGHTER:

Verify the most recent roll call, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Mr. Secretary, please read the bell -- ring the bell. Senator Righter has requested a verification. Will all Members please be at their seats? Will all Members please be in their seats? Mr. Secretary, please ring the bell. The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Those Members voting in the affirmative: Aquino, Belt, Bennett, Bertino-Tarrant, Castro, Crowe, Fine, Gillespie, Glowiak, Harmon, Harris, Hastings, Hunter, Hutchinson, Jones, Koehler, Lightford, Link, Martinez, Morrison, Mulroe, Muñoz, Murphy, Peters, Sandoval, Sims, Stadelman, Steans, Van Pelt, Villivalam, President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Does Senator Righter question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I need the light on. I need a light -- thank you. Senator Bennett. I'm sorry, I thought they were supposed to be in their chairs. Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Muñoz?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Oh, he's right there. Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Manar did not vote.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

No, sir. No one else. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

On a verified roll call, there are 31 Yeas, 19 Nays, and none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 1536 is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, let's turn to page 43 of your printed Calendar and continue on the Order of Postponed Consideration. There, you'll find Senate Bill 1310. Senator Rezin. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 1310.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Rezin, on Senate Bill 1310.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Here we are again to talk about the bill that deals with Starved Rock. If you weren't in the Chambers yesterday, Starved Rock's a beautiful park that is smack in the middle of my district. Over the course of the years, we've seen an increase in visitors to this district. In the past several years, we've had over two and half million people visit Starved Rock alone. An additional, half a million people visit Matthiessen, right across the road from Starved Rock, as well. So we have a huge influx of people to the park, which creates a unique
situation. And as I said yesterday as well, Starved Rock, if you rate Starved Rock compared to visitors across the country, we rank eleventh in -- in terms of the amount of people visiting our park along with State -- or national parks. The reason that we have this bill is because of the -- the traffic in and out of the park, the -- all of the wear and tear on the -- the trails throughout the park. We have cars that we don't have enough -- we have so many people visiting the park, we don't have enough places to actually park the cars, so the cars are parking along State routes. And -- and also, we have -- because of the huge influx of people, we are dealing on a weekly basis with public safety issue, trying to make sure that this park is safe for people who are visiting the twenty-four hundred acres. Oftentimes, we have people that are hurt on the trails, or may be on the trails and get too close to the cliff and fall into a canyon, and then the first responders have to come in, oftentimes, and rappel into these canyons and help extricate the patient out. This equipment can only be used one time and that equipment is paid for by local taxpayers from the -- from the first responders locally. This bill is asking to assess a parking fee on the cars - not the individuals - the cars that park at Starved Rock. We hope it will be a nominal fee. But what this will help us do is start to get new money in to the park to allow us to use that money, which will now go into the State Parks Fund, for Starved Rock to update our infrastructure, to pay for new parking lots so people can park in the -- in the park not on the State roads; to help our first responders, to allow them to have grants when they are in the park making -- helping with any emergencies that do happen. Again, it's a great situation to be in, but we've been trying to deal with this huge influx of -- of
visitors each year. We feel, after talking about it at our yearly meetings every year, that this is probably our best pathway forward. Yesterday, we had some discussion from Members from the committee and I -- I was also asked in committee, why is -- why are the -- the citizens of LaSalle County excluded from paying the fee? And, you know, it's a very important -- or it's a very important question, and the answer is, we've had a tremendous impact locally by an influx of people coming in -- to our roads, to -- to the public safety, to the first responders, to the local communities. Of course, we embrace having Starved Rock here, but this is just an answer that we feel would work for -- for Starved Rock. And, again, I ask for -- I'm open for any questions and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Again, this is the Order of Postponed Consideration, so we hear from one proponent and one opponent. Senator Rezin, the sponsor, is the proponent. Senator Castro is speaking as the opponent.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator, I have a question for you. Is there a proposal in the House to add back the residents of LaSalle County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Now, thank you for that question. I did talk to my State
Rep. Obviously, when this bill goes over to the House -- they have the same concerns. I mean, people that looked at this bill and when they picked it up, they had the same questions about the amendment. And my State Rep, who will be picking up the bill, is able to negotiate it and that's -- I mean, that's where we're at. We're -- we're at the point where this makes sense for our area. But when it does go to the House, we're open to negotiations in the House that will allow this bill to pass and hopefully come back here. I can't guarantee it, but I can tell you, though, there's been many questions in the House regarding the same issue that you've asked.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator Rezin, I know you -- you -- you've talked about a resolution to study the process. My question is, how come you have not introduced the resolution prior to doing the bill to get the study and information to -- to justify what you're trying to do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. So this was discussed in committee and the resolution was asked for. It -- it -- it took time to file it. So we have it here. It's Senate Resolution 333. We talked about it before. Happy to file it. Again, this came out last week. We had to send the resolution to LRB to get the language. We have it here. Happy to file it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)
Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR CASTRO:

While I appreciate all the work that the sponsor has done, the one thing that we always talk about is having the information, the data, to do such things. The -- the problem that I have is, I constantly hear from colleagues about how they can't stand carve-outs. In a sense, this is a carve-out, because you're carving out the residents of LaSalle County, who are still benefiting economically from all the influx of people who are coming in. And so I think everyone should pay their fair share. I -- I -- I hear where you're coming from, but I think everyone should pay their fair share and benefit, because they are benefiting from all the influx of people who are coming to their community. So with that -- and I -- you know, I still think if you were -- look at bringing -- doing the study first, then having the ammo to justify what you're trying to do, I think it would be a little easier to move the -- the pilot forward. So I ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Rezin, to close.

SENATOR REZIN:

Sure. Thank you, again. And I appreciate Senator Castro's comments, so thank you for that. Again, we're in a unique situation because of the two and half to three million visitors that visit the area. We have yearly meetings in the area that -- all of the first responders, all of the local law enforcement,
IDNR, State Police, IDOT - everybody's in the room discussing a great asset but the negative impact, on how do we keep everybody safe in the park and how do we handle the traffic and also keep the park as -- as beautiful as we can. This is our first -- like I said, this is our answer to a problem that we have in our area. I do not look at having -- LaSalle County as a carve-out. I think that in the past years, LaSalle County has -- yes, they do receive some tax from it, but they also have paid -- more of an impact because of the population there. That's why I have them in this bill, but I do understand your concerns and we do talk about that a lot. The Senate Resolution 333 has been filed, yesterday, but that resolution allows DNR to study this model, this bill that we would like to pass today, get over to the House, let them make the changes should they -- if they would like to make the same changes there. And then the Senate joint {sic} resolution will look at whether this is a good model or not. It's hard to study the model unless you have the model in place, right? And that's what we agreed upon when we said that we would agree to the resolution -- allow the DNR to look at this model once it's been implemented in the next year and look at what best practice is, what are we doing right, what aren't we doing right. And then the Senate joint {sic} resolution gives DNR the ability then to make the decisions to change the program we have in place and also make the decision of is this a good model for other parks. We don't know that answer and that's what this study will show. Because of that, I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1310 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 29 voting Aye, 8 voting No, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 1310, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is declared lost. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we're going to return to the regular Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Let's turn to page 13 of your printed Calendar and pick up where we left off at Senate Bill 531. Senator Mulroe. Senator Mulroe seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 531 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 531. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Mulroe, on your amendment.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I ask for its adoption and I'd explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Mulroe moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 531. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 531. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
    Senate Bill 531.
    (Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)
    Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:
    Thank you, Mr. President. In the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum enabling statute, the Museum has the right to accept, hold, maintain, and administer donated property of historical significance, including, but not limited to, the King Hostick Public Trust Fund. This amendment just adds the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum into the Public Use Trust Act to reflect its enabling statute. I know of no opposition. I'd ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

    Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 531 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 531, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we are in the portion of the Calendar that includes many of the technical bills filed by the Senate President. With leave of the Body, we're going to pick up those bills that have been amended. So let's turn to page 14 of your Calendar. Senate Bill 556. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, Senator Bush seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 556 to the Order
of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 556. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush, on your amendment.

SENATOR BUSH:

Sometimes something is just worth waiting for. I'd like to ask that we adopt the amendment and I will explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 556. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Floor Amendment -- Senator Bush, on Floor Amendment 2.

SENATOR BUSH:

I wish I could talk that fast. SB 556, as amended, requires any single-occupancy restroom in a place of public accommodation or public building to be identified as all-gender...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush, this -- this is on the Amendment 2. Are you moving to adopt it?

SENATOR BUSH:

Gosh, I was so excited to talk really fast. I -- I did that and you didn't hear me.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

We have two amendments, so this is -- Senator Bush moves for the adoption...

SENATOR BUSH:

I'm going to ask that the second amendment is also adopted. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush moves to adopt Floor Amendment No. 2. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Mr. Secretary, have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 556. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 556.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush, you're off.

SENATOR BUSH:

I believe I read it in its entirety. Senate Bill 556, as amended, requires any single-occupancy restroom in a place of public accommodation or public building to be identified as all-gender and designated for use by no more than one person at a time or for family or assisted use and requires exterior signage that marks the restroom as a restroom and does not indicate any specific
gender. The amendment also allows a health inspector or health officer to inspect to determine compliance during any inspection of a place of public accommodation or public building. And I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Well done. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 556 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 556, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 557. Senator Bush. Senator Bush seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 557 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 557. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush, on your amendment.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 557. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading.  Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 557.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 557.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bush.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you very much.  The amendment creates the Carpet Stewardship Act.  The Act creates a carpet clearinghouse non-for-profit {sic} who shall create a carpet stewardship recycling program.  The program must meet standards set in the Act and shall be subject to oversight and approval by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.  The -- it is an initiative of the Solid Waste Agency of Lake County.  It's based on California law.  In California, fifteen percent of carpet and padding is recycled compared to a national recycling rate of four percent.  California's -- recycling program was amended in 2017 to increase the recycling performance target to thirty-four percent.  California's EPR law has reduced barriers to recycled carpet, successfully returned scrap material to the circular economy, created economic jobs, and since 2011, when the carpet program was implemented, they have -- I can give you all the statistics.  I'd be happy to answer any questions.  I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator.  Is there any discussion?  Seeing none,
the question is, shall Senate Bill 557 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 557, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Let's turn to page 15 of your printed Calendar. Senate Bill 584. Senator McGuire. Mr. Secretary, Senator McGuire seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 584 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on -- now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 584. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator McGuire.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator McGuire.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

...you -- thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move adoption of the amendment and I'll be happy to explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator McGuire moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 584. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 584. Mr.
Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 584.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

    Senator McGuire.

SENATOR McGuire:

...you. Senate Bill 584, as amended, extends the sunset date from December 31st, 2020 to July 1st, 2030, to allow for non-home rule municipalities to continue to impose a sales tax approved by referendum to fund municipal operations and public infrastructure projects. I know of no opposition. Ask for a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

    Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 584 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none {sic} (1) voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 584, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Let's turn to the top of page 18 on your printed Calendar, the Order of 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 640. There's been a sponsorship change. Senator Tom Cullerton is the sponsor now. Senator Tom Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 640 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 640. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Tom Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

I'd like to adopt the amendment. Explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 640. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 640. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 640.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the General Assembly. The amendment adds clarifying language to the Public Aid Code, authorizing townships to provide for and administer food pantry programs as part of their General Assistance program. I know of no opposition. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator
Morrison, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MORRISON:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

The sponsor indicates that he will yield. Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senator Cullerton, just help me understand this bill. Does this allow for General Assistance funds to be used when you talk about programming? Is that what you mean, that General Assistance funds can then be used for the purchase of those items that our given out?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Hold on. There we go. It means the funds that the township takes in. There is no increase in funds that they can get. There is no tax increase, fee increase, or anything else, just their General Assistance funds they can actually utilize. I have two food pantries in townships within my district. We are seeing churches close their food pantries because not enough volunteers. We have actually had Addison Township and Wayne Township be the go-to food pantry within the township. So, while they're already doing it, we wanted to clarify the language and make sure that there weren't any issues with them going forward doing that.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

So I'm asking very specifically. So General Assistance funds, which are very carefully prescribed by statute as to what they can
be used on, are now going to be allowed to purchase products for the food pantry?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Hold on. I'm finding you the line right here. I don't have it, but it would be the funds it has as part of their General Assistance programming. That's what I'm looking at right here.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

I support food pantries. I've run them. I've been a township supervisor for many years. I -- I don't mean to put you on the spot, but I think it is an -- it is an important change from this funding. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you for the great questions, Senator. And I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 640 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 640, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing down the page. Senate Bill 653. Senator Sandoval seeks leave of
the Body to return Senate Bill 653 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 653. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Sandoval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)
   Senator Sandoval, on your amendment.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:
   I'd like to adopt the amendment and speak to it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)
   Senator Sandoval moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 653. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)
   3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 653. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:
   Senate Bill 653.
   (Secretary reads title of bill)
3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)
   Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:
   Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 653 extends the sunset of the Illinois Landscape Architect {sic} (Architecture) Act of
1989 from January 1, 2020 to January 1, 2030. There's no opposition. I'd ask a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 653 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 653, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 654. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Senator Bertino-Tarrant. Let's turn to Senate Bill 656. Senator Aquino. Senator Aquino seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 656 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 656. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Aquino.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Aquino, on your amendment.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to adopt the amendment and explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Aquino moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 656. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 656. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 656.

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Senate Bill... Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 656, as amended by Senate Floor Amendment No. 1, extends the sunset of Perfusionist Practice Act from January 1, 2020 to January 1, 2030. I know of -- I know of no opponents and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 656 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting’s 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 656, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 657. Senator Hastings. Senator Hastings seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 657 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 657. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Hastings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Hastings, on the amendment.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment becomes the bill. I'll explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Hastings moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 657. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 657. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 657.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Hastings.

SENATOR HASTINGS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of -- of the Illinois Senate. Senate Bill 657 extends the sunset of the Structural Engineering Practice Act of 1989 from January 1st, 2020 to January 1st, 2030. There's no opposition. I'll answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none,
the question is, shall Senate Bill 657 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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 -- 58 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 657, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeWitte, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like the record to reflect my Aye vote. My intention was to vote Aye on Senate Bill 6-5-6. Thank you, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. The record will so reflect your intention. Senate Bill 658. Senator Tom Cullerton. Senator Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 658 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 658. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton, on your amendment.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Like to adopt the amendment. Explain it on -- on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

...Cullerton moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 658. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 658. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 658.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 658 extends the sunset provision of the Illinois Professional Land Surveyor Act of 1989 from January 1st, 2020 to January 1st, 2030. I know of no opposition. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 658 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 658, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 659. Senator Aquino seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 659 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 659. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Aquino.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Aquino, on your amendment.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask for the adoption of the amendment and I'll explain it on 3rd. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Aquino moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 659. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 659. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 659.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Aquino.

SENATOR AQUINO:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is another extension of a sunset for actually the Pharmacy Practice Act from January 1, 2020 to January 1, 2030. It replaces the term "Director" with "Secretary" and clarifies standardized language regarding discipline orders to stay consistent with the language in other
licensings Act {sic}. I know of no opponents and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 659 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 659, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to return a few notches up the Calendar to Senate Bill 654. 654. Senator Bertino-Tarrant indicates she does wish to proceed and asks to recall Senate Bill 654 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 654. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, on your amendment. Senator.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

I ask for its adoption and I'll -- and I'll explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 654. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 654. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 654.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, on your bill.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is another extension of a sunset Act. This is with the Professional Engineering Practice Act of 1989. I know of no objections.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 654 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 654, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to turn back to page 5 of your printed Calendar. Near the bottom is Senate Bill 102. Senator Sandoval indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 102.

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

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Mr. President, are there a number of adopt -- couple amendments to be adopted or are they...

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

The amendments have been adopted, Senator.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 102, as amended, would allow the Secretary of State to issue digital registration plates and stickers. A number of issues have been resolved. There's no opposition to the bill. It passed out of committee unanimously. We want to get it over to the other Chamber to continue to work on this substantive piece of legislation. I'd ask a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 102 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, 1 voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 102, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We are pleased to -- the return of former Senator, now Congressman LaHood on the Senate Floor. Senator, good to see you. Welcome back. Let's turn to page 21 in your printed Calendar. Senate Bill 726. Senator Morrison, are you ready to go? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Senate Bill 726.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Morrison.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President.  This bill creates a disabled person's internship in all agencies in the State of Illinois that have more than fifteen hundred employees, as well as the constitutional officers.  I'm happy to answer any questions about it.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 726 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, none voting No, none voting Present.  Senate Bill 726, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  Next on our list is Senate Bill 727.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 727.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Glowiak.

SENATOR GLOWIAK:

Thank you.  I adopt the amendment?  No, go right into it?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)
We're -- amendments are already adopted. We're on 3rd Reading and you're ready to proceed. Senator Glowiak.

SENATOR GLOWIAK:

Ready to go. I'm ready to go. Thank you. Senate Bill 727, as amended, creates the Native American Employment Plan. SB 727, as amended, creates the Native American (Employment Plan) Advisory Council made up of various State agencies. The goals of the Plan and Council is to increase the number of Native American employees and the number of promotions to supervisory, technical, and managerial positions received by Native Americans at a State agency. It requires each State agency to add Native American persons into the required goals, affirmative action and equal employment opportunity goal. This initiative was brought to me through the Native American Chamber of Commerce of Illinois. And I ask for an Aye vote. Any questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 727 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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, none voting No, none voting Present. Senate Bill 727, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 728. Senator Sandoval. Senator Sandoval seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 728 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 728. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Sandoval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sandoval, on your amendment.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to adopt the amendment and explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sandoval moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 728. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 728. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 728.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Mr. President, this is an initiative of the Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists. It creates the DUI Prevention and Education Commission and Fund. IDOT, with guidance from the DUI Prevention and Education Commission, will distribute grants for a newly created fund for crash victim programs and materials. I'd ask a favorable vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

    Thank you, Senator.  Is there any discussion?  Senator DeWitte, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DeWITTE:

    Thank you, Mr. President.  Happy to cosponsor this initiative with Chairman Sandoval - anything we can do to try to prevent DUIs in the State of Illinois given recent incidents across the State over the last few months.  I urge an Aye vote.  Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR HARMON)

    Thank you, Senator.  Senator Sandoval, do you need to close?  Senator Sandoval, to close.  Question is, shall Senate Bill 728 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, none voting No, none voting Present.  Senate Bill 728, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.  Let's turn to page 22 of your printed Calendar.


PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

    We're going to go to page 19, Senate Bill 685.  Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 685 to the Order of 2nd Reading.  Leave is granted.  Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 685.  Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

    Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Harmon, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do not wish to adopt Floor Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do not wish to adopt Floor Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain Floor Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Third time's the charm. I would like to adopt Floor Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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 KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 685. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 685.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, to explain your bill.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 685 is very similar to bills I have passed through the Senate before. It is a pro-taxpayer bill. It offers an alternative way to ask a referendum question which will allow for a much more precise referendum. Many of us have experienced this, where our taxing bodies locally ask for an increase in their rate; when they do the math on the increased equalized assessed value or decrease, they end up with less than they thought they were going to get or, in some cases, much more than they told taxpayers they were asking for. This will allow them to ask for a dollar amount increase. It would also allow them to ask for it to be phased in over as many as four years to minimize the impact on taxpayers if they don't need all of the money upfront. We've had trouble getting it through the House, but this year the House does seem to be interested in -- in moving this as the result of a referendum gone bad in Berwyn. So I'm hoping to capitalize on this and pass this finally through both Chambers of the General Assembly and have it signed into law.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 685 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, there are 55 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 685, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 6, Senate Bill 182. Senator Morrison. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 182.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Morrison, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill requires the Department of Public Health to study the feasibility of creating a statewide registry of advance directives. The task force will be comprised of many stakeholders and will report back to the General Assembly in 2021.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 182 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 182, having received the required
constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to continue on, go to Senate Bill 190. Senator Morrison is ready. Please, Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 190.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Morrison, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MORRISON:

Senate Bill 190 requires Central Management Services to send a Successful Disability Opportunities (Program eligible candidate) list with the open competitive eligible list when open competitive eligible list has been requested by a hiring agency. This should facilitate more hiring of persons with disabilities in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Are there any questions? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 190 pass. All those in favor, say 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, there are 57 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 190, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On page 42 of the Calendar is the Order of the Secretary's Desk, Resolutions to Amend the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Mr. Secretary, having had its 1st Reading on April 10th, we will now proceed to the 2nd Reading of Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution in full for the second time.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

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

(Secretary reads SJRCA No. 1, as amended by SA No. 1)

Constitutional Amendment read in full a second time.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading.  Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 342, offered by Senator Bennett and all Members.

It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Resolutions Consent Calendar.  Mr. Secretary, Introduction of Senate Bills.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2250, offered by Senator Harris.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

A Message from the House by Mr. Hollman, 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 2.

We have received like Messages on House Bills 88, 92, 190, 331, 471, 1633, 1690, 1873, 2121, 2259, 2528, 2540, 2627, 2652,
A Message from the House by Mr. Hollman, 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 124.


PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:


(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 245, offered by Senator Villivalam.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 250, offered by Senator Barickman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1579, offered by Senator Cunningham.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1613, offered by Senator Sims.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1652, offered by Senator Belt.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 1915, offered by Senator Koehler.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2076, offered by Senator Gillespie.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2676, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3522, offered by Senator Sandoval.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3586, offered by Senator Koehler.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3590, offered by Senator Bush.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3661, offered by Senator Lightford.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2, offered by Senator Collins.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 88, offered by Senator -- President Cullerton.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 92, offered by Senator Barickman.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 331, offered by Senator Collins.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 471, offered by Senator Fine.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 1633, offered by Senator Hastings.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2121, offered by Senator Sandoval.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2259, offered by Senator Morrison.
(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2540, offered by Senator Tom Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2627, offered by Senator Castro.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2675, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2766, offered by Senator Cunningham.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 2847, offered by Senator Morrison.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3096, offered by Senator Harmon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3302, offered by Senator Koehler.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3334, offered by Senator Syverson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3462, offered by Senator Plummer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 3503, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Just to remind all Members of the Senate that tomorrow is the 3rd Reading deadline to get bills out of the Senate. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 10:30 a.m. on the 12th day of April 2019. The Senate stands adjourned.