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PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The regular Session of the 101st General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? And will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor Miriam Snider, Chatham United Methodist Church. Pastor.

PASTOR MIRIAM SNIDER:

(Prayer by Pastor Miriam Snider)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator McGuire, will you please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator McGuire)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Brian Mackey, NPR Illinois, requests permission to photograph and video record. And Lisa Yuscius, from the Blueroomstream, seeks permission to video stream. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Journal of November -- excuse me, Senate Journal of November 13th, 2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yeah, Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hunter moves to approve the Journal just read by the Secretary. There being no objection, so ordered. Oh, I'm sorry.
Yeah. Senator Hunter moves to postpone the readings and the approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 826, offered by Senator Anderson and all Members.
It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary, reports Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 671 and Motion to Concur to House Amendments 1, 2, and 4 to Senate Bill 177 Recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, Introduction and Reading of Senate Bills for the first time.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2309, offered by Senator Van Pelt.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sam Dunklau, NPR Illinois, requests permission to photograph and video record. Seeing no objection, leave -- leave is granted. Will all Members in the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Chamber? We'll begin business. The Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet. Will
the members of the Committee on Assignments please come to the
President's Anteroom immediately? The Senate will stand at ease.
Senator Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Purpose of an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your introduction.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Excuse me. Today, we have with us teachers and students from the Rich South High School. It is in Senator Hastings' district, but they're directly south, adjoining my district. Members of my district actually attend Rich South as well, but the school itself is located in Senator Hastings' district. But let's give a warm Springfield welcome to the Rich South School...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Welcome to Springfield and the General Assembly. Senator Morrison, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MORRISON:

On a point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR MORRISON:

November is National Adoption Awareness Month and DCFS and the Illinois Adoption Advisory Council are out to raise awareness about the urgent need for adoptive families for children and family {sic} in foster care through their campaign "What's Your Connection?" Everyone's connected to adoption in some way, whether it's through adoption through foster care, private adoption,
international adoption, or the adoption of a family member. More than sixteen thousand Illinois children were placed in a permanent home in the last decade and seventeen hundred youth are currently waiting to be adopted. I encourage my Senate colleagues and all Illinoisans to celebrate your connections to adoption via social media using the hashtags #findyourconnection #adoptionmonth and be sure to tag @illinoisDCFS. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Thank you, Senator. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 828, offered by Senator Bertino-Tarrant and all Members.
It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 827, offered by Senator Anderson and all Members.
It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Resolutions Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

And Senate Joint Resolution 51, offered by Senator Fowler. It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Plummer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR PLUMMER:

Mr. President, I rise for a point of personal privilege.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR PLUMMER:

To the Members of the Senate, if I could have your attention for -- for one minute here. I rise today to honor and congratulate a longtime public servant in both State and local government. Our friend, Phil Gonet, over here with his wife, Cathy, after forty-four years of service to the great State of Illinois and the City of Springfield will retire at the end of the year from his most recent job as President of the Illinois Coal Association, a position he has held since 2004. Phil started his career in 1975 in the Illinois Bureau of the Budget. From there, he had a number of positions throughout State government, including House Republican Appropriation Staff, Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance for the Board of Regents, Deputy Chief of Staff for Governor Jim Thompson, Executive Director of the Illinois Commerce Commission, Deputy Director for Program Support in the Department of Children and Family Services, and Phil served the City of Springfield as General Manager of City Water, Light and Power. Is there anything I missed there, Phil? Well, there is one thing I missed. In 2006, Phil opened and owned the Cold Stone Creamery in downtown Springfield, which, within its first six months of opening, was the second-highest -- second-highest revenue-producing store in the country. Phil has always been a true professional and a dear friend and it's been a pleasure working with him. We congratulate you on your retirement, Phil. I know you'll enjoy it with your wife, Cathy, and your family. And now you may have a little more time from April to September to attend Boston Red Sox games, because we know they won't be playing in
October. Phil, thank you for your friendship and your service to the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Will our guest please rise? Congratulations. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 10. Signed by Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

We're going to go to page 3 on the Calendar, House Bills 3rd Reading. We're going to start at the top of the page with House Bill 961. Senator Ellman. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 961.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Ellman, to explain your bill.

SENATOR ELLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 961 is just a cleanup from a bill that was passed during Session where Cook County is piloting a program such that seniors who qualify for an exemption in their property tax need not reapply every year. That bill listed tax years 2020 through 2024. It needs to be 2019 through 2023 and that's what this bill does. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 961 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 53 Yeas, none (sic) Nays, none voting Present. And House Bill 961, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're on House Bill 1268. Senator Emil Jones. House Bill 1269. Senator Emil Jones. House Bill 1271. Senator Hastings. Senator Harmon is going to take over for Senator Hastings. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 1271. We will skip the next one. We'll go to House Bill 39... We'll go back to House Bill 1271. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Yes, there's a letter on file for Senator Harmon to handle the bill for Senator Hastings. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
House Bill 1271.
(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 (sic) Bill 1271 is Senator Hastings' bill. I carried it through the committee for him in his absence yesterday and I'm happy to present it on his behalf today. This is a trailer bill on craft distiller licenses. I'm not aware of any controversy. I'd be happy to answer questions, or try to, but I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 1271 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 51 -- 52 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 1271, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We will skip the next one. We'll go to House Bill 3902. Senator Crowe. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3902.

(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. House Bill 3-9-0-2 reinstates the sales tax exemption for materials, parts, equipment, components, and furnishings incorporated into or upon aircraft. The bill provides that the credit will continue until December 31st of 2024 and that no refunds will be provided for the tax paid while the exemption was expired, which is 2015 through the effective date of this bill. This exemption is not new. We first enacted it in 2010 and it's worth taking a minute to talk about how we got to where we are today, where you all have the opportunity to reinstate it. In 2010, this exemption was put into place to allow Illinois to compete with other states, specifically our bordering states, and this exemption worked. The business came to the State of Illinois and it has grown greatly. The sunset date was not in the
original legislation that was enacted in 2010. Separate legislation was passed that put a sunset on any tax exemption bill that didn't previously have a sunset date on it. Therefore, this exemption sunsetted without anyone knowing it. And when I say that no one knew it, I mean the State did not know it and the industry did not know it. The original sponsor didn't realize that it had expired, and in fact, that original sponsor, Senator Clayborne, attempted to expand the exemption in 2015. And it -- and it turned out that the entire proposal at that time would have been invalid because the exemption had already lapsed. No one on our own policy -- or LRB caught this in 2015. In 2016, the company that is in my district, West Star, was audited by DOR. DOR, at that time, missed that the exemption had lapsed -- lapsed. Our own Legislator Tax Handbook still has this exemption listed as valid. The national tax databases used by the financial and tax professionals had it wrong. The industry's national association, the National Business Aviation Association, had it wrong in their tax guide. This industry did not know that the exemption lapsed and has been lapsed for the past five years, and it would simply be inequitable and unfair to hold them accountable for not having that knowledge. This is a sales tax, which means that it would have been paid by the customers at the time of the service. Because the industry did not know that they were supposed to be collecting that sales tax, they did not do so. It would be absurd to think that they would go back to customers from five years ago in an attempt to now collect those taxes. Over the past five years, this exemption has worked as it was expected to do so. The jobs were promoted and they have been performed by over thirty-seven hundred workers in our State that have paid taxes and ultimately
contributed to their local economies. The employers of these workers at the corporate level have also paid their taxes and increased Illinois' revenues. This original exemption caused growth in several areas. Illinois is the home to some of the largest, well-known, and most-respected MROs in the country. I mentioned one previously; it's West Star Aviation. West Star Aviation employs five hundred and seven employees in my district. They have grown since this exemption came into place, enormously. Customers in this industry are unique and they have to choose where to get their aircraft serviced. They have the choice of thirty-five other states, including our bordering states, where they can go for this tax exemption. I ask you to support the State of Illinois and the thirty-seven hundred workers and this industry by voting Yes for this bill. I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Anderson.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...bill.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I just want to rise in support of this legislation. I want to thank Senator Crowe for her work here. Like Senator Crowe, I have Elliott Aviation in my district, which employs a lot of people and is a huge economic driver to the Illinois Quad Cities. If this were not to pass, the company in my district, being literally less than two miles away from the Iowa border that does support this, they would be leaving. And I cannot
tell you how important this legislation is - not only to my
district, but to the State of Illinois. And I would just urge an
Aye vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I, too, stand in -- and rise
in support of this bill. There is a -- a company in my district,
Flightstar, which has grown dramatically since the exemption came
into effect and it has obviously increased employment in my area,
but also increased commerce. Flightstar is partnered with Willard
Airport in Champaign and the University of Illinois to fund a
customs and border protection building, which makes our Central
Illinois community a port of entry and allows direct international
flight into Illinois, which ultimately increases commerce. I would
point out, and some of the -- the trackers of the bill have talked
about, whether this is in some way protecting wealthy plane owners.
What I would say is, direct -- in -- in regards to the company in
my district, is that eighty percent of the business with Flightstar
is from out of State. In other words, we will not be collecting
this tax, because these need -- to -- to continue to see their
favorite mechanics in Champaign, Illinois, this eighty percent of
their business will have to fly over states where it's cheaper to
get their mechanics and their -- their repairs done to come into
Champaign. That simply won't happen. And just to -- to point out
that this isn't a provincial bill. This doesn't just affect Senator Crowe's district. There's a hundred and forty-five specialized employees in East Central Illinois working at Flightstar. I don't see that that would continue if this bill doesn't pass. I would ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator DeWitte.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...bill.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

I want to thank Senator Crowe for her work on this bill. My particular district is bordered by both DuPage Airport in West Chicago and Aurora Airport in Aurora. And I guess, in what could best be described as an oversight at best, but perhaps pure ineptness at worst, the previous administration did not do a very good job of policing this particular legislation. Unfortunately, Governor Pritzker has threatened to veto this bill, which could create dire financial straits to a number of these companies who do these repairs to the tune of about fifty million dollars. This money would come out of their pockets, would come out of their corporate reserves. They would have no way to recoup these tax revenues from past clients. In addition, the new tax would simply put these companies in an uncompetitive situation, having to compete with thirty-three other states in this country who offer this sales tax rebate for the avionics repair industry in this country. I rise to ask my colleagues to support this legislation and urge an Aye vote. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Belt.

SENATOR BELT:

Thank you. I rise in support of House Bill 3902. I commend Senator Crowe for her legislation. I, too, have an aerospace company in my district, Gulfstream. They provide a full selection of maintenance, repair, overhaul services. They occupy approximately six hundred and fifty-two thousand square feet. They directly employ four hundred and five people—thirty percent of those are veterans. It would be a devastating, negative impact on my district if those jobs were to leave. And beyond that, they partner with local—the local high school, Cahokia Unit School District 187. They bring the—the students out; they introduce them to the jobs that are being offered on their campus. And we all know it's about exposure, it's about experience. They're in partnership with the food bank. And so really I just want to rise and—and and really urge the Ladies and Gentlemen of this Senate to support and vote Aye on House Bill 3902. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Rose.

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's a—there's a—a fundamental fairness issue here, which is the rules can't change and then retroactively apply taxation. So if you want to do something, do it on a forward basis, but don't go backwards. But, more importantly, for the people I represent, I've got a couple hundred jobs at Willard Airport through Flightstar and the whole reason we get—we get extra flights into Champaign-Urbana, because the regional for the Midwest, they
service their planes there at Flightstar. So, for us, this isn't just about the fundamental fairness; it's about jobs and it's also about the future economic vitality of our whole region, because the whole reason we get those extra flights in and out of Champaign-Urbana is because Flightstar's there. So I thank the sponsor for bringing this forward. I -- I don't -- I think it's kind of ludicrous to somehow think that we are going to veto -- this is going to be vetoed, when these people complied with what they believed to be the law and then you're trying to retroactively come back in -- I've seen the Department of Revenue do this time and again over the years. A couple years ago, they did it to cell phone retailers. So all these little mom-and-pop retailers suddenly get a couple-hundred-thousand-dollar bill in the mail from the Department of Revenue when they were in compliance with what they believed to be the law and here comes DOR. Guess what? Even the First Circuit in Cook County threw the Department of Revenue out of court, but only after years of lawsuits later. DOR pulls this stunt again and again and again. It's unfair to do this retroactively. It's wrong to do it retroactively. And second of all, think about the -- last time I checked, Illinois -- Illinois is not doing anywhere near the rest of the Midwest in terms of jobs, anywhere near the rest of the -- rest of the Midwest. These are good jobs. These are jobs with benefits. Look at the regionalization all across the State of what this has done to bring jobs to the State of Illinois. But, for our area, it's more than even just the jobs; it's the economic vitality of the region those extra air flying -- air flights bring us every day because we've got Flightstar sitting there to service the aircraft. I couldn't urge a stronger Aye vote on this and I thank the sponsor for
bringing it forward. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Crowe, to close.

SENATOR CROWE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This exemption was designed to create jobs by putting Illinois on a level playing field with other tax-exempt states and it did exactly that. This industry did what we asked of them: They came to our State, they invested, they created jobs, they partnered with our community colleges to create apprenticeship programs. Let's do the right thing today. Let's support the industry and the thirty-seven hundred jobs that are in this State relying on us. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall House Bill 3902 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 48 Yeas, 1 Nay, 2 Present. And House Bill 3902, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go back up to the top of the page to House Bill 1268. Senator Jones.

Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 1268.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Jones, to explain your bill.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of
the Senate. House Bill 1268 extends the sunset -- Community Association Manager Licensing and Disciplinary Act by two years, from January 1st, 2020 to January 1st of '22. I know of no opposition. Look for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 1268 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 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 1268, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go now to House Bill 1269.

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 1269.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Jones, to explain your bill.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 1269 extends the Medical Practice Act of 1987 to align with out-of-state physician's renewal fees. I know of no opposition. Look for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall House Bill 1269 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 1271, having --
I'm sorry, House Bill 1269, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

...you -- thank you, Mr. President. For a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Every day we introduce people that make us look just a little bit better in the lives that we lead. Today is no exception. I'm honored to introduce two of our interns on our Communications Staff. First, we have Johnathon Goodenow. He's a recent graduate from Greenville University with degrees in Communication and English. He's from Central Illinois? Close. All right. Very good. And we also have Lane Caspar. She's a student at Millikin University. Lane is studying Communication and she's originally from Sherman. I'd like a warm Springfield welcome, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate. We're going to go to the Calendar on page 4, to the top. We'll deal with Concurrences. Senate Bill 119. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Oh, the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 119. Signed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Steans, to explain your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Hi. Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a trailer bill to the Budget Implementation Bill, so it -- it includes a lot of technical fixes that came out of a -- and primarily from discussions with Department of Revenue and the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. One, for example, was in doing the new Wayfair's tax on remote-located sales; that the way it had been put in place in the Budget Implementation Bill was found to just not be workable, so there's a technical fix for that. And there's a number of other sort of technical fixes to make a lot of the budget aspects work. Happy to answer any questions on any of the details it contains.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

A question for the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. For purposes of legislative intent, my question relates to the leveling the playing field and the related changes to the Use Tax and Retailers' Occupation Tax Acts. Is it -- is my understanding correct that these proposals were contained in Public Act 101-009 and 101-031 but were not correctly done?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

That's correct.
So what is contained in this cleanup BIMP enacts what we intended to enact last June?

Yes. It enacts what we intended for last June, including existing law advantage as marketplace for facilitators. Under the existing laws enacted last June, marketplace facilitors (sic) and their affiliates can send their good -- sell their goods over their marketplace. Under this fix, they are specifically prohibited from doing so; therefore, there will no longer be an advantage for the marketplace facilitators. It's important to note that they weren't seeking that advantage. If we didn't fix this, local governments could have actually lost money, particularly those with warehouses. Second, it authorizes marketplace facilitators to collect ROT at destination on sales made by marketplace sellers over the marketplace. Third, how information flows between the marketplace facilitator and the seller is fixed. For example, enacted law required the marketplace to obtain from the seller the local tax rate. The seller has no way of knowing at the time of sale what the tax rate will be. That information needs to be obtained from -- you know, Department of Revenue. If we don't fix that, it is unworkable. The enacted law required marketplace sellers to continue to register and pay the tax. This makes it clear that the marketplace collects and pays the tax on behalf of the seller. Without this, you lose the compliance advantage and
the revenue. And finally, fifth, use tax provisions were stricken in the enacted law. If they were not restored and something happened when we couldn't collect the ROT, State budget and the local government share of the one percent of the 6.25 percent would have been lost. We restore those use tax provisions to secure the State budget and the local share.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

...that long answer. My third question is, so we will be enacting what we intended last spring and delivering on the promises we made to our local governments, public safety agencies, schools, the RTA, and our Illinois retailers. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Senator Steans, my last question is, finally, it's -- my understanding accurate that these changes are made possible as a result of the Wayfair decision by the U.S. Supreme Court?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Correct. The Supreme Court ruled that remote retailers can now be considered retailers for the purposes of collecting sales tax. We've interrupted that decision within Illinois' occupation
and use tax system. The court laid out that they would view collection requirements in terms of simplicity and we have met those guidelines. Further, we're treating sales through marketplaces the same, sales by remote sellers the same, and Illinois retailers making sales outside of the marketplace the same. Finally, we had made similar distinctions in the past, such as with leases and vending machines.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin. Senator Steans, to...

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you for answering my questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans, to close.

SENATOR STEANS:

I urge your Aye votes. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 119. 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 48 voting Yea, 5 voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 119, having received the required constitutional majority, does concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 119, and the bill is declared passed. We're going to go to Concurrences. Senate Bill 391. Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 391.
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, to explain your motion.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President.  House Amendment 1 basically says -- it amends the children's mental health services Section of the Illinois Public Aid Code to clarify the intent of the original bill.  Be more than happy to answer any questions.  There's no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 391.  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 53 Ayes -- Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present.  And -- and -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur on House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 391, and the bill is declared passed.  We're going to go to Senate Bill 659.  Senator Martwick.  Mr. Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 659.

Signed by Senator Martwick.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Martwick.

SENATOR MARTWICK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.  Senate Bill 659 is a fire safety bill.  It is -- it does two
things. One is it expands the types of certification that fire safety or fire sprinkler safety inspectors can have in order -- in -- or -- or receive in order to become inspectors. And the second is, is it creates uniformity by taking the current NICET Level II and raising that certification to NICET Level III and phasing that in over a period of two years so the effective date would be 2022. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate -- I'm sorry. Senator McConchie, for -- do you have a question?

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to call -- the attention of the Members of the Chamber that this measure is opposed by a number of the business groups due to concerns in regards to this language. So I would just encourage you to double-check before you just hit Aye. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 659. The voting is open. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed voting Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 38 voting Yea, 15 voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional
majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 3 -- 659, and the bill is declared passed. We're going to Senate Bill 667. Senator Manar. Mr.... Senator Manar. We'll go to Senate Bill 670. Senator Muñoz. We'll go to Senate Bill 1041 -- or -- I'm sorry, 1042. Senator Anderson. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1042.

Signed by Senator Anderson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Anderson, to explain your motion.

SENATOR ANDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill -- or the motion to Senate Bill 1042 - this is an extension for an area of my district, a TIF extension. I would ask for an Aye vote. This is pretty important to my area.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 1042. 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 Yea, 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 1042, and the bill is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to Senate Bill 670. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:
I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 670.
Signed by Senator Muñoz.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As amended, just creates Corporate Governance Annual Disclosure Law. The bill aligns with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners Model Act and it just clarifies the definition of an "insurer". I know of no opposition to the bill.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments (sic) No. 1 to Senate Bill 670. 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 Yea -- 54 voting Yea, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments (sic) No. 1 to Senate Bill 670, and the bill is declared passed. We'll go to Senate Bill 1200. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1200.
Signed by Senator McConchie.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

SENATOR McCONCHIE:
Thank you, Mr. President. This bill simply addresses — extends the mandate for several task forces and cleans up some language in order to make sure they can all continue to function properly. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no -- no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 12 -- shall Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1200 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments (sic) No. 1 to Senate Bill 1200, and the bill is declared passed. Going to the top of the page 5. Senate Bill 1300. Senator Castro. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 5, 6, and 7 to Senate Bill 1300.

Signed by Senator Castro.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your motion.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1300, as amended, consolidates all Article 3, Downstate Police Pension Fund, and Article 4, Downstate Fire Pension Fund, pension fund assets and investment authority into a single Downstate Police Officers' Pension Investment Fund and a single Downstate Fire (sic) (Firefighters') Pension Investment Fund over a thirty-month
transition period that starts with the enactment of this bill. The two Funds, known as the Consolidated Funds, must separately — separately calculate account balances for each participating pension fund. The operations and financial conditions of each participating downstate pension fund will not affect the account balance of any other participating pension fund. Further, investments returned (sic) (investment returns) earned by the Fund must be allocated and distributed pro rata among each participating pension fund in accordance with the value of the pension fund assets attributed to each fund. The bill, as amended, leaves local pension funds and their exclusive authority to adjudicate and award disability benefits, retirement benefits, survivor benefits and to issue...(inaudible)... GOMB estimates a total savings for the consolidation will be a hundred sixty million annually. I'll take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a few questions, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator Castro, this issue, generally speaking, has been the subject of a lot of press coverage and a lot of conversations inside and outside the building and, at -- at least, in my district, and I suspect in a lot of others, the source of significant local consternation under the heading of "Do You Trust Springfield with Your Pension Dollars?"
But I -- I'll go back to that in a moment. I want to ask some -- some -- some specific questions about the way the bill will -- will operate. It's my understanding that in the legislation there is a thirty-month transition timetable, if you will, during which the assets that are currently held by the local funds are going to be transitioned into these larger Consolidated Funds. Is that generally -- is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

That is correct, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

What can you tell me specifically - and of course, not just tell me, tell the retirees and the -- the fire and police retirees back home - what can you tell me specifically about what that transition process will look like? In other words, the -- the process by which the investment asset that is held in the Lawrenceville Police Pension Fund is going to be transferred over into this new large consolidated statewide, State-managed police fund, how does that -- what does that process look like?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So -- so the -- so the simplest way to answer that for you, Senator, is the process is left up to the Board which will be elected and permanent in one year. And much of the process will be spelled out in rules. There will be audits. And so, in the
transition timeline that's been outlined, is -- beginning January 2020, the Governor appoints the transition board. The board appoints an interim director and starts hiring consultants and staff; audits local fund assets. December 2020: The permanent board must be elected by then. The election process is likely to begin well before this. January 2021: The permanent board is seated. January -- June 2022: The initial transfer process is complete. September 2022: All other assets that have not been transferred should be accounted for and transferred. December 2022: All books and all other pertinent records must be transferred of the local funds to the Consolidated Funds. Also, a permanent director must be appointed by the board by then.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay, the -- okay, I listened very carefully to your answer, Senator, and I heard generally two issues. You broke out a timeline for me and you told me who is going to make the decisions about the process of transferring the assets. Can I take from that answer that there's no detail in the bill about that process, nor do you have any about the process by which those assets will be transferred from our locals to the State-managed fund? Is the fair?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senate Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So it'll be through rules with the consolidated boards and the smaller boards. That's who'll -- that's where the -- some of that decision still lies.
And those -- those transition decisions are going to be made by the board that's appointed, not the board that's elected by the members, right? I mean, that's the whole point of having the transition board, is to put together the process of transitioning the assets. So that board is not accountable to the local members. That board is appointed out of here in Springfield. Is that correct?

So the initial board will take part for the first twelve months and then the permanent board will start making those decisions.

Now, I want to -- I want to put before you a -- a situation that is a very real situation in my district. I suspect it is very true in a number of our districts, whether you've talked to your locals or not, about the specific investments or investment vehicles that they maintain in their local funds. In my district, I have a number of communities whose police and fire pension funds contain annuities and the annuities mature. In other words, the payoff comes upon the passing of a specific individual. Now, we have a transition process that says this is going to be done in thirty months. If the individual whose lifetime is linked to the
maturity of the asset doesn't pass away in the thirty months, then how does the -- and transition process handle that? Do they sell off the annuity prematurely, take the loss, and then transfer it into the larger fund, or are they going to hold that investment separate until it matures?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

...think the ninety-six percent is easily liquidable. The other four percent would have to be negotiated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

We do have other questioners. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm -- I -- can you repeat that? I did not understood {sic} what you said about ninety-six and four.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So ninety-six percent of the assets can be easily liquidated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. Okay. I mean, I -- I do not -- where does -- one, where does that number come from? And two, what does easily liquidated mean? Because you could easily liquidate the annuity, you're just going to take a huge loss on it. And in the -- in the instance of one of my communities, if they are required to sell off those annuities, right now -- right now, based on market conditions -- if they're required to sell off those annuities or
rather if the State sells them off before they mature, it's a twenty-five percent hit to the value of the fund. Twenty-five percent hit to the value of the fund, which is probably underfunded already like most of these are. So, two questions, where does the ninety-six to four ratio come from that you just gave me, and two, what does easily liquidated mean?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So, again, the ninety-six percent is liquid; the four percent won't be moved till it -- it can be moved, until it's liquid.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter, further questions?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay, Senator, I asked where does the ninety-six/four number that you -- and now, when you said that earlier, you said easily liquidated; then you just said ninety-six percent is liquid - which would be two different issues. Where does the ninety-six/four number that you are giving me come from? And what falls into the category of liquid or easily liquidated?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So, can they -- they will stay with the local board until they can be transferred. They will not -- they will transfer funds not required to cash them out.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Is that language in the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:
It is in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Can you give me a page and line reference, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:
We'll have to get back to you on that, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Mr. President, I know we have a few things today -- to do today. We're talking about billions of dollars in assets, local retiree monies. I think we can wait for sixty or ninety seconds to allow Senator Castro and staff to come up with the bill page number and line reference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
We do have other Members that want to ask questions. Can we get back to you on that? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Actually -- actually, I think she has an answer, Senator -- Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Castro. I ask again. They're working on that. Can
we have some other questioners ask questions and get back to you and give you more time? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, Mr. -- my understanding is, we're going to let her come -- find the answer while others are speaking and then come back to me so I can finish my questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Yes -- yes.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I appreciate the accommodation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

All right. Further questions? Senator Martwick.

SENATOR MARTWICK:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill. I rise in support of this legislation today. This is something that in my tenure in the House as Chairman of the Committee on Personnel and Pensions, we conducted numerous hearings on this. This is the right way to go. This is sort of a "can't lose" situation. However, I do want to point out that while this bill does so much good, it leaves some things left to be done. For years, those first responders who served in the City of Chicago have had a substantially, dramatically lower pension benefit compared to their downstate police and fire colleagues. This bill creates, once again, a disparity. It fixes problems with Tier 2. It -- it fixes problems with -- with the Tier 2 benefit for downstate police and fire, but it does not address those problems for Chicago police and fire. So while I rise in support of this bill, I would ask the Body to join me in ensuring that we address the same solutions to the same
problems that we are finding here for every other first responder in the State of Illinois; that we provide those same fixes to the pension systems for the City of Chicago. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

I want to follow up on maybe a different line of questions from Senator Righter's earlier discussion and talk about the pension benefit enhancements that are in the bill and that I believe have received very little discussion to date. So, to the sponsor, I guess a -- a few questions. First of all, as I understand the legislation, it's been reported that this is an attempt to satisfy some safe harbor rules put in place by the IRS. Can you just explain to me what -- what the intent of that piece of the bill is designed to address?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So the benefit increases that you're talking about are: The "final average salary" - means the greater average monthly salary obtained by the dividing of the total salary of police officer or firefighter during the forty-eight consecutive months of service within the last sixty months of service or the ninety-six months within the last hundred and twenty months in which the total salary was the highest by the number of months of service in that period.
COLA - the cost of living adjustment calculation has been redefined. The amount shall annually be increased by the lesser of three percent of that amount, including previous adjustments, or the annual unadjusted percentage increase in consumer price index. Survivor benefits - the pension to which the surviving spouse, children, or parents are entitled shall be in the amount equal to the greater of fifty-four percent of the police officer or firefighter's monthly salary at the date of death or sixty-six two-thirds of the police officer's or firefighter's earned pension at the date of death. And this is to make sure we satisfy federal law. If you're asking what are the two -- Tier 2…

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Yeah, I -- I think your -- your answer attempts to describe technically what is done. But -- but here's the -- here's the question. The -- Illinois has a long history of having some very significant unfunded pension liabilities. Your proposal increases the benefits that Tier 2 pension members would receive. I think that's a very controversial position to take, the notion that, given Illinois' long history of funding its pensions, this proposal attempts to enhance the benefits. And I'm asking, why are you including that -- that -- this has nothing to do with consolidation. This is a pension benefit enhancement. And I want to know, why are you proposing to enhance the pension benefits, given the long history of problems that this State has with this issue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.
SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator, I -- you know, one of the things that you have to understand, we have to fix this anyway. That's part of the requirements and that's why a lot of this conversation is taking place, because we have to fix this eventually when it deals to Tier 2. This was negotiated amongst everyone, from IML to the unions. This was a part of the working group, the Governor's pension task force. This was all negotiated and agreed upon amongst all the groups.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Okay, so you've raised two separate issues. One, you said, we have to do this, and two, you said, a bunch of stakeholders negotiated this. Explain to me, why do we have to do this? This has -- this question has nothing to do with the desires of the stakeholders. Explain to me your answer of -- your point of we have to do this. Why do -- why do we have to do this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)


SENATOR CASTRO:

So we -- lose a million dollars a day if we don't consolidate these funds. On top of the fact, if we -- you know, we -- we need to do this to close this gap if we don't do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:
Says who? Again, who is requiring the State of Illinois to enhance pension benefits under this bill and your proposal? Who's requiring it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator, I -- I -- I understand you're thinking of it in pension enhancements. We have to fix these problems inherent to Tier 2. We have to start talking about this and working through this. This is part of negotiating between the -- the -- the Governor's pension working task force. And it's cheaper to do this now than do it later, so why not fix this now? There was countless hours, countless negotiation that took place to make this happen so that way we can stop the bleeding and also take pressure off taxpayers, who are constantly yelling at us about help us address the property tax issue, because that's what's paying for their pensions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Your response though, again, you're -- you're -- you're -- you're mixing two issues here. You're saying property taxpayers are demanding relief and you've proposed a pension consolidation plan that may generate some relief. Separate of that in your bill is a pension benefit enhancement. Property taxpayers -- I have not found a property taxpayer who is demanding this Body enhance pension benefits. And so I'm asking about those provisions in the bill, what you say it's required. You say that it's required because the working group requires it. Who -- I don't think that's
true. Who is requiring the State of Illinois to enhance its pension benefits that you've proposed in the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Senator, this was asked and answered. Again, the IRS is going to make us fix this anyway. So why -- why are we delaying fixing this when it's going to cost us more later? Let's fix it now. Let's have this conversation, fix it now, before we keep bleeding on this issue. So you're either for pension consolidation or not? Which is it?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

I've now put the timer on. Can we please be concise in our discussion? Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

I want to help with the question. You -- you say the IRS may require it. The IRS -- let's just -- to bring it all in, the IRS issues rules and the rules deal with the retirement benefit plans that are offered in places like the State of Illinois. And I think, to help the sponsor there, I think the sponsor's suggestion is that the IRS safe harbor rules are -- is your point that these safe harbor rules are being violated and that the IRS is requiring us to do this?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Safe harbor rules are already being violated. We will be required to do this. Again, asked and answered, Senator. Do you have a different question other than asking the same question three
times? If you don't want to vote for pension consolidation, so be it, don't vote for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Can we wrap this up, Senator Barickman?

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Where is the IRS directive requiring the State to do this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Again, we can get sued at any time on this issue. Would you prefer us to get sued and force a fix, or would you rather be proactive and fix it now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Barickman, to wrap up.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Here's -- to the bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Here's the point of the questions. We know a lot of things in this State. We know that in 2011 the General Assembly passed into law certain reforms to its pension systems designed to slow the growth of its unfunded liabilities. Those 2011 reforms included certain provisions that this bill walks back. Those reforms have nothing to do with pension -- pension consolidation. Pension consolidation can be done without increasing the benefits of Tier 2. We also know this: We know that Illinois has some of the worst funded pension systems in the country. Most people point to at least two things as to why Illinois pension problems exist.
One is lack of funding and two is actions done year after year by
the Legislature to enhance benefits, often without even
understanding the costs of paying for those benefits. We know
something else. We know that, under the Illinois Constitution,
when the General Assembly acts and passes a pension benefit
enhancement, what's passed by the Legislature may never be taken
back. A few other things. The problems created in Illinois'
pension systems, lack of funding, pension benefit enhancements,
this year we're seeing both. The Governor's budget proposal this
year proposed to take a pension holiday, which would clearly
aggregate -- aggravate further the pension problem that exists in
this State. Thankfully, the Body, we came to an agreement to move
past that reckless proposal by the Governor. But here, today, we
see a proposal that attempts again to increase pension benefits.
What we don't know: We don't know whether this pension benefit
enhancement is required. The IRS has not told us that we must do
this. The IRS has not opined that we're violating some safe harbor
provisions. The sponsor is speculating that we may violate IRS
rules. But even if we did, the next question would be, does this
solution fix the problem? Nothing's been suggested that that be
the case. And even if we could go down that road and say, well,
it -- it solves a problem we don't know exists, the next question
would be, must we do it now, must we pass a pension benefit
enhancement now? And lastly, and an important question that I
hope the sponsor will address in her comments, which is, what is
the cost of the pension benefit enhancement? Not the Governor's
analysis, but why have we not had an actuarial analysis to tell us
what the cost of this pension benefit enhancement is? If this is
necessary, which I don't think has been shown, and if this fix is
the proper fix, we still should have -- it's prudent for taxpayers for us to know what is the cost per an actuarial analysis of what these pension benefit enhancements cost. Without that, this Body stands to do just what our predecessors have done, which is pass pension benefit sweeteners and enhancements overnight without public scrutiny and without even knowing what those benefits may cost. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Thank you. We're going to continue to use the timer at this point. Further discussion? Senator Oberweis.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

First of all, for way of background, for those of you who don't know, I am more than just ice cream; I started Oberweis Asset Management about forty years ago. Today our firm manages over three billion dollars in pension -- primarily pension assets. I also served for several years on the pension board of Moose International. So I've sat on both sides of the table. I think I understand these issues fairly well. First question I have for the sponsor is, can you give us an idea of what you believe the actual savings will be in terms of basis points or percentages?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

So, GOMB has predicted a -- a savings of a hundred and sixty million. Most funds will see a two percent gain from their current
investment rate, roughly one million dollars per day of gain when -- with consolidation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOECHLER)

Senator Oberweis.

SENATOR OBERWEIS:

I would say to this group, the idea of two percentage points increase is ludicrous. It's silly. It's ridiculous. Now, I start from a basis that I believe in pension consolidation. I think that's a good idea. I support the idea. However, don't go in with the idea that we're going to save two hundred basis points or two percentages points - that's absolutely ridiculous. But there are some potential savings there. What really -- and I was firmly supportive of this bill - I have talked to my constituents and I've had twenty or thirty constituents calling, writing, saying please don't vote for this, give it time, at least wait till the -- the full Session, and I've argued in favor of it because I think pension consolidation is the right thing to do - until this morning, when we come out and we say, okay, now we're going to throw in a new Tier 2 benefit. And just as Senator Barickman was talking about, I believe this is a real problem. If we need to make a fix on that, provide a bill that will make a fix on that and let's debate that issue. Don't do the typical Springfield bull, where we, at the last minute, we throw it into a bill and say, okay, you got a good bill here, now I'm going to put this sweetener in there and nobody's going to notice it and we're going to pass it all in one package. That's absolutely the wrong thing to do. It's the Springfield way to do. Please don't let that happen. In fact, with that in there, I will be a No vote on something that I think has a good idea that we should pass, but
not with that added on. And I think Senator Barickman made a very strong case and convinced me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Cole Henke of WCIA requests permission to film. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Castro, to...

SENATOR CASTRO:

Righter's answer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

We have one more questioner and then we'll go to Senator Righter. So, Senator DeWitte.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR DeWITTE:

I rise today in support of this legislation because I have the support of my public safety agencies and the mayors in my district to make things happen with regards to pensions in this State, and this is not the catch-all to end all, but it is a start in that process. I believe the local fund consolidation will create the potential for greater investment returns and help ensure financial stability so that we can keep our promises to our first responders in the State of Illinois. I believe the efficiencies of six hundred and fifty different investment strategies has proven to be problematic and millions upon millions of dollars are lost to administrative fees that can be saved and returned to taxpayers by this consolidation Act. Both labor groups and the Illinois Municipal League were able to work out a compromise that sets the stage for better results for these funds. The administration of
benefits will still take place at the local level, so our first responders will still be given the local representation that ensures that this gets the benefits -- that they get the benefits that they have earned for their service to this State. And finally, this bill contains changes necessary, and to be continued in discussion, to be compliant with federal law to avoid the potential of costly legal challenges in the future, which I believe to be an irresponsible path to maintain. I support this legislation and I urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

And now we'll go back to Senator Righter. And do you have a response, Senator Castro? Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

As promised, Senator Righter, we looked up the bill and we have the answer you're talking about. Page 175, line 17, "the Fund shall promptly and prudently transfer all such pension fund assets". That means transfer, not cash out. This is local fiduciary duty. So no one's forced to liquidate anything. They'll transfer as soon -- when it's best for the fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. I heard the quote and -- and I'm just -- we can bring this in for a landing, because the issue, the specific issue I asked about, is not in the bill. What you're saying is that language confers upon these people a fiduciary duty and if they're complying with their fiduciary duty, they're not going to be so silly as to cash out something that hasn't matured. I hope you're right. I hope you're right. The point is, it's not in the bill.
The issue, that specific issue, is not in the bill. I do not disagree that the people who are running this fund will have a fiduciary duty, just like the locals do right now. So, with that, one of the other questions I've been asked by my constituents is the issue of timing here. Veto Session is six days long. Why is this not something that we can do in the spring Session after we have perhaps some more independent verification of the savings claims and return on investment increased claims that that have been made?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Very simple. It costs a million -- you know, a million dollars a day. On top of the fact that this has been part of a -- a commission -- a working group that has been talking for a long period of time that was talked -- that was put together by the Governor of different stakeholder groups who worked tirelessly. Many conceded things that they weren't happy with. This is a compromise bill. I understand there's some upset folks who want to talk about, well, where does the IRS say that. We will have to pay this eventually. And so, I -- I -- I -- you know, when you have folks that sit there and say they talk about consolidation, consolidation, consolidation, yet here is a vehicle that -- is it perfect? As Senator DeWitte said, it's not perfect, but it's a big stepping forward to resolving an issue that is crushing taxpayers, and so that is why now. Taxpayers are tired. How many times did you go or hear from your taxpayers and they come to your office and say, "I am being crushed by property taxes"? And this is a bill that addresses that issue. And I know there's folks who
aren't happy with it. But I will tell you, the folks that are local -- the State does not -- the -- the funds are not in the State Treasury. They can never be swept. One fund can't supplement another fund. So this is a very good bill. And I understand there's opposition from community banks and investment fund folks. Well, yeah, they're getting cut out of that. This money should all go into the assets so that way we can stabilize the pension fund and start generating what it needs to generate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, you and I had a conversation earlier about the time. This is what I'm talking about. I will -- I'm not sure where a million dollars a day comes from. I'm pretty sure that that's not a figure that's been actuarially verified. We'll pass on that. I wonder if I could just go to the bill, Mr. President. Save everyone some time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have before us what is the classic Springfield solution that has led to the underfunding of our pensions across the board, and this is the solution, we're going to increase benefits so the fund or funds will pay more. We're going to spend more. We are not going to put in place any mechanism, any mechanism whatsoever that will require the contributions to be increased. So we're going to get no new money -- spend more, no new money, and the difference is going to be made up by a savings figure that we've been given by
the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. That's the solution - spend more, don't put any new money in, and we'll just kind of come up with the rest of it and we'll be fine. This isn't a pension fix. This isn't a pension fix. Senator DeWitte is exactly right that this concept holds the - and this is the word he used - "potential" to increase the return on investment. I couldn't agree more with that. I could not agree more with that. But there are a litany of unanswered questions here about the transfer of the assets, much of which will be governed by a board that is not accountable to the people whose money is being managed. Now let me ask you, go back home, have a town hall, and ask this question, "How many of you trust Springfield with your pension money?" Okay? Even in the most optimistic of districts, even for the most Pollyannish of areas that just want to believe that government is always going to do what's in their best interest, hardly anyone's going to raise their hand - hardly anyone's going to raise their hand. This is not your money. Okay? This is not a call to be -- that should be made by someone else. All right? I've received a number of contacts from my -- in my district that are opposed to this. They're all opposed to this. And with all due respect, they don't come from investment advisors, they're not coming from the community banks, they don't come from people who sit on these local pension boards who are being taken out to dinner every weekend and whatever. No. The calls are all coming from the rank-and-file members, retirees and active, of police and fire, who say, "Dale, are you kidding me? You want me to trust Springfield with my money? At least when we're local, I can pick-up the phone and ask a question." Ladies and Gentlemen, the institutional people here may be for this, but the rank and file
back home are not, and what makes it worse is we can't get basic answers to simple questions about the transference of assets. This is a bad idea. It is an even worse idea because of the timing in which we're doing it. I understand that the Governor wants it done now because it's a policy priority of his. With all due respect, that by itself is not good reason to do this right now. That's just not. And we should say no at least for now. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Thank you. We have one last question from Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. I do have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes, Senator, I had a concern that was brought to me actually this morning before we came to the Floor and this concern was brought to me by the Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts. They had a concern that they did not have a member of theirs, because obviously, as you know, especially downstate, a lot of -- instead of being represented by the firefighters, they are represented in fire districts. So they were concerned about the governance of this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro.

SENATOR CASTRO:

That's a great question. So, Senator, the makeup of the board is there's five members of labor and then there's a member that is
appointed by the IML and then there's three other members that run for election. Fire protection districts can run for one of those seats or possibly all three of those seats. So that includes city mayors, village presidents, fire -- fire protection boards, also department -- department -- city officials, and then also city department heads. So all of those can also run to be a part of the board.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

...bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...bill.

SENATOR HOLMES:

It's -- it's been a bit of a lively discussion, but I want to point out a few things. I was elected in 2006, so I've been here since 2007. I can't tell you the number of times, particularly under past administrations, where all we hear about is, "What is wrong with you? Illinois just has things divided up. Why can they not do any consolidation?" Why is that always an issue that we talk about, but it never happens? Here, we're finally taking six hundred and fifty funds and reducing it to two funds. If that is not a prime example of consolidation, I don't know what is. Did this happen overnight? Well, we sort of saw the legs of the bill and the -- and the details coming out overnight. I will tell you this bill was put together. It was our municipalities working together, it was our public safety officials working together, it was the Governor's Office, coming together and working for months. While some of us were on summer break, there was this group that
was hammering out all the details and making a huge number of concessions in order to make this work for the taxpayers of Illinois. Is it perfect? No. Nothing this big, this detailed, and finally, this transformative for the State of Illinois is not going to have little issues that all of us can sit here and try to pick apart. Does this finally address some of the Tier 2 issues? The safe harbor provision? Which, by the way, we are not violating right now, but within a year or two could be. How much is that going to cost us should that happen? We're finally doing what Illinois is supposed to do, which is getting ahead of these issues and addressing them before it becomes a crisis. I urge everybody on this Floor to vote Yes for this bill because we are finally able to do this, and I would love if we could do this in a bipartisan fashion, to come together and say, we in Illinois are working on consolidation, we're listening to our taxpayers, and we're doing what's best of {sic} them. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to close.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Lively discussion indeed. I think one of the things that really kind of perplexes me is we always hear: we need to consolidate pensions, we need to deal with pensions, we need to deal with this and -- this and that, now we're -- but we're not -- we're for pensions but not for pension consolidation, we -- we -- we're spending too much money, we have an unfunded liability. I -- I'm -- I'm personally kind of tired of the talking of both ends out of your mouth -- out of mouth. I really am. So you're either for pension consolidation or you're not. Doesn't sound like it. But here's the other thing. Your
mayors, many of them, are supportive of this issue. IML is supportive of this issue. This is not just driven by labor. This is driven by a group of individuals who sat down and talked through some very difficult discussions to address an issue that is, you know, impacting many municipalities, but also the taxpayers. You know, when you keep saying, you know, property tax, property tax, property tax, here's an opportunity to help address that. When you look at some of the funds, IMRF is one of the best funded. This takes some of that aspect and puts it into place in two funds. The funds can't be swept. We made sure there was protections in there. And so I guess I'm just perplexed at how some folks say, well, I'm for pension consolidation, but not really this one. Whatever. This an -- this is an example of what happens when all parties work together toward a common goal that will be good for taxpayers, employers, employees, and in the case, also for retirees. There were months of discussions that took place and unfortunately some last minute issues arose that could have stopped all of the progress, but that has all been resolved. We understand that all parties are again supportive and are at least neutral of the bill. Again, the bill's not perfect, but it's a good start, as Senator DeWitte said. It is important to remind everyone that the intent of this legislation is to consolidate investment funds only, so more revenues can be generated by and kept in the funds to stabilize and sustain those pension funds for public safety employees and their community. The intent was never about changing local pension board processes or how pension determinations are made locally or who can or can't be involved at the local level. All of that remains in place as it currently is and this doesn't impact that at all, nor does it create any intent otherwise. This
is a clean bill that focuses solely on the real problem, which is how we fund and manage our public safety pension investments. So you are either for pension consolidation or not. I know there are many in this room that are for it. And I ask for an Aye vote. 

The passage of this measure will require a three-fifths majority, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 5, 6, and 7 to Senate Bill 1300. 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 42 voting Yea, 12 voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the House does -- the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 5, 6, and 7 to Senate Bill 1300, and the bill is declared passed. We're going to go to page 2 in the Calendar. Senate Bill 671. Senator Bennett. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Bennett seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill No. 671 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 671. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Bennett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett, to explain your motion -- your amendment.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just move for its adoption. 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?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 671. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett, to explain your bill.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the jury {sic}. As you may recall, in the spring, we had a long-negotiated bill, Senate Bill 9, which deals with coal ash. There were two kind of lingering issues as a result of those negotiations that were not resolved in the final bill. One, many of those who voted No on the bill asked for more options for industry for financial assurances. In addition to bonding, they wanted some insurance. So what this trailer bill does, in 671, is allow for an insurance option for those that maintain the coal ash pits to -- to buy an insurance policy with certain parameters. Number two was, okay, that took care of who pays for any potential coal ash environmental disaster, but who's actually cleaning it up and are they being -- are they in safe conditions? This bill also creates a certification program that makes sure that the -- those that are actually doing
the physical cleanup have both the resources and the training to do so safely. I ask for an Aye vote and will answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Are there any questions? Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

...President, will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Thank you, Senator Bennett. I know that you have -- have worked extremely hard on this and put in a lot -- a lot of work on it. Just -- my understanding is, though, that this amendment -- when you're talking about providing an insurance option, my understanding is that, you know, that option is going to be much more difficult for the -- for the -- for the companies in question. The thing that I'm concerned about, and I just wonder if you could verify this, is that this option that we're putting in is now going to require insurance premiums to be paid two years in -- in advance. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

That's an excellent question. I -- I made no -- I did not hide the fact when we discussed this last May that I was distrustful of any insurance policy for fear that if there was an environmental disaster that would then give one more line of attack in court, which then the insurance company and the policyholder could then fight it out over who was responsible and then ultimately create a possibility that the tax -- taxpayers would
either have to clean it up or that that disaster would -- would sit there as the litigation languished. So, in the House negotiations, it was agreed that we would put an insurance policy in, but we wanted to make sure it was somewhat strict. The question came up, well, what -- how do we make sure that a policy isn't just purchased and then canceled as soon as it's purchased and IEPA checks off on it. The agreement was kind of reached then, what if they had to purchase a policy in advance and the -- the term was a two-year policy, which was, again, the product of negotiations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

To -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Now, I'd like to thank the sponsor for that answer. My concern would be that I -- I would rather see that problem addressed through regulatory action, in that if there is a bad faith effort to acquire the insurance policy, I think that could be addressed through -- through permitting process or through administrative sanction. I don't think that the solution, which is just requiring two years' worth of insurance payments up front -- I think that's more -- I think that's more punitive than solving the problem, but I appreciate the answer. As far as the bill itself, I would just like to make sure that -- that everybody in the Chamber realizes that this amendment is still -- it's -- it's opposed by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois
Manufacturers' Association, the Illinois Energy Association. There is still -- there is still opposition to this. And although I appreciate what you're -- what you're trying to do and the work that you've put in, I'm going to urge a No vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Senator Bennett. I know that you have been working on this -- this bill and it's been -- a lot of good negotiations, going back and forth. As my colleague said, there's still opposition. So my hope is -- this is a very real issue, but my hope is that you will continue to work with the opposition to get some agreement on certain issues. Some of the coal ash impoundments are required to close under federal law before State laws can be implemented, hence a conflict whether to comply with the State or the federal rules. What would you say to that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Well, first of all, that's one of things we're trying to avoid. The Illinois EPA has been on top of this issue. And in fact, one of the reasons we had to put the second amendment in is that we had, in our initial amendment, created some additional accommodations for industry. Unfortunately, it created some federal inconsistencies. And so, in working with the Illinois EPA
attorneys, we said, you know, we're not against trying to find some kind of resolution with Ameren and others, but it was just simply too close to the end of Veto Session to get that done. We believe in the rules process. Just like in Senate Bill 9 that was created, the Illinois EPA will make sure that they are consistent ultimately. But that's not something ultimately that's addressed I think in this trailer bill as much as the two points I -- I pointed out earlier. And if I can say one thing, earlier the -- the comment was made that maybe insurance was too arduous in this. I'd point out, that's just one of many options. You still have a trust fund, a surety bond guaranteeing payment, a surety bond guaranteeing performance, and an irrevocable line (sic) (letter) of credit. There are many different ways they could do this; this is just one more option for industry to use.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

So is it your intent to pass requirements for insurance that cannot be obtained in a commercial policy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

Absolutely not. We could've -- we could've created an insurance policy that I would consider not practical to get. Ultimately, one of the -- one of the statements that was made in our negotiations was that Illinois EPA checks on policies about every year. The concern was, if there was a slight lapse in that, if someone left their job or did something else, and they only had a one-year policy in advance and it wasn't checked on time, if, at
that point, there was an environmental disaster and there's no policy -- no insurance policy, which is my exact concern about this, then the taxpayers would be left holding -- holding the bill for this and not the polluters themselves. We -- didn't go -- we didn't go to a ten-year policy. I simply went one extra year for a two-year in-advance policy. And again, when this goes to the House, we'll continue to negotiate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

And I thank you for that answer. One last question, Senator Bennett. The Illinois EPA does not define pollution -- or "other pollution". The use of that term creates ambiguity as we're dealing with the EPA and regulatory uncertainty because the Illinois IPA -- or EPA Act defines air and water pollution. Is this something that you'll be working on as well with the House?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett.

SENATOR BENNETT:

I don't know if it's the origin of your questions, but I know Dynegy has brought that up several times. And in regards of whether or not, in the initial Environmental Act, pollution has been described -- or been defined rather, I -- all I can say is that as we continue to -- to negotiate it in the House, we'll make sure if there's any loopholes we can close or inconsistencies that can be addressed, we'll do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:
Thank you, again. I appreciate your work on this issue and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bennett, to close.

SENATOR BENNETT:

I thank you -- everyone for their patience on a -- a somewhat dry, but very important topic and I'd ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 671 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 39 voting Yea, 12 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 671, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to page 4, Senate Bill 667, on Concurrence. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 667. Signed by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is the bill that caps insulin prices at one hundred dollars per month. The House made two small, but significant changes that removes all known opposition to the bill. So that those parties that were opposed in the Senate are now neutral. The first provision deals with how the reporting of insulin pricing over recent years is going to be
compiled, we're moving that from the Attorney General's Office to Executive-level departments under the Governor's Office. And number two, we apply a COLA to the one-hundred-dollar copay cap. I would also note that today is World Diabetes Day, which is a global effort to raise awareness, not just about the challenges -- health challenge of individuals with diabetes, but also the financial challenges for the individuals, especially in the United States, for having diabetes. So I would ask that the Body concur with the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is -- the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 667. 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 43 voting Yea, none -- 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 667, and the bill is declared passed. We're going to continue with Concurrences on page 5. We're on Senate Bill 1597. Senator Sims. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1597.

Signed by Senator Sims.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Sims, to explain your motion.

SENATOR SIMS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
House Committee Amendment No. 2 is an omnibus land transfer bill authorizing land transfers covering Chicago-Read Mental Health Center, City of Pana, Will County, and the Village of Manteno. The -- the bill we -- the motion you have before you is a result of continued discussions, as I mentioned when we passed this bill in the spring. And I ask for any -- I'll answer any questions and ask for a favorable consideration by the Body.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 2 to Senate Bill 1597. 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 52 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 2 to Senate Bill 1597, and the bill is declared passed. We will skip the next one and go to Senate Bill 1711. Senator Glowiak Hilton. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1711. Signed by Senator Glowiak Hilton.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Glowiak Hilton, to explain your motion.

SENATOR GLOWIAK HILTON:

Thank you. This is Senate Bill 1711, as amended. Allows a third-party organization to develop and implement a cancer clinical trial participation program to provide reimbursement to
participants for costs associated with participation and sets forth requirements and guidelines for such a program. I'd entertain any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1711. 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 52 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 1711, and the bill is declared passed. Continuing on, we'll go to Senate Bill 1797. Senator Castro. Senate Bill 1909. Senator Glowiak Hilton. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1909.
Signed by Senator Glowiak Hilton.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Glowiak Hilton, to explain your motion.

SENATOR GLOWIAK HILTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Alzheimer's Disease Research Act, as amended, we change just a few Sections so that if there was extra money in the Fund that it would be used for not just paying for the Dementia Coordinator, but also funding supporting activities, as well as recommendations on implementing the Alzheimer's Disease State Plan. I ask for questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1909. 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 53 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments (sic) No. 1 to Senate Bill 1909, and the bill is declared passed. Moving on to Senate Bill 2104. Senator Jones. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2104.

Signed by Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Jones, to explain your motion.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2104 amends the Regulatory Sunset Act to extend the sunset to the Pharmacy Practice Act to January 1st, 2023. Know of no opposition. Look for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments (sic) No. 1 to Senate Bill 2104. 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 Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House
Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 2104, and the bill is declared passed. If you would turn now to the Supplemental Calendar No. 1, we're going to go to Senate Bill No. 10. Senator Manar. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 10.

Signed by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill corrects an inadvertent error to Senate Bill 1952, which was an omnibus measure that we took to address different aspects of teacher licensure for the teacher shortage across the State. So this is focused precisely on the paraprofessional license, correcting an inadvertent error, as recommended by the State Board of Education. I'm happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion - let me mention that the passage of this measure will require a three-fifths majority - the question is, shall the Senate concur in Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 10. 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 48 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 10, and the bill is declared passed. Continuing on the Supplemental Calendar No. 1, we have Senate Bill
No. 177. Senator Harris. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2, and 4 to Senate Bill 177.

Signed by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harris, to explain your amendments.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 177 is the trailer bill for Senate Bill 690 and Senate Bill 534, which passed in our prior legislative Session. It covers the Illinois Works Job (Jobs) Program, which is part of our Rebuild Illinois, the State's first capital program in ten years. We retain pretty much the majority of the information -- of the bill that was in Senator Jones' 534. So I'd like to thank Senator Jones for the work he's done on -- on that bill. That bill was put into here and then negotiations in the House with my Rep, Will Davis, enhanced it and put other things to the bill to move the ball forward in relation to the BEP program. And I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Schimpf.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill.

SENATOR SCHIMPF:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. We did -- this bill came through Judiciary this morning and the sponsor and I had a -- had a discussion. There is one small thing that --
that I -- I do have a concern with. There is a Section of the bill that does reduce penalties for fraud and that -- that reduction in penalties is -- is something that I think also kind of steps on the toes of one of our task forces, this DBE, which stands for disadvantaged business employees {sic} (enterprises), this minority task force that is meeting to do work to try to figure out what we can do to get more participation. My understanding of the task force's work is that the task force is supposed to be addressing issues precisely like this. So I'd like to give the task force an opportunity to -- to do its work. I also don't really feel like there's enough of a justification to reduce penalties for fraud. So because of that, I'm going to ask for a No vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Senator Harris, to close.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Members, for your indulgence. That point was brought up in committee today, and as I said before, we're merely just returning the criminal penalty to where it was earlier, from a Class 1 back to a Class 2. We want to encourage small businesses owned by people of color, women, and people with disabilities who can participate on State contracts. We're concerned that increasing the penalty here will be -- will likely disincentivize {sic} those type of businesses. But we're not stepping on the toes of the task force. The task force is still going to act and they will have the ability, once they make their recommendations later in the spring, to move forward any recommendations that they feel are just. Thank you for your indulgence and I urge an Aye vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Passage of this measure will require a three-fifths majority. The question is, shall Senate concur in Amendments No. 1, 2, and 4 to Senate Bill 177. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 voting Yea, 6 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1, 2, and 4 to Senate Bill 177, and the bill is declared passed. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions. We're going to go to page 3 on the Calendar. We're going to go to Senate Resolution No. 451. Senator Plummer. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 451, offered by Senator Plummer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Plummer, to explain your resolution.

SENATOR PLUMMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution simply clarifies. The Kaskaskia Watershed (Comprehensive) Plan in Southern Illinois has been granted money from the federal government. In order for them to receive that money for badly needed improvements, they need a three-hundred-thousand-dollar allocation from the State of Illinois. This matches what was done in the House and I encourage a Yea -- a Yea vote on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 451 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. We'll go
to Senate Joint Resolution 50. Senator Manar. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution 50, offered by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to explain your resolution.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution came to me from a constituent, John Galer, in Montgomery County. It follows what other states are doing, which is urging the President and Congress to take steps to ensure that the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from World War II be offered a state funeral, including, but not limited to, having the option to lie in state in the rotunda of the United States Capitol. Several states have passed this. Clearly, the efforts of the "greatest generation" are worth noting and this resolution says that they should be worth noting with a state -- official state funeral. I would ask for adoption of the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 50 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. The Senate will recess for committees and reconvene for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess.

(Senate stands in recess/Senate reconvenes)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 829, offered by Senator Brady and all Members.

Senate Resolution 830, offered by Senator Harmon and all Members.

They are both death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2310, offered by Senator Murphy.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator DeWitte, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Please -- please state your announcement.

SENATOR DEWITTE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Republicans will caucus in Leader Brady's Office for thirty minutes, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

All right. The Republicans have called for a caucus for thirty minutes in Senator Brady's Office. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair.

(Senate stands in recess/Senate reconvenes)

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, 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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill -- excuse me, Senate Bill 83.

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

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 83.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 30 (sic) (730), with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 1557, with House Amendments 1 and 2; and Senate Bill 1756, with House Amendment 2. Passed the House, as amended, November 14th, 2019. John W. Hollman, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Introduction of Senate Bills.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2311, offered by Senator Fine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Koehler, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like the record to reflect that I intended to vote Yes on House Bill 3902. Somehow my button was not pushed.
The record will reflect your intention. Senator Koehler, in the Chair.

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

Senate Resolutions 831 through 833, offered by Senator McGuire and all Members. They are all death resolutions, Mr. President.

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Will the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom? Committee on Assignments. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

Secretary Anderson:

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration – Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1756, Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 730, and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1557. Signed, Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

We're going to the regular Calendar, page 5, in the middle of the page. We're going to start with Senate Bill 1797. Senator Castro. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

Secretary Anderson:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1797. Signed by Senator Castro.
Senator Castro, to explain your motion.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment is a trailer to House Bill 1553, which was signed into laws {sic} on July 23rd, 2019. The amendment moves the effective date of House Bill 1553 from January 1st to be effective immediately. This need is to change the start so that the courts can start making the findings to allow a ward of the court to petition the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for classification as a special immigrant juvenile. I know of no opposition. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} 2 to Senate Bill 1797. 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 43 voting -- 44 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1797, and the bill is declared passed.

With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 2, House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 392. Senator Morrison. All right. We'll go to House Bill 597. Senator Villivalam. We will go to Senate Bill -- or House Bills {sic} 744. Senator McGuire. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 744.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

Senator McGuire, to explain your bill.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 744 streamlines the AIM HIGH scholarship program by replacing a reference to fiscal year with a reference to academic year. I know of no opposition. Ask for a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 744 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 50 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 744, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll go to House Bill 745. Senator McGuire. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 745.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator McGuire, to explain your bill.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

...Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 745, an ISAC initiative, clarifies that a student who applies for financial aid using a State form has the same privacy protections as a student who applies for financial aid using a federal form. I know of no opposition and ask for a Yes vote.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no -- no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 745 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 50 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 745, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go back to House Bill 597. Senator Villivalam. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 597.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Villivalam.

SENATOR VILLIVALAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 597 is a cleanup to House Bill 3711. It amends the Equitable Restroom {sic} (Restrooms) Act by changing the entities that determine restaurant occupancy from the State Fire Marshal to the local fire department, fire protection district, building permitting entity, or building inspector. This Act has an effective date of January 1st. I know of no opposition. I'd ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 597 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 47 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House
Bill 597, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to Supplemental Calendar No. 2. We'll start with Senate Bill 730. Senator Bush. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 730. Signed by Senator Bush.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, to explain your motion.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. So, last year, I think we all know that we passed a rather large package that included the sexual harassment, discrimination, and ethics omnibus bill. There were two pieces that needed to be fixed in a trailer bill. So, one is the Inspector General had a correction that they wanted to include. The other one came from the Inspector General -- excuse me, the Attorney General and the Inspector General. I know of no objections. Just ask that we concur with the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, this -- passage of this measure will require a three-fifths majority. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 730. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill
730, and the bill is declared passed. We'll go to Senate Bill 1557. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1557.
Signed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans, to explain your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is the trailer bill to the cannabis legalization Act. There's a number of things that's done. I really want to thank Senator Barickman and colleagues over in the House. We have done a lot of work on getting us to this point. There's a number of -- we've kept it very narrow. There's a number of technical changes to it. It also makes changes to the municipal and county tax -- taxing situation so they can move up when they're able to start collecting taxes from September to July. It makes clear that public consumption on social consumption laws can only be in a location that has no food and drink, no restaurants, no bars. It can only be in a dispensary or retail tobacco store. It -- clarifies and makes sure that the employer drug policies that we intended to have to ensure that employers can have a zero-tolerance drug-free workplace is in place. We made changes to clarify that. We had not, in the cannabis bill itself, addressed paraphernalia, cannabis paraphernalia, so were making clear that that is legal, and also making it clear that it's illegal to drive under the influence with watercraft or snowmobiles. And we've also been doing some cleanup language around the expungement portion of the
bill. Would urge your support and happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1557. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed 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 41 voting Yea, 6 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1557, and the bill is declared passed. We'll go to Senate Bill 1756. Senator Manar. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1756.
Signed by Senator Manar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Manar, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill has two pieces. First, it prohibits any health maintenance organization, HMO, from passing the cost of the MCO tax assessment on to consumers as an addition to their premiums, which was the intention of the MCO tax back when we built the FY'20 budget. The second piece is a follow-up to our PBM transparency bill, which is Public Act 101-452. It is a technical change that comes from the Department of Insurance. I know of no opponents and would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall
the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 2 to Senate Bill 1756. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1756, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. I would like my vote on Senate Bill 1557 to be recorded as a Present. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Ashley Jenkins is our lead Legal Counsel for the Senate Criminal Law Committee, for the Senate Exec Committee, and she previously staffed the Senate Executive Appointment {sic} (Appointments) Committee. Ashley is moving on and we're so proud of Ashley and all the work that she's done here for the past seven years with all of us, almost eight years, and so I just wanted to take this time to just thank Ashley for all of the work she did, and there's like a -- a list of things
that we would not have done if she'd not written: the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act overhaul, the Illinois Eavesdropping Act, the Police and Community Relations Improvement Act, the Law Enforcement Officer-Worn Body Camera and Management Act, the Alternatives (Alternative) to Opioids Act of 2018, the Lifting Up Illinois Work Families Act - 2019 minimum wage increase, the Illinois Sports Wagering Act, and the Cannabis Regulation and Taxation Act. She's been working really hard for us. We're so happy to extend our sincerest gratitude and we just wish you all the best. Ashley is this young lady from my area and her family is the Jenkins family, who I grew up with her aunts and cousins, and when she arrived here she said, "You know, my grandfather is Reverend Jenkins." I said "Oh, Reverend Jenkins from the West Side?" So the Jenkins family produced a wonderful young lady. And I really love you and wish you all the best, Ashley. Thank you for all your hard work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Harmon, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To add to the chorus, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

State your -- state your point.

SENATOR HARMON:

I, too, rise to wish Ashley well. She's staffed the Senate Executive Committee for much of my tenure as Chair and I'm glad we had four and a half hours yesterday to reminisce. I'll thank Senator Hastings for allowing us that time together. But Ashley is whip-smart, she is cool under pressure, and most importantly, her legislative moral compass is true. And she has always found
deft ways to push us to do the right things and to make sure the
language of the laws we pass reflect our priorities. I know you
aren't going far and you will continue in our orbit, but I -- I
couldn't let you go without joining with Senator Lightford and
telling you how important you have been to the Senate family and
wishing you all the best in your next adventure. We'll see you
soon.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
    I think I'm going to have to put the timer on. We've got a
number of lights flashing here. But, Senator Righter, for what
purpose do you seek recognition?
SENATOR RIGHTER:
    For a point of personal privilege, if I might.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
    State your point, please.
SENATOR RIGHTER:
    I would like to echo Senator Lightford's and Senator Harmon's
comments from the Republican side of the aisle. What -- I will
speak for myself, but I think that many -- many on my side of the
aisle and actually I think many on the Democrat side of the aisle
would share this. What you hope for in a member of the staff that
works for the other side is that, when you come to them, they are
going to be fair. They are going to tell you what they know. They
are going to tell you when they don't know something and they're
going to be credible. Ashley, you check all of those boxes and
several other that I'm probably not mentioning. You're -- you
have been an important force in this Chamber and that force will
be missed. Congratulations to you.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Senator Sims, for what purpose do you seek recognition? State your point.

SENATOR SIMS:
I -- I'm waiting for my mic to come on. For rebuttal, Mr. President. Let me -- let me first say, yeah, I am deeply disturbed by the fact that Ashley's leaving. The fact that you have meant so much to just -- not only this Chamber, but to the institution of the Legislature. When I was in the House, Ashley and I worked together on a number of -- number of pieces of legislation that are now law. And all of the things that have been said about you are true. But the things that -- that have not been said about you are that it is not just the moral compass, but your sense of -- your sense of purpose. You have a sense of purpose about what you are doing and what you are trying to accomplish and that means a great deal. So I appreciate all that you have meant to this institution, not just the Senate, but the entire institution of -- of government, and we will truly miss you. All that you have meant to reforming our State's criminal justice code, all you have meant to economic development opportunities, all that you have meant to making sure that those who do not have, have a -- have a voice in this building. So thank you so much. So, from one former staffer to a soon-to-be former staffer, congratulations.

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

SENATOR BARICKMAN:
Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
State your point, please.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:
Thanks, Mr. President. Ashley, just to continue the -- the kind words towards you, which are -- you've heard this from me before, but very well deserved. I've known you -- evidently, we joined the Senate the same day. We worked on a bill that year and many since, including one that we just voted on that required a lot of your time and effort. And from this side of the aisle, I will say, again, what I've said before, which is, you have always represented yourself very well. You're kind. You're professional. You're incredibly bright. And it has always been a pleasure to work with you and I look forward to continuing to work with you as you move on to greener pastures. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HUNTER:

Personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Ashley, I just wanted to say that we are going to miss you. I wanted to say thank you for taking my calls on a Friday and a Saturday night when thoughts came to my mind -- and on Saturdays and Sundays. You know, I'd call you up and run something past you in terms of -- of a bill and I'd say, "Well, can you have it drafted for me in a couple of days, Ashley?" She said, "Yeah, sure." You know. And so I just wanted to say thank you for being patient with me. You have always been cool, calm, and collected. I've never seen you go off or -- I've seen you roll your eyes a little a couple of times, but -- but other than that you've been really cool, calm, and collected when you've been under fire and
that shows the -- that shows that you're a really true leader. And I -- I know you have a wonderful career ahead of you and I wish you the best. And anything that I can do to help you move forward, please don't hesitate to call me. Thank you. Good luck. God bless.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Link, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR LINK:

Well, Ashley, I gotta tell you one thing, you know, one of the things I'll miss the most is that whispering in my ear, telling me what I'm supposed to say. But I gotta tell you one thing, you know, you have worked with me for a long time. I'm not getting rid of your cell phone number -- I'm telling you that. I'm going to keep that. But you worked for me for a long -- with me for a long time and I gotta tell you, and I think I can speak for a lot of other Senators in this building, you made us better legislators. You made us know our subject matters a lot better. You -- you -- you -- you brought the best out in all of us. And I gotta tell you, I'm deeply, deeply gratified -- gratitude (sic) for you for everything you've done for me and I look forward to working with you for many more years. But the main thing, all I can say is -- thank you, thank you, thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Belt, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BELT:
Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

State your point.

SENATOR BELT:

Ashley, I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for everything you did for me. As a freshman here, you availed yourself whenever I needed help and -- and I won't forget that. You have one of the best poker faces I've ever seen. You -- you can never tell what's going on just by watching you, you know, and that's a testament to you. You come in each and every day with a smile on your face. And so, to your next endeavor, I wish you nothing but the best. God bless you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you. Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR JONES:

Ashley, I just want to echo the rest of my colleagues. I want to thank you for your service. Thank you for being a real friend. Thank you for talking me down out of doing a lot of legislation over the years. This Chamber's truly going to miss you. I know Gio's really going to miss you, 'cause you're the brains upstairs and we all know that. But I wish you the best and success. Congratulations on your recent engagement and I look forward to working with you down the future. Love you dearly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

And the last word, from President Cullerton.
SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Ashley, you have now just broken the record for nice things being said about somebody who's leaving. You've actually exceeded most of the Senators who leave here by evoking such -- such nice comments -- and you deserve it. Now, you know that guy that used to be here, that guy with the big smile that we worked so hard to help get to be our Attorney General. First thing he did after he got elected was come back here and try to raid our legal staff from some of the best lawyers that exist in the State of Illinois. So he was trying to steal us -- steal our -- our -- our lawyers from us, but thank God Ashley stayed with us. And I really thank you for that. And then we heard that she was thinking of going to the dark side and that's okay, especially since she's going to the bright side of the dark side. But I gotta tell you, I am so proud of the fact that I was able to be part of you becoming the -- the first African American woman to serve as Deputy Chief Legal Counsel and Parliamentarian for the Illinois Senate and you did a phenomenal job. And you can tell, from the adulations you're getting today, how everyone loves you. And we wish you the best. Thank you so much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

...our love. Well deserved. We're going to recess after that. Senator Harmon in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Koehler in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Bush, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BUSH:
Thank you, Mr. President. Can I just get your attention just for a moment? Personal privilege. And I -- I realize he's gone, because he wasn't about to wait for us to finish our business, but today Tom Mann, who was a doorman, since 2008 here -- those of us on this side may know him as the -- the cake baker guy. He's the -- the guy that baked the German chocolate cakes for, certainly, Leader Lightford's birthdays and others. I realize he's gone, but I just wanted to thank him for his service and I wish he was here so we could properly say goodbye, but I don't blame him. He put his coat on and went home about two hours ago. But, anyway, it's his last day and I just wanted to honor that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Let's give him a hand. Senator McConchie, for what purpose you seek recognition?

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
Please state your point.

SENATOR McCONCHIE:
Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, up behind me in the Republican side of the gallery, we have some veterans here from the Lake Barrington Shores veterans group, who are here in town today to receive the Hometown Award over at the Governor's Mansion for their outstanding work on behalf of veterans in my community. So I would just really appreciate the Members of the Senate giving them a warm welcome and thanking them for their service and here -- being here today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
...guests please stand. Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Will
the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom? Will the Committee on Assignments please meet? Committee on Assignments, please meet in the President's Anteroom? Mr. Secretary, 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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 1639.

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

House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1639.


PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1639.

Signed, Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

If everyone would please be at their desks, we'll go to Supplemental Calendar No. 3. On Supplemental Calendar No. 3 is Senate Bill 1639. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1639. Signed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans, to explain your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1639 makes a couple of changes to the sort of lobbyist disclosure area of the law. It requires that primary lobbyists identify each lobbyist subcontractor and what clients that subcontractor provides services for. It also requires it in reverse so that if you're the prime lobbyist, you also have to identify who your subcontractors are. It requires that all State lobbyists disclose any unit of local government which he or she lobbies and it requires State lobbyists to disclose any elected or appointed office that they hold as well. And then it also sets up the -- requires the Secretary of State to provide publicly accessible and searchable database that brings together disclosures by registered lobbyists, contributions by registered lobbyists, and statement of economic interests that are filed by State officials under the Illinois Governmental Act -- Ethics Act. Happy to answer any questions you may have on this and would urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:
Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator Steans, I recall the subject matter hearing that we had in the Senate Executive Committee. I think it was earlier today. The three days have kind of run together. And you presented what I would describe as a two-part bill. One had to do with the additional lobbyist disclosures, which you just described on the record. The other had to do with clarifications to the statement of economic interest as well as some additions. I did not hear that in your rendition. Is that part of Senate Bill 1639 as amended by Amendments 2 and 3?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

It is not. It had been in the bill originally. It is not in the bill that came over here for concurrence. I will note that - - that is a bill that this Chamber has passed several times over to the House and we have done it unanimously. It is not in this bill that came back from the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you for taking the words out of my mouth, Senator Steans, because I know that the clarifications and additions to the statement of economic interest is a measure that has received strong bipartisan support on more than one occasion in this Chamber. Do you know why the House chose not to send over the statement of economic interest provisions that would've required more disclosure?
PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

I do not.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I -- what I anticipate will be my last question, Mr. President. Thank you. Senator Steans, and this is going to be a little awkward, but it has been suggested to me strongly and more than once that the reason that the changes to the statement of economic interest, including the additional required disclosures, including the additional disclosure that would require the person filling out the form to disclose indebtedness to an entity or an individual that is not a traditional lender, the reason those did not come over is because there were perhaps certain Members in the House who were less than interested in disclosing in a public fashion to whom they might owe money other than a traditional lending institution. Do you know anything about that or have heard anything about that?

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

No. I had no such knowledge.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Steans, thank you for that. I rise in strong support of this. Senator Steans, thank you, not just for this bill, but
for the work that you and the Democrats have done on the statement of economic interests issue generally and we look forward to doing more in the spring.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, this is -- obviously I think there's more that we can and will be looking into doing around the areas of ethics reform and the culture here in Springfield.  I think this is a good first step and urge your support and look forward to seeing a lot of green buttons (sic).  Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1639.  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 48 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present.  And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 2 and 3 to Senate Bill -- 1639, and the bill is declared passed.  We're going to go back, with leave of the Body, to page 2.  We're on House Bills 3rd Reading.  House Bill 392.  We have a letter on file that states Senator Bush will present the bill for Senator Morrison.  Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 392.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.
Senator Bush, on the bill.

SENATOR BUSH:

Thank you so much and I'm the chief cosponsor on the bill, so I'm really honored to be able to present this. So, simply extends the sunset on the Lake County Children's Advocacy Center jury fee donation Pilot Program to January 2022. The current sunset date is December 31, 2019. It allows jurors to donate their compensation received for jury services to the Lake County Children's Advocacy Center. I know of no -- excuse me, objections to the bill and I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 392 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 50 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 392, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to be at ease just for a little while. We're waiting on two measures to come over from the House and then we'll take more action. So, just to alert the Committee on Assignments, as soon as we receive that paperwork, we'll be asking for you to meet in the President's Anteroom. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR WEAVER:

Matter of personal privilege, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR WEAVER:
Great! It's not very often we get to interrupt silence around here. Usually we're asking people to be silent, but everyone's silent. I'm really honored to have with me four people from Williamsfield that just won the Governor's Hometown Award for a Playground Barn-Raising Project. This is a town of six hundred people. Did a fantastic job. Mayor, if you'd raise your hand, please, Matt Tonkin, and then also Joan Stiers, who led the whole thing. So could you give them a round of applause? And welcome to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SENATOR ELLMAN:

Point of personal privilege, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Please state your point.

SENATOR ELLMAN:

I rise to recognize Cían Pallasch, my legislative aide, whose last day with me is today. He's leaving for maybe not as -- not greener, but definitely hillier pastures. He's moving onto Pittsburgh. And I will miss working with him. He's been a joy. We've learned together on this, since this -- we're both newbies. And I appreciate his sense of curiosity, his eagerness, and obviously, his help. So, thank you, Cian.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Please have the record reflect my intent to vote Yes on House Amendments -- motion to concur to House
Amendments No. 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1639. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The record will so reflect. Will the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom? The Committee on Assignments. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House. 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 adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 93.

Offered by Senator Castro, and adopted by the House, November 14th, 2019. John W. Hollman, Clerk of the House. It is substantive, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - House Joint Resolution 93.

Signed by Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Supplemental Calendar No. 4 is being passed out. And we're going to go to House Joint Resolution No. 93. I will be putting the timer on for discussion on this. Senator Castro. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 93, offered by Senator Castro.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Castro, to explain your resolution.

SENATOR CASTRO:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Joint Resolution creates a Joint Commission on Ethics and Lobbying Reform. The Commission will consist of sixteen members: two appointed by each Legislative Leader; four appointed by the Governor, with no more than two may be of the same political party; two appointed by the Secretary of State, with one being the Inspector General for the Secretary of State; two appointed by the Attorney General, with one being the Attorney General's Inspector General. No appointee may be or have been a registered lobbyist in the last five years. The Commission will review the State Official and Employee (sic) (Officials and Employees) Ethics Act, the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, the Lobbyist Registration Act, the Public Official -- Officers Prohibited Activities Act, and the Ethics and Disclosure Article under the Procurement Code. The Commission shall hold public hearings. The Commission may also issue periodic reports, but shall issue a final report by March 31st, 2020. I know there's been a lot of discussion and there was a -- a good amount of spirited debate in the -- in Executive. But one of the things that -- when we created this Commission, the idea was to put together obviously Members of the Body, but also subject matter experts that are dealing and can understand and help us come up with the best solutions when it comes to the ethics. And so, while I understand there's some concerns, we are in the eleventh hour. The House, right now, is debating their final bill. We need to do
something. We need to address this issue. We need to get to work. And I'll take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Leader Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

    Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I rise in opposition to this resolution. We do need to do something, but we need to do something that's balanced. Earlier this week I had a discussion with the Senate President and the other two Leaders about what we could do to bring some integrity back to this Body. And we'd agreed earlier this week that to do that we needed a commission that would report ongoing to us and that would bring proposals to us and how important that was that that commission be balanced. In fact, I even spoke to the Governor last night about the draft that we had last night, being -- how he would go about his Republican appointees, and he gave me assurances that he wanted this commission to be balanced so that we could help work to restore integrity to this Body and the Body across the Chamber (sic). I will say that President Cullerton, later today, tried to rectify that in a discussion we had. I thank him for that discussion. But this isn't a proper measure. Corruption and ethics aren't partisan. The integrity of this Chamber is not partisan. This is an unbalanced, partisan commission, though. And if you support that, you are not voting in the interests of the people of this State, in my opinion, which is why I stand in opposition to this. This would have an unbalanced level of appointees in favor of the Democratic Party. That's what the people will see and that will disgust them. We have tried to work collectively with you all, but this is not a measure that this
caucus can support, because the people of Illinois deserve better, which is why I have filed a subsequent amendment that removes the voting privileges of the Democratic Attorney General and the Democratic Secretary of State's members, bringing it back to an equal balance of party representation. I know there are some of you on that side of the aisle that agree with me and I compliment you for that. I just hope you'll be able to vote with us to defeat this measure so that we can do something that the people of Illinois will be proud of and work toward restoring integrity to the Illinois General Assembly. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER:  (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? President Cullerton.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I respect the Republican Leader's comments. It's true that we started with all four Legislative Leaders working on this project. It did require some compromise and I agree with him that we do need a nonpartisan commission to make recommendations for the Legislature. I -- I believe though, after hearing your objections, that I was able to negotiate with the House to get some changes that would say that it really -- really is nonpartisan. The question here is we have the Attorney General with an appointment, we have the Secretary of State with an appointment, because they are directly involved, probably, in what the recommendations might be and -- and implementation of those. That's why they were added. The Governor's authorized, I understand from this resolution, I believe, that -- to make four Republican appointments that would result in it being a -- nonpartisan. I think the important thing is - what is it that they're going to recommend? The goal here is
for them to take testimony, maybe from other states to find out what their best practices are, and then they're going to make recommendations for legislation. It's not a joint committee. It's just a recommendation that's going to come and then we vote, here, on the recommendations by passing legislation. So I believe it was an attempt to be bipartisan. I think that was reflected in the House vote. I believe it was a 111 to nothing. And so I would urge that we pass this, because if we don't, we -- we -- we will not look so good if we don't pass anything and that's why I think we should vote for this bill {sic}.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Castro, to close.

SENATOR CASTRO:

I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

The question is, shall Senate {sic} Joint Resolution No. 93 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed will say No. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. I -- I tried -- I tried. The question is, shall Joint Resolution 93 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed voting Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 voting Yea, 18 voting No. House Joint Resolution No. 93 received the required constitutional majority -- majority and is declared adopted. And with that, we're going to stand at ease. Mr. Secretary, Introduction of Senate Bills.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2312, offered by Senator Plummer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Just to let you know, we're waiting on one more bill from the House. Would the Committee on Assignments please meet in the President's Anteroom? The Committee on Assignments. Mr. Secretary, 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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 222.

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

House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 222. Passed the House, as amended, November 14th, 2019. John W. Hollman, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 222.

Signed, Senator Kimberly Lightford, Chairperson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Supplemental Calendar No. 5 is being passed out. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.
SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 222. Signed by Senator Muñoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I know there was a lot of discussion last couple of days about the casino for Chicago and other changes. This has nothing to do with that. We will address those concerns and get that hopefully addressed next year when we get back. This bill - it's technical - is just two things. It ensures that the casinos and the sports betting get off the ground and start producing money for the capitol bill. Just two technical changes in the bill, that's it. I'll attempt to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

To the bill. To the motion.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

To the motion. We rise -- I rise in support of the gentleman's motion and appreciate his help and leadership on this and urge a quick Aye vote so we can get on our way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Muñoz, to close. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 3 to Senate Bill -- 222. 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, there are 40 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur with House Amendments No. 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 222, and the bill is declared passed. President Cullerton.

SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe we're getting very close to finishing our business. I just wanted to thank everyone for the work they did this year. It was an historic year, when you look back on all the things we accomplished. We had a lot of good bipartisan work together. Don't even need to go into the list of all the accomplishments, but most importantly, the most important thing we do is pass a budget. It's as close to balanced as we can get. We did that this year. So I just wanted to thank all of you for all your work. And for the Democrats, we're going to have a very short, but important, caucus after this adjournment. But I, once -- once again, wanted say on the Floor that -- that -- how much I appreciate all the help from all the staff and both the Republican and Democrat staff working together. And hope you enjoy your holidays and thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Mr. Secretary, 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 adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the
concerence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 94.

Offered by Senator Lightford.

(Secretary reads HJR No 94.)

Adopted by the House, November 14th, 2019. John W. Hollman, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

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

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No objections filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the resolutions are adopted. On the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution... Communication from the President.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

I have a letter dated November 14th, 2019.

Dear Mr. Secretary - Enclosed please find the spring 2020 Senate Session Schedule for the 101st General Assembly. If you have any questions, please contact my Chief of Staff, Kristen Richards.

Sincerely, John J. Cullerton, Senate President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)
On the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 94. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 94, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR KOEHLER)

Senator Lightford moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 94. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Senator Lightford moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 94. All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. There being no further business to come before the Senate, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 94, the Senate now stands adjourned until the hour of 12 noon on the 28th day of January 2020, or until the call of the Senate President. The Senate stands adjourned.