81st Legislative Day		2/28/2006	
HB0166 HB1397 HB4125 HB5524 SB1835 SB2236 SB2246 SB2254 SB2263 SB2333 SB2368 SB2369 SB2369 SB2400 SB2455 SB2477 SB2477 SB2477 SB2510 SB2555 SB2616 SB2617	First Reading First Reading First Reading First Reading Second Reading Third Reading Third Reading Third Reading Second Reading Third Reading Second Reading Second Reading Second Reading Third Reading Second Reading Third Reading Second Reading Second Reading Second Reading	2/28/2006	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
SB2716 SB2748 SB2778 SB2798 SB2810 SB2829 SB2960 SB2967 SB2971 SB3016	Second Reading Third Reading Third Reading Second Reading Second Reading Second Reading Second Reading Second Reading Third Reading Third Reading Second Reading		59 53 52 60 60 61 61 55
SB3036 SR0662 Senate to Order-President	Third Reading Resolution Offered		55 1 1
Prayer-The Reverend Journal-Postponed Introduction of Guests Senate Stands in Reces Senate Stands at Ease, Committee Reports Committee Reports Messages for the Govern	chn Park s-Senator Cronin ss/Reconvenes /Reconvenes /Reconvenes /Reconvenes /Reconvenes /Reconvenes /Reconvenes		1 1 1 2 43 62 62 62 63 63 65 68

Messages for the Governor

Adjournment

68

68

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDENT JONES:

The regular Session of the 94th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Reverend John Park, Korean United Presbyterian Church, Springfield.

THE REVEREND JOHN PARK:

(Prayer by the Reverend John Park)

PRESIDENT JONES:

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Maloney)

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President, I move -- I move to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal of February 27, 2006, pending arrival of the printed transcripts.

PRESIDENT JONES:

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

Senate Resolution 662, offered by Senator Link.

It is substantive.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Madam Secretary, House Bills.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 166, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1397, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4125, offered by Senator Garrett.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 5524, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Will the Members within the sound of my voice, if you're in

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

your office, will you kindly come to the Senate Floor? We are going to 3rd Reading. This may be the last time around. You have bills on 3rd Reading, I would suggest that you come to the Senate Floor so that we can commence taking care of the people's business of this great State. Senator Cronin, Senator Bomke have some special guests this morning.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may have your attention for a moment, please, I'd just like to stop for a moment and celebrate one of the very -- one of the wonderful, positive things that happens in public education from time to time, and we focus on the challenges and the issues and it's also nice to focus on the accomplishments, as well. We're joined here up at the speaker -or the Senate President's Podium with my colleague, Senator Bomke, Representative Poe. We're here to celebrate the Illinois Principal Association's Middle -- Middle School Principal of the And the Principal of the Year is John Marsaglia. John Marsaglia is joined here with his -- joining us here -- up here is his -- with John is his lovely wife, Jean. We also have Zack Stamp, no -- no stranger to Springfield. He's the President of the School Board, and Maureen Talbert, who's the Superintendent. John has been an eighteen-year veteran of the school district in The criteria Pleasant Plains. for the award collaborative leadership and innovations in curriculum He's a leader. He's something that makes things instruction. happen for kids. He's the "captain of the ship" at Pleasant I think we all who come down here and practice in State government know that Pleasant Plains enjoys an outstanding reputation as a middle school and I want to turn it over to my colleague, Senator Bomke, as we recognize the Principal of the Year. Thank you.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Senator Cronin. It certainly is a pleasure to be here to recognize such an outstanding individual and John Marsaglia. I've known John probably for thirty years. He has been principal at the elementary school at Farmingdale - currently the middle school principal at Farmingdale - all of this, part of the Pleasant Plains School District. And it's certainly an honor to be here to recognize an educator. The last

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

time I was here with Pleasant Plains, it was to recognize three State championships - two basketball and one baseball. But John is very deserving of this. He's been an educator all of his life. And certainly proud to be part of this school district and proud to be here representing the school district and proud to be here with John Marsaglia.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Well, just to kind of conclude our presentation here we have a recognition on behalf of all Members of the State Senate, sponsored by Senate President Jones, myself, Senator Bomke and Raymond Poe that recognizes Principal John Marsaglia. The principal is our pal, and in this case, our pal is the Principal of the Year. Congratulations, John Marsaglia.

PRESIDENT JONES:

While our distinguished guest has and a great honor, he doesn't want to say anything. Perhaps he can say something, though. Talk to this side of the aisle and convince them of their errant ways. Thank you very much. Senator Wendell Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR W. JONES:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. Today I have with me my Page for the Day, Marilyn Gaskey, from St. James School in Arlington Heights. She's an eighth grader and she's coming back for her second year as my Page for a Day. And her mother, Sharon, is in the gallery behind me.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized by the Senate? Senator Crotty, what purpose you rise?

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you very much. On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Today I also have a Page for the Day. And her name is

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Sydney Strick, and this is her first time visiting the Capitol, and she's with her dad, who's up in the gallery, Dan Strick. So, I'd like you to welcome them, too.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be welcomed by the Senate? Senator Burzynski, what purpose you rise? SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purposes of announcement. Like the record to reflect that Senator Rauschenberger is absent today due to legislative business. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

You sure it's legislative business? The record shall so reflect. Will the Members kindly come to the Floor? If you have a bill on 3rd Reading, we are going to 3rd Reading. This may be your last shot to get those bills out or have the bills killed. On page 5 of your Calendar, the middle of the page. Senate Bill Senate Bill 618. Senator Crotty. Senate Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 819. Senator Haine. Bill 789. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 820. Senator Hendon. At the top of page 6. Bill 821. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 841. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 843. Senator Maloney. Senate Bill 854. Senate Bill 855. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill 880. Senate Bill 893. Senator Link. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 894. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 951. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 951. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 999. Schoenberg. Senate Bill 1085. Senator Martinez. Senate Bill Senator John Sullivan. Senate Bill 1087. Senator Link. Senate Bill 1183. Senator Crotty. At the top of page 7. Senate Bill 1214. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill -- 1839. Meeks. Governor Meeks. Senate Bill 1991. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 2123. Senator Don Harmon. Senate Bill 2137. Senator Debbie Halvorson. Debbie Bush Halvorson. Senate Bill Senator Link. Senate Bill 2236. Senator Demuzio. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2236.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT JONES:

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senator Demuzio.
SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This legislation makes clear that the State of Illinois feels that ethanol should be consumed in this State. It only makes sense that if you grow it here and make it here, that we should Renewable fuels are cleaner for our air, biodegradable, and provide job opportunities for Illinois. of this is accomplished while adding a new source to our portfolio of energy products. Energy demand is not likely to go down and we need to take action now to begin the transition to renewable energy sources. Our finite sources of petroleum will not be here forever. And renewable fuel has -- has growth potential for the future and this legislation helps us begin to take the steps toward these new fuel sources. Renewable fuels are good for Illinois. They're good for Illinois agriculture. They're good for our economy. It's good for our environment and it's good for reducing our reliance on foreign oil. And as I said, Senate Bill -- 2236 is good for Illinois. 2236 has three major components. It increases ethanol production in Illinois by funds for the construction of Illinois providing facilities that will ultimately increase supply and decrease the price of ethanol. It also provides incentives -- incentives for the installation of new E85 retail pumps throughout the State, in addition to providing money for research for renewable fuels. And it also reduces our reliance on foreign oil. I have worked with the proponents and the opponents of this bill since it was introduced, and there have been several meetings held in an attempt to negotiate an agreement. The proponents of this bill made several proposals to the opponents in an attempt to address And we even went so far as to amend the bill their opposition. from a ten-percent standard by 2008 and a fifteen standard by 2012 to a ten-percent standard and a fifteen-percent goal in an attempt to remove concerns of the opponent. As you will note, there are a number of proponents that have signed on for this bill. And just to give you a little idea, Senate Bill 2236 and how this bill works, it establishes a standard that ten percent of all motor fuel gasoline consumed in Illinois shall be pure ethanol by 2008. And this provides the fuel industry flexibility

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

to blend fuel as ten-percent ethanol, motor fuel or E85. This bill also establishes a goal of fifteen percent of all motor fuel consumed in Illinois will be pure ethanol and it also reduces the current State sales tax incentive on ethanol from its current rate of eighty percent of the State sales tax to a rate of ninety percent by July 1, 2006, and will continue the tax rate to December 31st, 2015. Renewable fuel programs are supported and created by Senate Bill 2236, and as you will note, that there are a number of them, including research at SIUE Edwardsville, Western Illinois University and a number of other research facilities throughout the State. I -- I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Dahl. SENATOR DAHL:

Mr. President, to the bill.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Proceed.

SENATOR DAHL:

I signed on this bill as a cosponsor when it first came out with the understanding that there would be negotiations between both sides to come up with a fair and equitable bill. that didn't happen. My concern with this is, is the word "mandate". In private business, I'm a firm believer in supply and demand and the equal opportunity for all business to have an equal opportunity to -- to do whatever it -- it takes to -- to create their business. I'm a huge supporter of not only ethanol, but soy diesel, -- biofuel products. As you know, I'm in the trucking business and my company burns approximately five thousand gallons of biodiesel fuel every day. So it -- it's not that I'm -- I'm against biodiesel. I am going to be a Yes vote on this bill. I do have a problem with the word "mandate". And I would be concerned and I would urge each of you to be concerned and to encourage the producers of the ethanol product to make sure that our constituents don't pay more at the pump, for this vote that we're going to take here today, over the next three years until these ethanol plants are put up. It -- it probably doesn't make a lot of sense what I'm saying. I'm -- I'm talking against the bill, but I am going to be a Yes vote. So,

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

this is good for the future. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I have a couple of questions. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDENT JONES:

She indicates she will.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Senator, what scientific evidence do you point to that it doesn't consume more energy to produce a gallon of ethanol than it generates in the manufacture process?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Would you repeat that, 'cause I'm having difficulty hearing you? Okay?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Could we tone it down a little bit? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Certainly. Thank you very much. What scientific evidence do you point to that it doesn't consume more energy to produce a gallon of ethanol than it generates?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Senator, I believe that there's been a study, I -- out of Berkley University out of -- out of California, and that study showed that -- that it does not take any -- any more.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Because of the importance of this, not only for the President -- present, but also the future, are you saying that we're basing this entire vote on one study? I mean, isn't -- I would think that there'd be a whole body of, and that you'd be able to speak to the specific studies so that people -- I mean, this is -- this is a -- a substantial impact on the market, the workings of a market. Do you have a whole body of scientific

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

evidence that points to that there's actually more energy produced than is consumed?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Senator. No, we're not basing this particular bill on one study. I believe that there have been a number of studies that have been conducted. This is the recent study that we were doing it. And also if -- if you'll recall, I believe last week or a couple weeks ago, that the President in his speech indicated that, you know, we're dependent upon -- we're all dependent upon foreign oil. And so I'm sure that his comments, along with his studies at the White House and -- and their research, also indicates that this is something that we're -- we're needing.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Senator. I think that it is very important that we have alternative fuels, whether it's ethanol and biobased fuels or hydrogen or something, because I think that it's essential that we don't send our young men and women over to fight in conflicts if there's any, even a piece, of that conflict is to protect a supply of oil coming into this. By coincidence, just today I have my youngest son, Robbie, here and I want to make sure that we don't send any of our children, mine included. My oldest son going -- has selected into the Marine Corps a year We don't want our -- our children's blood spent on something as -- that we can correct through technology. And so I admire the work that you and proponents have done. I recognize the objection that opponents have. There's one other thing that I think that we need to get out into the debate here today, and that's how do you answer the criticism that it costs more gallon for gallon to drive a mile with this ethanol than with gasoline? PRESIDENT JONES:

That is your final question. Senator Demuzio. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Senator, for your question. And as you know, that has been discussed. As you listen to the farm reports,

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

you'll hear that -- that it comes up. Occasionally individuals will say, well, you can't get enough, you don't get the mileage out of a gallon of gas that you would, you know, with ethanol. But the mileage issue, you know, this bill invests money, and I don't know, I didn't read it, but it will be doing research into -- SIU and the University of Illinois and Western Illinois University. And those dollars will be going in for research. And what that will do is possibly -- and we hope that what it will do is to be able to correct that -- that misconception or -- or research and find out if we can make the ethanol get more mileage. We know that that's probably a question and we're very well aware of it, but until we get the research, until we get the plants, until we're able to put the dollars into it, we're not going to be able to find out if we can correct that, if there's an issue.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Lauzen, for the last time.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Just a concluding comment. I'm -- I'm very much in favor of the technology -- moving the technology forward. We have an example of a major economy in South America, in Brazil, where they've converted - not based on corn, but based on sugar cane, which has a higher content of this type of energy to convert into gasoline. They now have two hundred and fifty of these plants at a cost of a hundred million dollars each. Another fifty on the drawing board and they have wiped out their dependency as a country on foreign petroleum. So, I believe that if they can do it, we can do it.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Bill Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. To the bill: I would -- first of all, want to congratulate and I appreciate very much the work of Senator Demuzio on this bill. Her leadership and courage in bringing a difficult issue before the Senate is a hallmark of her tenure. And this is a -- this is an interesting issue. It's an issue which the -- the -- as the previous speakers have alluded to, the -- it's even been addressed by the President of the United

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

States. But I, unfortunately, have to vote No on the bill. And my -- the -- the -- what -- what troubles me about the bill -and there are many good things in this bill, thanks to Senator Demuzio, many good things - the research component, the goals of looking at alternative fuels. Those are good things and I appreciate very much her graciousness in putting them in the However, this is a mandate, as Senator Dahl so correctly described it. It is a mandate that will mandate after a certain number of years that ten percent of all the petroleum products sold in Illinois for the use in automobiles will be ethanol. the use of petroleum rises, the mandate will rise. The base will -- will rise. Ethanol now is about a dollar a gallon more than That will mean the cost of gasoline will go up at the gasoline. pump because of the mandate. There isn't enough ethanol to meet that mandate with the petroleum manufacturers. Some areas that have attainment requirements for ozone, because of the nature of ethanol, will see a further rise, the Chicago area, because of the way they have to blend this with ethanol to reduce the -- the ozone increase. In -- in my area - I'm a border area - the advantage -- or, the disadvantage of this bill with neighboring state will increase because the subsidy will removed. Granted, it is removed to fund some worthy things, but today at two dollars a gallon, Illinois has a 1.317 {sic} (.1317) per gallon disadvantage because of our higher taxes. This bill pushes that disadvantage in relation to Missouri to .1494. three dollars a gallon, it goes up to 1930 {sic} (.1930). mandate here is the problem for -- for me. If it was a goal, if we could do the research without it and look at the alternative fuels, as Senator Demuzio has so correctly put it, that would be great. But the mandate creates a risk for the consumer at the The shortage, the demand, the shortage of fuels aggravated by the mandate will increase the cost of gasoline at the pump, President, and that prevents me from voting for what is otherwise not a bad bill. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator John Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: You know, I think that it's really important to keep in mind what it is that we're

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

trying to accomplish here today. Senate Bill 2236 is going to increase the production of ethanol and -- biodiesel fuels, renewable fuels, homegrown fuels, by building new plants and expanding existing plants, the production in those plants. We're going to increase the supply of ethanol, which is one of the very concerns that Senator Haine just brought up. We will increase the supply. The bill also promotes -- promotes further research in the renewable fuels industry. We have only touched the tip of the iceberg in regard to research in the ethanol and renewable fuels industry. We want to expand on that. Senate Bill 2236 also will help educate the public as to the benefits of renewable Talking about educating the public in regard to -- E85 fuel - fuel made from eighty-five percent corn, only fifteen percent petroleum. The bill's going to promote job creation. Every time we build an ethanol plant, we create construction jobs in that plant - and also biodiesel plants. Every time we build a plant, it's going to -- the construction jobs and also the jobs that are involved with the operating of that plant. So this is The bill ultimately and -- and also a job creation bill. renewable fuels will ultimately reduce our reliance on foreign oil. And I think that it's very important to keep that in mind. I want to certainly thank Senator Demuzio for her hard work on this -- on this outstanding bill. I also want the Members here in the Senate to know that -- that negotiations, discussions have taken place over the past several months on this bill and that those discussions will continue when this bill moves over to the House. We're trying to address the concerns of all sides in this debate, and we're going to continue to work on that bill, and with Senator Demuzio's leadership, I feel very confident that we will be able to do that. I certainly ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I've always been a strong proponent of ethanol and there's no state in America that probably benefits from increasing ethanol production like Illinois. I do have two questions for the -- for the lady, if she would answer, please.

PRESIDENT JONES:

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

She indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. Senator Demuzio, I have British Petroleum and Amoco's laboratory in my district, so I've heard all of the arguments from the -- from their side, as well as that of the Farm Bureau and others. But tell me, one thing I'm not clear of is, what is the impact of this bill on local sales taxes? What's its impact on the City of Chicago and our local governments? PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Senator. Actually, I -- I thought maybe that question would be -- would be asked today. So, ethanol is almost close to being ten percent of all of the share of Illinois gasoline sales today. And so the ten-percent standard that we're talking about is almost there, where it's going to be easily reached here shortly. Because as we know, there's been so much push and it's out there and everyone's talking about ethanol and our E85 and the whole -- our flex fueled vehicles are coming out - Ford, GM. So we know that very shortly that ten percent's going to be met. We all -- we do not believe, okay, that achieving it will have any significant impact on our local government tax collections. They -- but if it does, okay, I think that's something that we're going to be willing to take a look at and we'll see if it -- if we can address it at that time. But actually we're so close to being there right now, I don't think that -- hopefully that is not going to happen. We don't think there'll be any effect.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just one more question and then to the bill. Senator Demuzio, is there enough ethanol today to, you know, if -- if we do this and we encourage it, and I heard -- listened very carefully to Senator John Sullivan's explanation, but just tell me, I mean, is there enough ethanol today to -- to cover this kind of mandate in Illinois?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Senator. Yes. We feel that there will be. And why we're saying that is that currently Illinois already produces enough ethanol to meet the demand created by this bill. In addition, this bill will help increase production. So what this - what we're asking is -- yes, we know we're -- we're producing it. We have enough, but with this bill and with our plants that we're proposing to build out there, with the research that we're going to be looking at at SIU-Edwardsville and all of the other universities here, we know that every day their research is going on. I believe it's more at SIUE at the research center. Those students are out there. So, that research is going on. The production's going on. And so with that, we know we're going to be able to keep that supply going once this bill gets established.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just to the bill: You know, clearly I -- I would encourage Senator Demuzio to keep talking to all the sides. And I think she's indicated that this is an ongoing work in progress. And not to use a term that my children might use and that's "wuss out" on the bill, but I have a law partner that is a graduate of the University of Illinois. He specializes in agriculture and does a tremendous amount of work in the ethanol industry. So I've got a conflict of interest on this bill because of my law partner. So I will be voting Present. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, we've been talking about reducing our dependence on foreign oil since the oil embargo of the -- of the 1970s. And thirty years later we're still trying to put things in place that will provide incentives and utilization of alternative fuels. We've been talking about that for thirty years now and it's long overdue that we start making some tangible efforts in that direction. I've had a long interest in

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

because of my background in agriculture my involvement in the seed industry. We know this product works. We know that it is efficient. We know that it's cleaner for the There's no question; the studies have been done. With the new technology in -- in ethanol plants, we definitely do have an energy benefit by producing ethanol and blending that with fuel, with motor oil, with petroleum products to make an ethanol blend. Those questions have been answered and we need to move forward. I think it's of great concern to everybody in this country when we hear the President of the United States from Texas, who's got close ties to the oil industry most of his life, tell us that we've got a national crisis in America and that's our dependence on foreign oil. We're addicted to foreign oil. And if -- if you've kept up with this issue of energy, I'd advise you to -- to check out a book at the library and get a book called Twilight in the Desert. And this is a very authoritative study about what's happening to the oil reserves in -- in the world - not just here in the United States, but in Saudi Arabia and all over. Read the book, <u>Twilight in the Desert</u>. The easy oil that we've lived on for a hundred and fifty years is not there much longer. We are running short on oil. Now, we have a lot of coal reserves and there are things that can be done with coal gasification and the Fischer-Tropes process to produce a new clean type of fuel. I heard on 60 Minutes, Sunday night, the Governor of -- of Montana, I believe, that's moving forward very aggressively in the Fischer-Tropes process to use carbon gasification or coal gasification to produce new fuel there. of things on the horizon that -- that need to be done. what this bill is all about, is moving the alternative fuel energy -- or, issue forward in the State of Illinois, providing some incentives. I would also encourage the sponsor to work with the Petroleum Marketers and the Petroleum Council on this issue of the mandate and how that can be achieved and how we move the utilization forward, 'cause you're talking about three things. To have success in this area, you have to look at the demand side Is there a demand for the product? Well, Ford first of all. Motor Company, General Motors - look at their announcements in the last month. They're significantly increasing the production of flex fuel vehicles, so they're adding on that demand side.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

The consumers want this type of fuel if it's efficient, if we can get the technology improved so the miles per gallon comes up a little bit instead of being twenty percent below what's straight gasoline. That -- that problem can be solved. That's the demand This bill deals with the supply side. If you're going to have the demand for it, then you have to have a way to deliver That's the -- distribution side. You know, a year ago we had twenty-two fuel stations in the State of Illinois that sold E85. We're over a hundred now, and we've got incentives in place that the Governor's announced, that makes sense, to help stations convert to sell the fuel. There's your distribution. So you got the demand in the vehicles, you got a distribution system, now but you got to come up with more supply. So, how are you going to come up with more supply? Ethanol plants are being proposed all -- all over this State in most legislators' district where they've got an abundance of coal -- of corn; they're going to be producing the supplies then. This bill is all about supporting the production, the manufacture of the biodiesels, of the -- of the ethanol, of those kind of plants. It makes Illinois a leader. It's the right thing to do. Is it perfect? not perfect. Is it the right thing to do for Illinois? Absolutely. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Since Senator Sieben...

Could we tone it down a little bit, gentlemen? SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Sieben has once again proven why I say that he is a logical, reasonable Republican, and someone that we should support every time we get the opportunity. He has clearly stated the case here. And he always does in such an eloquent way. Sometimes I wish he would move to this side of the aisle, but since he's on that side of the aisle, that's fine. But it's good, and we should have bipartisan support for this legislation. Just as the Senator just said, I heard President Bush the other day talking about this very same issue, how we have to reduce our dependence on foreign fuels, foreign oil. President Bush said

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Today Senator Barack Obama is presenting this -- this case to the nation - same issue. Republican, Democrat, Black, White, it -- it doesn't matter. This should be a no-brainer. should be fifty-nine Ayes and no Nays. Fifty nine to nothing this should come out of here. Not only are we reducing our dependence on people who we are at war with or people who we don't trust, in addition we're supporting the farmers Illinois. Corn is a major crop in this State. So, we should support the people of Illinois. The product is in Illinois. makes absolutely no sense to me at all for anyone to speak against this legislation, to vote against this legislation. almost un-American. Some of you are acting like as if 9/11 never occurred. Some of you are acting like we're not being held hostage by Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq and other places like that. Some of you have selective amnesia. And I hope you don't have selective amnesia when it comes to this vote. Support this great Senator, both sides of the aisle and certainly on this side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Adeline Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I pioneered in ethanol fuels for the last thirty-two years. And little by little, finally we're getting there and I certainly support the bill and I urge everyone to support it. It's not perfect, but it can be improved in the -- in the House, but remember we got to start sometime. And I urge a favorable vote on this.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield? PRESIDENT JONES:

She indicates she will.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Demuzio, I -- I think the big hang-up here today on the bill - and I -- and I support the bill; I'm a hyphenated cosponsor of the bill - but I think the big hang-up, and we worked -- tried to work through this process of the mandates. I

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

don't think there's very many Senators in here that approve of mandates of any kind. But I -- I want to ask you, because I heard Senator Sullivan say that he thought the process would continue to work to try to remove the mandates over in the House, but I haven't heard you say that and I want to know if you have that commitment to continue to work to try to remove the mandates.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Senator. I believe that just this morning that talks had continued or had resumed. As you well know, we had -- I -- at our last meeting, we indicated that we wanted to continue to keep the dialogue open. We wanted to work on it, and I will continue to work on that commitment to keep that dialogue open as it goes over to the House. I just heard about it right as I was calling the bill. Yes.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

As I drove up here yesterday from my district, there is a supplier or distributor in my district that probably has about three hundred convenience stores and truck stops in the Midwest here. Their corporate office is in -- in Carmi. And he expressed great concern of the mandates due to the fact that he's at about nine percent right now, but he's having trouble finding ethanol to blend. I think we are on the right track, but I -- I don't see any teeth in the mandate, so I don't know why we've got the mandate in there. Because what's the fines and penalties if they don't meet the mandate?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you. Actually, that -- that's really a good question, and I think that that's something that needs to be addressed. Actually there's two parts to that -- two answers -- two parts to that question. The price of ethanol has been up recently because of the oxygen additive, the MTBE, which is a cancer-causing chemical, by the way, and it has been banned in

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

many states including Illinois. Ethanol has been the only other approved oxygen, so that has been -- driven up the demand for ethanol across the country, especially in places like California and the East Coast where that oxygenated gasoline is needed to meet clean air standards. So, the federal EPA will remove its oxygen requirements in May. So that should relieve some of the demand for the ethanol. And so, therefore, we should be able to see a price -- that price coming down. I know today, as we looked at -- as I was looking, the price today is a \$1.99.9 at Qik N EZ station on Monroe Street and gasoline is 2.22. So, as they remove that oxygen problem, that MTBE, I think we'll see the price coming down and that's going to be something we'll be looking at.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: You know, I -- I rise in support of the bill, and I -- I hope that we see the bill again, because I think it needs to be amended. I think the mandate needs to come off of it, and hopefully they do that over in the House and bring it back to us. Because I think right now with the mandate, we're going to see a -- a rise in -- in the cost of gasoline, as Senator Haine said, and I think that's a great concern of a lot of us here in the General Assembly. I also want to say that it is very beneficial to some of our universities, and especially Southern Illinois University, and I would like to recognize the President of SIU is in the gallery right above President Senator Emil Jones, in the gallery. So, welcome, President Poshard.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Yes. President Poshard was a distinguished Member of this great Chamber. Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield? PRESIDENT JONES:

She indicates she will.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Senator Demuzio, I, too, am a cosponsor on this legislation and I think it's a great move forward; however, recently there

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

appeared an article in the <u>Tribune</u>, and actually I don't believe it was an article, it might have been an editorial, that suggested that ethanol might not be a renewable energy and that many of the programs that we're looking at might not really be cost-effective because of the amount of fuel used in the up-front production. So, my -- my question would be is, can you tell me how much fuel is used at the front end as input to develop the corn -- to develop the one gallon of ethanol?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Senator, I really do not have that figure, but I would imagine that as we go through this process, we'll be looking at - that will probably be some of the issues or maybe they already have that answer. I'm not aware of it. They may have that at their -- at the SIU research center now. As they're going through, they're looking -- they're doing the research on this, and as we do more research, maybe Western, University of Illinois, they probably have that answer. I don't. And I imagine that's something that they're looking at.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Currently is there a figure, however, after the corn is harvested, how much does it cost to produce one gallon of ethanol?

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I do not have that figure. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. President. And I -- I share a lot of the concern, I guess, about the mandates. And appreciate the sponsor's willingness to talk and continue to negotiate on this and -- and -- mandates are all right if -- if they're realistic. And they -- what -- what I understand for us to reach the -- the ten-percent mandate - and I -- and I know you

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

took the fifteen percent out, which I think that was -- that was important to do - would take about sixty million gallons of ethanol to reach the ten-percent mandate by the year 2008. just so happened that a week ago yesterday in my hometown of Greenville - I was meeting with some of the development people there, economic development people - we had a group in who is looking to build an ethanol plant in our -- in our location. And I had the opportunity to sit down and talk to -- to this individual and we had a very good discussion about ethanol in general and the importance, obviously, of developing renewable fuels and what that means to all -- not only to the Illinois farmer, but certainly to the economy of this State to end the dependency on -- on foreign oil. But I asked him -- the question was, is it realistic to think that you can reach this goal by the year 2008? And he had some real reservations about this because of the impact in Illinois of the ability to get these plants online. It -- it is a huge problem right now and he's telling me that Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, other states around much more ahead of us in the ethanol production advancement area because they aren't putting all these regulatory hurdles in front of the industry. Now, that's concerning to me because in -- if this plant would have been built in -- in Greenville, if it -- if it is to be built, it'll employ about sixty to seventy people. And that's obviously good for -- for So, my concern would be, not only is it realistic our economy. to reach the mandates, and I'm -- I'm obviously going to support this legislation. ADM, which is in Decatur in my district, they're -- they're -- they're neutral on this bill. You might find that surprising, but they are -- the largest producer of ethanol, they are actually neutral on this. And I've talked to the president there and his -- their concern is, is it realistic to be able to reach these goals. And we've just -- because what happens if we can't reach the goal is that we obviously start bringing that product in from elsewhere and the price goes up. And we've heard that discussed considerably here on this Floor. So, anyway, my point being that I appreciate the fact you're going to continue to negotiate. I know your interest is in -- is in -- with the agriculture here in Illinois and the importance it is to our farmers here, and I -- I know that's your major

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

But we just have to be -- understand we have to be realistic when we set these kind of goals out there, or mandates - not a goal, it is a mandate - by 2008 we will have this much ethanol used in this State. And can the industry produce it? And if they can't, that's a problem. But I'm hopeful that they will, and I'll be standing in support of the legislation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Demuzio, to close.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you for all of the input on Senate Bill 2236. And as we -- as we look at this particular bill, we know that this bill calls for a major investment in Illinois ethanol and the biodiesel production plants, ethanol research in Illinois, jobs in universities and the placement of E85 service pumps at Illinois gas stations from fiscal year '07 through fiscal year We believe that the standard is an important tool to guarantee that while we're making this investment, renewable fuels will be available here in Illinois and for the benefit of motorists. And so as we chart these waters today, as we start out, this is something that we will be giving the consumer a choice at the pump and I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JONES:

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2236 pass. favor will 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 52 voting Aye, 3 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2236, having received a constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hunter, what purpose you rise?

SENATOR HUNTER:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

SENATOR HUNTER:

We have in the Chambers today young people visiting from schools in the Chicago public school system. I'd like for the schools to rise as I announce them. The first school is Shoop Elementary, which is home of President Emil Jones. Elementary school, will you please stand? And also one of the schools in my

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

district is here, Woods Elementary School. Will you guys please stand? And let's give them a well round of applause and welcome them to the Senate.

PRESIDENT JONES:

We're certainly glad to have the two elementary schools from Chicago here. John D. Shoop Elementary School is one of the feeder schools to that great school, Morgan Park High School. I was one of the oldest graduates of that school. I stayed around a long time because I enjoyed it so much. So, welcome to Springfield. Senator John Sullivan, what purpose you rise? SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege. PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Members of the Senate, I'd like to introduce a young lady that's here with me today. Her name is Amy Vetter. She's an intern in my Macomb district office. A senior at WIU, Western Illinois University in Macomb. Originally from -- her home is Crystal Lake, Illinois. But she's down here today seeing what we do and how the process works. I'd like everybody to welcome her to Springfield.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guest please rise and be welcomed by the Senate? Senator Lauzen, what purpose you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you -- thank you, President Jones. I'd like to ask the Senate to welcome students from the Glenwood School in St. Charles, Illinois today. They are led by Cheryl Frederickson and they're sitting in the gallery just over my shoulder here. I'd ask the Senate to welcome them. Please rise.

PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized? Senate Bill 2243. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 2246. Senator Link. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2246.

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

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2246 amends the Illinois Income Tax Act and creates an income tax deduction for employers who hire released individuals. The deduction shall equal up to sixty-five percent of the gross wages paid to released individuals during the individual's employment during the taxable year. The deduction may not exceed twenty thousand per -- released individual. The bill creates an income tax for certain tuitions, training and deduction child care expenditures paid by the employer with respect to the released The deduction shall not exceed one hundred percent individual. of the cost or a thousand dollars per released individual in any taxable year. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen. SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to speak in favor of Senate Bill 2246. I recognize that there were concerns by some members of the committee about the piece of legislation, but I'd like to commend the sponsor on the work that he's doing in this area. Any of us who have done any work with either friends or family members who are trying to reenter society after serving their debt after committing a crime, you realize how important it is and how wise it is to make an investment with employers on behalf. This is not money that goes to a person getting out of jail. It is money that goes to an employer who takes that little bit extra risk to employ and put a person to work. So I commend the sponsor on his work. I think this is a -- a good commonsense idea. We need to move it forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Roskam. SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Link, can you just walk through the mechanisms for

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

how this would work and who would be the beneficiary and are there any limitations for the underlying crimes which somebody could commit and still be employed and benefit -- or -- and have the employer benefit from this deduction or credit?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

To answer your second question first, no, the crimes aren't limited, but what this would do is it would give benefits to the employer to help bring employment to these individuals who have been incarcerated for a felony charge and have served their time and are trying to get back into the work-a-day world and not be a burden on the society, have spent their time, have paid their debt to society and now are trying to become individuals back into society and not be a burden to society anymore.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Can you compare this at all, Senator, to any other programs that are in place right now for other tax -- it's a -- it's a tax deduction, not a tax credit, so I -- I think I misspoke when I asked credit last time. Can you compare this to any other tax deductions that are available for employers who employ any other class of individuals?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Not that I know of, Senator. And I think that this uniqueness about this type of program, because I don't think this has been addressed before, because one of the things we have, that we've heard the problem numerous amount of times that these individuals have a hard time every time they go to fill out the application and they're being very honest and forthright when it is on the application, "Have you ever had -- convicted of a felony, or have you ever served time?" And they do -- they put the answer, yes. Even though the employer is supposed to look the other way and not take that into consideration, they do and they don't hire this individual. Well, this would give an incentive for that individual to be hired for the business. So,

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

I think we've given a -- a unique perspective in trying to bring these people back into society.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Wendell Jones. Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. To the bill: I voted against this in committee. I just have one question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you. Senator Link, do we have a similar deduction for veterans?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

You -- Senator, you asked the same question in committee. You have veterans preference in almost every field that we have and I think that we do that for our veterans in every which way that we can, and -- and I would not take away from veterans preference and I would commend anybody to hire -- or, recommend anybody to hire veterans. And we have gone in every which way to make sure veterans get first preference in these jobs. And this is not to diminish or take away from veterans in this type of bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Well, my -- my question had to do with whether or not we have a deduction for veterans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

No. We don't have a deduction for businesses to hire veterans. We've given veteran preference to businesses. So, like in State employment, the first employee to be hired would be a veteran and I think that that's what we've done throughout the entire State, is to make sure veterans are the first person to be

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

hired, and as well it should be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. My final statement is as I said in committee. I think this -- this bill, while well-meaning -- the sponsor's certainly well-meaning, I think it sends the wrong message to the people of Illinois, and I would recommend a No

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, I -- I think I understand what you're trying to do, but I just can't imagine you would -- you would go to this level. I mean, you are going to give an advantage to convicted criminals to get a job, as I understand this, over law-abiding citizens and over veterans. Is that right? Because you're offering a benefit to hire somebody who's a convicted criminal who served their time. It would be more advantageous for an employer to hire them over a veteran or a law-abiding citizen. Is that -- is that a fair description of what you're trying to do here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Maybe I should announce my candidacy for Governor, because it seems I've been debating you more than you have in the gubernatorial race. But, no, that is exactly the opposite of what this is doing. This is a pro-business bill, in case you haven't read it, Senator Brady. It's a very pro-business bill. What we're trying to do is to take people who have served their time, who have served their debt to society and take the burden off of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois and give them the chance to go back to work so they're not paying -- society is not paying for them. And businesses are getting an opportunity to give them work. So, they're getting the opportunity. So, this,

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

as you should want, is a pro-business piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, does this include sex offenders as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

It includes everybody. They would have to state what their offense was and this still would be up to the individual to hire the individual in which they would hire. This is stating everything. It states all convicted felons. It would state that they would have to take what their offense is. This is not telling them they have to hire anybody.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

So, Senator, you're giving an advantage to sex offenders, rapists, people who use guns in crime and -- and not just Illinois residents, as I understand it, you're offering the same benefits to -- to criminals from other states. I mean, already have a Governor who wants to bring everybody around the country to this State for welfare. Now you want to bring all the criminals - all the criminals - all the criminals from other states to our State, Senator. Come on. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the bill: You know, this is ridiculous. I mean, I think even the Governor would veto this piece of legislation. I -- I'm not sure, but I think he might veto this. This is a piece of legislation that gives advantage to sex offenders, people who use guns in crimes, cocaine gang-bangers and provides an incentive for them to move to Illinois to get a job. you want to bring criminals from all around this nation to Illinois to get a job because there's an advantage, and if you want to give an advantage to sex offenders and rapists over lawabiding citizens in Illinois, you should vote for this. But I don't think any of you do. In fact, I would recommend you pull it out of the record, Senator. Vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Hendon.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

SENATOR HENDON:

You know, Madam President, as much as I like Senator Brady as a person, I'm almost ready to put in a bill that says no Senator can run for higher office and debate on the Senate Floor. Because now an intelligent Senator such as Senator Brady wants to totally mischaracterize Senator Link's legislation for political It's almost to the point -- at least Steve purposes. Rauschenberger doesn't get up on every bill - and we know he's a candidate for higher office - and distort the truth. And -- and -- and as much as I could like to get Terry Link now and then, to act as if and to say on this Floor that he is supporting sex offenders and rapists over veterans is an absolute outrage. wonder -- no wonder you can't break into double digits. people of Illinois need the truth. Guess what, Senator? Many of these people who are -- convicted felons, many of 'em are innocent in the first place. Have you ever thought about that? Some of 'em didn't do nothing. In addition to that, when they get out, if they have no opportunities to work, what do you think they're going to do? Where do you think they're going to go? We're going to pay to put 'em back in jail, that's what we're In addition to that, this is a tax break for going to do. businesses - a Republican dream. If they don't want to hire the person, they don't hire 'em. They don't get the tax break. Tell the truth. You used to tell the truth before you filed your nominating papers. Tell it now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

I'm sure the sponsor will yield, Senator. ${\tt SENATOR}$ RIGHTER:

Thank you. Thank you. Senator Link, it's my recollection last year we passed legislation that was signed into law that allowed an individual to have their records expunged, I think for all misdemeanors and some felonies. The notion behind that legislation was so that when they went and they applied for a job, they didn't have to tell the employer that they had a conviction on their record. Now, I mean, setting aside the --

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

the issues that some had with that bill, the point of the bill was to address the very issue that you're saying you're trying to address with Senate Bill 2246. Isn't that enough? I mean, isn't it enough to give these individuals an opportunity to say that they really don't have a criminal record?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Senator Righter, those were limited misdemeanors and limited felonies that we expunged last time. This is basically for anybody, and as Senator Hendon so eloquently said, this basically a pro-business type of bill. It's a -- it's a bill to give the opportunity for people to hire individuals. mandating anybody to be hired. It's not saying you have to hire an individual. It's giving an opportunity to have you take a second look at an individual and not turn that individual away immediately because he or she has been convicted of something and has served their time - in Illinois, if you read the bill. You had to serve your time in Illinois. So it's an Illinois conviction that -- where they had to serve their time. So we're not importing people from other states to give 'em here. Illinois serving of time. So the point is, it's individuals to give them a second chance so they don't become a burden on our society.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Well, Senator Link, I mean, just between us, I - I don't really care whether that someone committed a sex offense or an armed robbery in Montana or Illinois, that's really not my issue. My issue is with placing the public's dollars in a position of trying to incentivize employers to hire people who have served prison time. I mean, in the world of unlimited funds, I suppose there is an argument to be made, you know, an altruistic one, that this would be good. I mean, there's a million good ideas, literally, that float through this Chamber and this building every year. But at a time when we talk about limited funding for schools and we talk about the excessive tax burden that is on employers, which there is one, is this a wise

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

use of the public's money to spend public money incentivizing employers to hire people who've been convicted oftentimes of very serious felony offenses?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: It is a little bit stunning that we are here seriously deliberating a piece of legislation that would take money out of the State treasury. mean, there aren't very many people in this building. the question, do you think State government needs more resources, who wouldn't raise their hand? There's a lot of people saying that nowadays. And I don't know what this bill would cost, but we all need to make decisions about where the public resources are best spent. Is it best spent in our schools, on our roads, in drug rehabilitation facilities and after we've gone through a litany of three years of telling businesses that we're taking away many of their longtime tax deductions, whether it's credits or deductions, we're now going to place a single one in place for people who have served prison. I don't think this will -correctly reflects the priorities of what this Chamber should be in spending the public resources. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Meeks. SENATOR MEEKS:

Thank you so much, Senator Halvorson -- or, Madam President. To the bill: The one thing I know about this piece of legislation that the sponsor has put forth, today in Illinois there are forty-five thousand people in our prison system, this morning as we speak - forty-five thousand. Twenty-five thousand of those individuals are scheduled to be released some time this year. Many of them are there for nonviolent crimes. They -- they're not rapists. They're not murderers. A drug offense - they sold twenty-five dollars, a hundred dollars' worth of drugs. They're in jail, but twenty-five thousand will come out this year in the State of Illinois. Here's the problem. Because they have a record, they can't get a job. They can't even get a ID while they're in the Department of Corrections. So they come out -- we won't even have the decency as a State to provide a person with

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

an ID so that when they walk out, they could at least go somewhere and get a job. Therefore, the recidivist rate is seventy-five percent of the twenty-five thousand who will come out this year. And I think we have a responsibility as a State, and I want to commend the sponsor for this legislation, because we have a responsibility to try to study every mechanism we can to put people to work after they serve their time, to put people to work so that they won't go back into the criminal justice system. And I recommend on this side, all of our colleagues, to wholeheartedly support this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Trotter. SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Madam President and Members of the Senate. You know, some of our Members have been talking about, one, what's good for this State, and what's -- what's good for our image, and what is the -- the real reason, why are we incentive -- giving incentives to business. Well, as pointed out by Senator Meeks, recidivism is up. And recidivism costs us on the average of almost twenty thousand per inmate. It also costs us in our -- in our judicial system and in our justice system. What we need to be looking at, one, is how do we get people to be taxpayers and not tax eaters. And that's what we have every time that we cannot find a position or a job for individuals once they've served their time, have done what we have mandated that they should do, and that is, serve their time and come back and be a good citizen. For the past few years that we've been grappling with this fledging economy that we have, it's been consumer confidence that's kept us afloat. That's consumers buying things. People spending money, generating sales taxes, generating, one, income taxes, which has kept us afloat, which has paid for education, which has paid for our roads and our services that we render for all of our -- our citizens. not welfare. We don't want to be the welfare state. We want to be the state that's rebounding and is doing great things for all of its citizens and we do that by providing services and we do that by generating money and taxes. You do that by putting people to work. This is a "put people to work" bill. And I ask for everyone to vote Aye.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Lauzen. SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Madam President. You know, I think that this is a fascinating debate. It -- I think it revolves around a basic difference in a philosophy that perhaps some of the Members who have spoken against don't realize what they -they may be saying. I have enormous respect for my colleague, Senator Brady. If he becomes Governor, I think he'll be a good I -- I would like to say for our guests in the audience that when Senator Hendon kind of pulls his leg that it is only in a respectful -- he's -- he's pulling his leg. wouldn't want our guests to have the wrong impression. However, here's why -- here's the reason - and this Body in the General Assembly is supposed to be about reason, not about our emotion, but about our reason and what is good for our society as a whole - the reason why I believe that Senator Brady's position might be incorrect revolves around the question of if a person is guilty at one point in time, are they guilty for the rest of their lives? Are they guilty of that crime even after they've served the time in prison and they come out? Now, some people really do feel in their hearts that a person is guilty forever and that they should not get anything from a society because they've disappointed a society. But if we believe that once a person has served the time that the law has established, that it is all of our job to try to integrate that person back into productive society. And for that reason, I think that we solve a serious problem of recidivism, as Senator Meeks pointed out. We need private industry. We need private industry to leverage their money to solve the problem of recidivism. We want people back into society. And if any of us are so strong and perfect that we have never done anything wrong, or don't know of anybody, either in our neighborhood or in our family who has committed a crime, and we want them to be back into society after they've paid their debt, then I think they're guilty forever and you vote No on But if we want to use imaginative, practical incentives and leverage the private industry to help us in a job that we haven't done such a hot job of, so far, of reducing recidivism, I think that it's good for us to vote Yes. Thank you very much.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Raoul. SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I'd like to echo some of the sentiments of Senator Lauzen. I -- I think that there's a reason we call it a Illinois Department of Corrections. Inherent in the name is correcting, and -- and once we have done the job of correcting, it is assumed that the job that we are supposed to be doing in the Department of Corrections is to be helping reduce recidivism, not to just put people out to fail again to support the prison industrial complex. And I think we need to get out of the mindset of looking at prisons as economic engines. We -- we put -certainly we put people in prisons to punish, but also to correct and to give second opportunities. There -- there are specific penalties for specific crimes and those penalties are in -- in -in our Criminal Code. The Criminal Code does not say, thereafter do not give people an opportunity to work to make a better life. This question -- this bill, sponsored by Senator Link, is a public safety bill as well. Because if you don't give opportunities to not only those that fall within the limited class that we have for expungement legislation, but for all of those who have paid their dues pursuant to our Criminal Code, then it's going to be a public safety risk for all of us. So I urge support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link, to close.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. Obviously, this was a lot of interesting debate. And a lot of the people that want you to vote No, I agree with a lot of their statements about the tax dollars, that we want to see tax dollars go to education, to the roads, health care, and I agree with 'em. That's exactly why this piece of legislation will help that. If my colleagues who have been around here for a long time can remember, for twenty-some years we built new prisons in the State of Illinois. Every year we were building a new prison. Why? Because we were sending people to prison every year and overcrowding us. Why? Because, as Senator Meeks said, seventy-five percent of 'em were

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

going back for a second, third and forth time. Why? Because they couldn't get a job in society to correct their ways. This is a step forward to save money for the people of the State of Illinois. What little bit of a deduction you're going to give business will save us millions and millions and millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. This is a pro-business, but it's a pro-taxpayer-dollar bill. I ask you for a pro-people vote and vote Yes on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2246 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 29 Yeas, 24 Nays, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 2246, not having received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Madam President, I would ask that it be put on Postponed Consideration -- Senate Bill 2246.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link requests that Senate Bill 2246 be postponed. The bill will be placed on Order of Postponed Consideration. Senator Sandoval, on Senate Bill 2254. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2254.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Illinois Senate. Before I proceed, I'd like to recognize a group that has worked arduously in support of this bill and its advocacy. I'd like to recognize the students from SIU-Edwardsville are in the President's Chamber this afternoon. Senate Bill 2254 mandates each person who successfully participates in a Home and Community Based Services Waiver for Persons with -- Development Disabilities who display behavioral changes to have an

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

individualized behavioral support plan. Senate Bill 2254, as amended, makes it clear that each person participating in the waiver program, regardless of whether the individual qualifies for federal participation for those services, who exhibits behavioral challenges must have an individualized behavioral support plan. This initiative -- the Illinois Health Care Association, the Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, Citizen Commission for Human Rights, the ARC of Illinois and the Family Support Network of Illinois and the Illinois Association of Rehab Facilities is in support of this bill. I ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2254 pass. 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 On that question, there are 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, record. none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2254, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Forby, on 2262. Crotty, on 2257. Top of page 8. Senator Ronen, on 2267. Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 2277. Senator Cullerton, on 2284. Senator Clayborne, on 2285. Senator Martinez, on 2290. Senator Haine, on 2302. Senator Cullerton, Senator Jacobs. 2325. Senator Martinez. Senator Jacobs. 2330. Senator Watson, on 2333. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2333.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Last spring we received phone calls in my district office from several of the dairy farmers located primarily in Bond County, my home county; Clinton County, which is just south of -- of us, in fact, Clinton County is the second-highest milk producing county in the State - and then Madison County. And what was happening was anonymous complaints

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

were going into the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency and complaining about their farming practices. And these were anonymous complaints. And in many cases, these were very frivolous. I mean, it was almost like harassment on the -- the farmers that were involved. During the testimony, we had two individuals from -- from my area come up to testify and they did an outstanding job of talking about the stewardship and the -the responsibility that -- that farmers have to -- to agriculture and the environment and -- and the manner in which they handle themselves on their own dairy farms, and the problem -- that was happening and what this legislation does, is it says that you can longer file an anonymous complaint. And this is only And there was some concern in the original bill. agriculture. We amended that to take out anything other than agriculture. And -- and what we're saying is that if you're going to file a complaint with the Environmental Protection Agency, you must don't address. I think this supply your name and unreasonable. This -- this name and address from the Environmental Protection Agency, it's required to be kept confidential. So there'll be no retaliation. There is actually So I think this a -- a penalty for anyone who releases the name. is a reasonable approach. It's trying to help the agriculture industry in this State and especially the livestock industry that -- that has really had so many problems over the last several And I think this is a reasonable -- reasonable approach, Madam President, and ask for the support of the Body.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2333 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On that question, there are 51 Yeas, 2 voting Nay, 1 And Senate Bill 2333, having received the voting Present. required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Sandoval, on 2376. Valle, on 2399. Cullerton, on 2394. 2394. Senator Wilhelmi, on 2395. Senator Cullerton, on 2400. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senate Bill 2400.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. bill is a follow-up to a bill that we passed last year dealing with the ability to regulate smoking in local jurisdictions. Last year we did authorize municipalities to regulate smoking in their -- all -- all municipalities to regulate smoking in their Up until that time, there were about only municipalities. eighteen jurisdictions that could do so. That bill is the law. And, in fact, in this town, in Springfield, they have passed an ordinance which goes into effect later on this year in September. The Mayor of Springfield asked me if I could put this bill in, as well as some DuPage County board members, who've indicated that they wish to have the same authority extended to the county boards -- the non-home rule county boards so that they can pass ordinances that affect the unincorporated areas of those So this bill is limited to -- first of all, it's counties. permissive. It's up to the county board to decide if they want. If they don't want, they don't have to. It just empowers them, if they wish, to pass ordinances regulating smoking only in the unincorporated areas of the county. It's that simple. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Madam President. A question of the -- to the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator Cullerton, I think you answered the question, but I want to make absolutely certain that it is only the unincorporated area, because I understood there was a bill that would apply to -- to all areas within a county and a corporated area would have to opt-out of the bill. But that -- that's not

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

in this bill. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

That is correct. As originally introduced, that's what the bill did. So we amended it at the request of the parties that I've indicated. So it's only the unincorporated areas of the county that they can regulate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: I commend the sponsor for what he's trying to do and I -- I -- I think it's a step forward, but I passed a piece of legislation out of committee the other day that would enact a statewide ban on And what we will be doing is having hearings over the summer and I think that that's the step forward that I think we need to do, because what we're going to do with this piece of legislation, which I will be voting for, is, I think, what we're going to do is just add more confusion to people as we have right now where people don't know what the regulation is from one step to another, municipality to county, to where they're going to what we got to do. And I think the time has come for a statewide piece of legislation. And I hope that we can all work together this summer on a piece of legislation, that we could pass it, and that we could send Illinois into what other states have, into a piece of legislation that will affect the entire State of Illinois. I commend the sponsor for what he's trying to do and I hope that we can all work together to fulfill the wish of getting a statewide ban.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Madam President. I rise in support of the bill and I rise in support of it for the following reasons. Number one, I know that there are philosophies here and some people have to think for a moment about smoking bans and things of that nature. And I guess when you're talking about a activity that somebody wants to engage in, we're all for it. But the

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

moment that activity has a negative effect or harmful effect on someone else, then there may be an appropriate place for government to step in. I embrace this approach because it allows the people at the local level who are closest to the bars and the restaurants and other establishments to decide what's best for 'em. With all due respect to one of the previous speakers who favors a statewide ban, I would argue that as we view this train chugging down the track, this political correctness of smoking bans and so on and so forth, I would argue that -- that this is the far more desirable approach, far more substantive public policy than a out-and-out ban. And so, therefore, for those of you who are interested and acknowledge that we need to address this issue and that there is a fine line that we can draw empowering local county boards to do this if they so choose, I think, is the right way to go and I strongly urge an Aye vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Cullerton, I want to make sure that I understand what you're doing in this bill. There may be and -- in counties, areas that they're not technically incorporated areas, they're little towns, but they're not -- they don't have a village board, a village president, whatnot. Those are the areas that -- that you're seeking to subject to the county board's authority with regards to a smoking ban. Is that -- is that a fair characterization?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, the -- the language of the bill is "the unincorporated territory of the county may regulate smoking". So, I -- I hope that answers your question. That's the area that we are limited to in allowing the county board to enact the ordinances - the unincorporated territory of the county.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senator Righter. Any further discussion? Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Madam -- or, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield for some questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. Senator Cullerton, if they are not limited to the definition of public place in the Clean Air -- Indoor Air Act, will locals be able to expand that to private homes or cars? What about the exceptions in Section 4 for private social functions and factories, warehouses and similar places of work not usually frequented by the general public?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. This is an area that's caused some confusion when we passed the bill last year. We -- we passed a Illinois State statute twenty years ago and there was a lot of debate at that time about public place versus not public place. And that definition still stands and it -- it affects our State statute. But it's been the -- and it might be the subject of some litigation in the future, but many people believe, and I am one of 'em, that the -- that definition of public place versus non-public place only relates to the State law, that local jurisdictions have always had the ability to regulate smoking in what would be considered not public places as defined by the State law. So maybe that's something that'll be litigated; I'm not sure. All this bill says is that the local counties have the same authority that the -- that the municipalities have and that is to regulate smoking within their unincorporated areas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

How will this affect private clubs, such as VFWs, American Legion halls and Knights of Columbus?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

SENATOR CULLERTON:

It totally allows them, the -- the county board, to do the same thing that we allowed the municipalities to do. And if there's a question as to whether they can regulate private places, that might be litigated. I've given you what, I believe, my opinion is as to what the law is. We're -- in this bill, it's really very simple; it just allows the county board to do the same thing that the municipalities can do with regard to the regulations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Senator, what is the impact of local ordinances on the federal buildings, including military bases and State facilities and buildings?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

I'm not positive, but perhaps the federal law trumps the State law, but I'm not absolutely certain.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

To the bill, Madam President: Last year I voted against this because I wanted some consistency. This bill maybe takes it more toward consistency, but it seems to -- it seems to add some confusion. I told Senator Cullerton that since last year's bill passed and we're overriding the Clear Indoor Air Act, that I would support the legislation. But it looks like we need to write -- rewrite the whole Clean Indoor Air Act and maybe consider whether or not this issue ought to be left to the marketplace. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Rutherford. SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. I'm going to speak to the bill. I had supported the original bill with regards to municipalities having the authority to determine. I'm not going to be voting for this bill, because I represent many counties where the county

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

in specific districts. So, а rural area unincorporated is represented by county board members. Then you have the municipalities, larger dense population area, that are represented by county board members. What's happening different here compared to the original bill and the municipalities is you're having people that are not representative of those specific rural areas helping to determine the destiny for those that -- that they actually don't represent, albeit on a county board side of this things. So, I do see a distinct difference between the municipal ordinance opportunity and this and the county board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

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

SENATOR CULLERTON:

I'd like to address some of the concerns. First of Yes. all, addressing the last speaker, I think it's clear that the county board could, if they wish, because we're just making this permissive, decide that not all parts of their unincorporated areas would have to be covered by the ordinance. That would certainly be something they could do if they choose. know, even in the City of Springfield, you have different wards, You have different wards. Some aldermen voted for it, right? some aldermen voted against it. But the law that they passed covers the whole city. So, I don't think that's as great a concern for you as it should be. I appreciate the -- the fact --Senator Jones' comments. We still have an Illinois Clean Indoor It's viewed as a very weak Act, but it is a State law and we still have that, and it still makes a distinction in the areas that the local governments have not chosen to regulate. And as far as Senator Link's points, yes, indeed we might pass at some point in time a statewide law, or -- or toughen up the current Illinois Clean Indoor Air Act. But there's a lot of controversy as to what that bill should look like, and it may be that it won't pass this year. So, all I'm trying to do is allow the counties to have the same authority that municipalities have. It's a specific request of the Mayor of Springfield in light of the -- the way the Springfield jurisdiction sits vis-à-vis the county of Sangamon and the

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

unincorporated areas of Sangamon. The Sangamon County Board has also asked for it. The DuPage County Board has asked for it. For that reason, I'd ask you to please vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2400 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 45 Yeas, 10 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 2400, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Link, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LINK:

There will -- there will be a Democratic Caucus immediately in President Jones' Office for about forty-five minutes. And... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski, for what... Oh! I'm sorry, Senator Link. SENATOR LINK:

And we will be coming back after that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, thank you. I would request a Republican Caucus in Senator Watson's Office for forty-five minutes and we'll see who gets back on the Floor first.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

You got it. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After caucuses, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The Senate will come to order. Would all Members under the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor? We are about to resume Senate business. Please come to the Senate Floor. President Jones has notified everyone that you need to move your legislation and you need to move it today. Will all Members under the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor? If

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

you're in your offices, you need to come to the Senate Floor. We're about to resume Senate business. Would you please turn your Calendars to page 9 of the Senate Calendar? We're going to Page 9 on the Senate Calendar. Top of page 9. 3rd Readings. Will all Members under the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor? All administrative assistants, please send your Senator to the Senate Floor. Top of page 9 on the Senate Calendar. Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 2405. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2412. Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2436. Crotty. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2446. Senator Forby. Senate Bill 2456. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2456.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2456 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. We, as a Body, particularly the General Assembly, certainly have recognized the need to protect our constituency from the increasing crime of identity theft, in particular our seniors. This legislation provides that any person sixty-one years of age or older applying at a driver license facility to renew his or her driver's license or Illinois ID Card be provided without charge a brochure warning the person of the dangers of financial identity theft. The brochure is developed by the Department of Finance and Professional Regulations and then distributed to the Secretary of State's Office. I know of no objection and would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

To the bill, sir.

SENATOR MILLNER:

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

The committee unanimously -- unanimously went for the bill. So we request a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2456 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2456, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2465. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 2469. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 2475. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 2477. Senator Shadid. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2477.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2477 deletes and replaces the underlying shell bill. Amendment No. 1 amends the Public Building Commission Act such that the Peoria Public Building Commission will have the temporary authority to enter into construction contracts with -- with Peoria School District 150.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of the bill. This bill has a sunset clause in it, as I understand. And it's a good bill for the City of Peoria. It's supported by the city council and also by Dunlap School District, which is also in the City of Peoria.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield. Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. First of all, Senator Shadid and -- and Senator Risinger, I -- I appreciate the fact that you're trying to do something for your school district. So, I -- I do appreciate that. My question -- first question would be, how in the world did the public building commission, I'm assuming, accumulate so much money in its funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

That's -- that's a good question, Senator. They have not -in 1993 the State -- the State of Illinois -- our -- our
legislators put in a bill that would not allow any public -public commission to build anymore schools in the State of
Illinois. They can build public buildings. So they have been
sitting there for ten, twelve years and getting so much money
every year to -- and this money has accumulated and they have
nowhere -- and they have not been able to spend it on schools.
And now this is a good time because they are really in dire -dire straits because they can't get a referendum passed. They
have a sixty-percent minority student population and this would
be very, very beneficial and really well -- well needed. I mean,
we need this in our city.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, I'm not here to argue the point whether or not they can or can't get a referendum passed, but when was the last time they offered a referendum to the people?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

I have to tell you, they -- they've not had a referendum on the -- for the last ten years that I'm aware of. I can only tell you that when I tried to build a county jail, we had three referendums that failed and we finally had to go to the public

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

building commission in 1985 to get a jail built that was to replace the jail that was a hundred and twenty-five years old. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. To -- to the bill itself: First of all, let me indicate, what I recall in the discussion in committee is the fact that it's been close to thirty years since they tried to pass a referendum. Now, I don't doubt whether or not they could. So that's not really the issue. The issue is whether or not we want a public building commission -- and this is an isolated case. It only deals with Peoria and I understand I'm more concerned about an overall long-term impact of public building commissions throughout the State being able to be utilized to build schools. In other words, taxation without representation. You don't go to voter approval, but the voters still have to pay for that school building if they don't want to. Folks, it doesn't just impact whether or not you can build the school. A public building commission can also then be contracted with to pay for the maintenance, the upkeep of those buildings anything associated with that. The administrative costs can be written off to the public building commission, as well. So, it does have a much broader scope in my opinion - long-term throughout the life of a public building commission. it's a very, very slippery slope. And I think there is a unique situation here; however, there's also a situation where you've got two boundaries that don't necessarily overlap. If you lay them on a map, the City of Peoria and the school district of Peoria, they do not match up. So, in some ways you've got some people that are going to get the -- receive the benefit of the public building commission without having to pay for it, and in other ways, those that are paying for it without any benefits. So, I just urge you to vote your consciences, but I certainly have some very concerns -- large concerns with public building commissions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further -- Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

I'd like to answer Senator Burzynski's statement. When he

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

says some school districts would have to pay for it, I can only bring this -- I think you're talking about when the City of Peoria, like other cities, remove and do annex, the boundaries for the cities move, but the school districts don't move now. And that's how Dunlap gets the benefit of all this, because of a law that was passed in 1960. They get the property tax money from the City of Peoria taxpayers to go to the Dunlap School District, which I'm not arguing that point. But when you say someone's benefiting and they do not have to provide police or fire service or fix roads for all that benefit that they're getting. So, really, I can only tell you this is a good bill. It's well -- it's needed very badly and I'd like to have an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I -- I would like to emphasize my respect for Senators Shadid and If this bill -- I -- I certainly appreciate what Risinger. you're trying to do. If this bill would not encourage other taxing districts to reactivate and refuel their public building commissions, then I would say let's all climb on board and all be The fear that I have about the legislation - maybe it's unfounded, but I am convinced of it - is that this is going to encourage others to follow this approach. I served -- thirteen years ago I served on a public building commission in Kane County for about two, three years and it was incredible to me how four out of seven members of that commission could spend millions of in building things and then, as Senator Burzynski accurately stated, then set up the maintenance. It was -- it was really phenomenal how powerful these are and I remember how relieved I was after about two years in the Senate, when, I a bill was brought forward to freeze and basically deactivate new bonding authority for public building commissions. I think that the taxpayer approval is a very natural check and balance on the power of even local government. In my hometown, in Aurora, East Aurora High School, we have greater than a sixty percent minority population in my hometown. And we had to go many times for referenda, not once in thirty years, but we went

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

many times. And finally it was approved by the voters because they recognized the essential good that was going to be done. Because of the encouragement to others that this example will provide, I would recommend a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With respect to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I -- I -- I have to respectfully disagree, if I may. And I think, when you look at a bill like this, you have to look at the equities. And it may not fit into a specific category, but I think once you look at the experience in Peoria, I think you look at the need, you look at the fact that they have sixty million dollars that they've already collected and they're just looking for authorization to use that sixty million dollars to finance the construction of some much needed schools and classrooms, you couple that with the fact that we have a school construction grant program here in Illinois that is dysfunctional at the State level - you've got everybody talking about how they're all for it, but nobody comes up with a responsible plan for how to pay for these bonds - so, if you add it all up, I think Senator Shadid has come up with a reasonable and a rational approach to addressing a problem in his community and I think we -- we ought to be voting Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid, to close.

SENATOR SHADID:

Yes. I'd like to remind you all that this has a five-year window to it, that this money has to be spent within the next five years or whenever the school board approaches the public building commission. And the public building commission cannot build anything unless it's requested by a public body, and this school board is elected and they're going to be requesting it because they're supporting this because they know it's sorely needed. And I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2477 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 43 voting Aye, 9 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2477, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Trotter, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR TROTTER:

Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you. I would like the -- the Senate to recognize some young ladies from my district. We have Ms. Marvinetta Penn and her girls, the Global Girls, who are in Springfield today lobbying on behalf of the Illinois Campaign for Responsible Sex Education, and they want us to all vote for and support this legislation. Please welcome them to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests please rise and be welcomed to the Senate? Hope you are successful. Senate Bill 2489. Senator Shadid. Mr. Secretary, out of the record. Senator Shadid, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR SHADID:

Someone brought it to my attention that I must have got so excited, I didn't vote my button. Would you, as a matter of record, vote me Aye? Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The record will so reflect your level of excitement, sir. Senate Bill 2514. Senator Ronen. 2514. Senator Ronen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2515. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2520. Out of the record. The Chair is going to skip to the top of page 11. Senate Bill 2555. Mr. Secretary. Senate Bill 2555. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2555.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard, to explain your bill, sir.

SENATOR DILLARD:

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill came from an obscure governmental body called the Clarendon Blackhawk Mosquito Abatement District, which is in my area. And it makes a technical change with respect to petitions for referendums on how a mosquito abatement district is put together to make it mirror the way the law is for park districts. In my area, where this -- this particular abatement district is, there's a number of teardowns of older homes going on and this would set it up the same way for a park district to pick up these little parcels of land. It's really at and aimed at combating West Nile Virus, where you don't have one little particular area totally encapsulized by an abatement district for mosquitoes that's covered. And it keeps making sure that all of the mosquito abatement area is covered. It's the same as park districts. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any... Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield. Senator.

SENATOR CRONIN:

You know, Senator Dillard, it -- it may seem a little silly, but sometimes, you know, you go to the grocery store and you see things like mesquite flavor and I never quite understand it. Is that -- is that from mosquitoes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

It's amazing how mosquitoes do come around when you're barbecuing, but this is not my first bill. So, I'll get you an answer in writing sometime.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2555 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2555, having received the

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. For personal privilege, please. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point, madam.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'd like for you to welcome members of the Lutheran Social Services, Michelle Caldwell, who is a dear friend of mine for over twenty years, and Jennifer DeLeon. Can you please welcome them to the Chamber? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Would our guests please rise and be welcomed to the Senate? Welcome, ladies. Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. We're very fortunate today to have here on the Senate Floor more than one Lauzen. We've got them in triplicate today. And I think I'd like for the Body to join me in welcoming Sarah and Rob Lauzen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Would Sarah and Rob Lauzen please stand and be welcomed to the Senate? That is the wife of Chris Lauzen, and son. You are a courageous woman. Senate Bill 2579. Senator Collins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2608. Senator Haine. Senator Haine. 2608. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2639. Senator Garrett. 2639. Senator Garrett. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2672. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 2684. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 2691. Senator Link. Senate Bill 2695. Madam Geo-Karis. We're waiting for amendment. Senate Bill 2730. Senate Bill 2745. Senator Demuzio. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2748. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 2770. Senator Pankau. Senate Bill 2778. Senator Sieben. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill for this

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

gentleman.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2778.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Sieben, on your bill, sir.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This legislation passed out of the Higher Education Committee unanimously. And it would provide that each institution of higher learning in Illinois would adopt a policy that reasonably accommodates any student who is a volunteer emergency worker in regard to -- absence from class caused by the performance of his or her duties as a volunteer emergency worker. I know of no opposition and I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. As Senator Sieben said, this came out of the Higher Ed Committee unanimously after some concerns were raised and he made some adjustments relative to those concerns and I urge its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2778 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2778, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to go back to Senate Bill 2748. Mr. Secretary, leave is granted. 2748. Senator DeLeo. Mr. Secretary, please read the Senator's bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2748.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you -- thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2748 is -- we're removing the deadline to issue -- from the Chicago Park District to issue bonds for museums, aquariums, art museums under control of the Chicago Park District. This will have no fiscal impact on the State and this will -- allow them to reauthorize their bonds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam. Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2748 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Take -- take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2748, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2796. Senator del Valle. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 2807. Senator Clayborne. Senate Senate Bill 2837. Senator Demuzio. Bill 2808. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2871. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 2872. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 2878. Senator Sandoval. Sandoval. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2882. Senator Link. It is the intention of the Chair to only go through this Calendar maybe once, maybe twice. You need to call your bills as President informed everyone. And we're taking it as a pace that you can keep up with. I hope you appreciate that. Senate Bill Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2921. Senator Hunter. Waiting for an amendment. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Inquiry of the -- inquiry of the Chair, Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your inquiry.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You just -- you just stated to the Chamber that it was your intention to go through the Calendar once and maybe twice more. Is that for the remainder of the Session?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Well, Senator Righter, while I am in the Chair, that is my

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

intention, but I -- I will probably not be in the Chair for the remainder of this Session. Moving right along. Senate Bill 2955. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 2959. Senator Martinez. Senate Bill 2968. Senator Cronin. Senate Bill 2971. Senator Roskam. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2971.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2971 is an initiative, really came out of a Sun-Times story and it's been a -- it's a bill that has been based on Senator Cullerton's recommendation. improved Essentially, it amends the offense of impersonating a public official to include employees of the federal government and it increases the penalties for impersonating law enforcement Senator Cullerton suggested an amendment in Judiciary officers. Committee, which we adopted last week, to make it so that the -the -- the offense would be a Class 1 felony, instead of a Class X as I originally introduced, and also make the consecutive sentences permissive. I don't know of any opponents and I'll do my best to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2971 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2971, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2978. Senator Halvorson. 2978. Out of the Senate Bill 2980. Senator Cullerton. record. 2980. Cullerton. Senate Bill 2981. Out of the record. Senate Bill -out of the record. Senator Hendon's bill. Senate Bill 3036. Senator Syverson. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senate Bill 3036.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. This legislation addresses one of the two major complaints that people give when it comes to computers. Of course, the big one is always the problems of viruses on computers. And this one addresses the issue of spyware. This is modeled after a Texas law and, in essence, addresses the problem of illegally gathering information or illegally placing spyware into your computer to gather personal data on you. I know of no objections to this legislation and would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3036 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 3036, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 3056. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3086. 3086. Out of the record. We will now go to 2nd Garrett. 2nd. Now see, that's -- just for that, I'm going to go very quickly through 2nd Readings. If you want your bill called, you're going to call it. If you don't, you -- you're going to miss it. Page 2 of your Calendar. Senate Bill 1835. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 1835.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2144. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 2180. Senator Silverstein. 2180. Senator -- Senate Bill 2196. Senator Sandoval. Senate Bill 2198. Senator Dillard.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senate Bill 2225. Senator Maloney. Senate Bill 2229. Senator Maloney. Senate Bill 2237. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 2263. Senator Bomke. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2263.

2nd Reading of the bill.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

No committee or Floor amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2303. Senator Burzynski. Senate Bill 2326. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 2349. Senator Collins. Senate Bill 2368. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2368.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2369. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2369.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2374. Senator Millner. Senate Bill 2415. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 2426. Senator Millner. Senate Bill 2442. Senator Link. 2442. Senate Bill 2455. Senator Trotter. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2455.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Trotter.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Trotter, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank -- thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. In our efforts to -- to further spread the -- the word about the abandoned baby bill, we are trying to clarify certain points. And at the request of the Republicans in committee, we have added language to delete -- excuse me, we have added this amendment to delete some language that they felt was unnecessary. I can explain the bill when it goes to 3rd a little more.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Trotter moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2455. All those in favor will say Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2510. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2510.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported, Mr...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2519. Senator Demuzio. Senate Bill 2558. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 2561. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 2568. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 2574. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 2580. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 2511. Senator Link. Senate Bill -- I mean, 2611. Senator Link. Senate Bill 2615. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill 2616. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2616.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2617. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2617.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2619. Senator Collins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2670. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2674. Senator Demuzio. Senate Bill 2676. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 2688. Senator Link. Senate Bill 2693. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 2716. Senator John Sullivan. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2716.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Agriculture and Conservation adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2737. Senator Maloney. Senate Bill 2777. Senator Althoff. Senate Bill -- let's go to the next

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

-- out of the record. Senate Bill 2795. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill 2798. Senator Bomke. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2798.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2810. Senator Forby. Mr Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2810.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2829. Senator Lightford. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2829.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford, to explain your amendment, ma'am. SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment removes some of the changes that would have been made under the original bill, which is the less red tape initiative. The bill is a part of the Governor's effort to reduce regulations and paperwork for Illinois schools and to remove obsolete language regarding schools for the State statute. The Floor amendment also changes the requirements regarding public comment on waiver requests. I'd be happy to answer questions.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Lightford moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2829. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2845. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 2869. Senator Munoz. Senate Bill 2960. Senator Wendell Jones. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2960.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2962. Senator Petka. Senate Bill 2965. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 2967. Senator Bomke. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2967.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2969. Senator Burzynski. Senate Bill 2998. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 3016. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 3016.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 3037. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 3046. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 3053. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill -- that's it for 2nd Reading. The Senate

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

will stand at ease for just a moment.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator John Sullivan, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Colleagues, fellow Senators, I have some guests here in the gallery today from my home county, from Schuyler County. We have representatives of the Schuyler County Farm Bureau here today and I'd just like to welcome them. They're up in the gallery up to my left. I'd like to welcome them here to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests please rise and be welcomed to the Senate? Welcome. The Senate will stand at ease for just a moment.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

This would be a good time to make this announcement. The Senate/House softball game has been scheduled for April the 4th. The cowards in the House have finally agreed to a date. The cowards in the House, I repeat, have finally agreed to a date. Lincoln Park, April 4th. We must defend our championship. So we will schedule some practices later on in the month of March. We only need one or two to beat those chumps from over across the other side of the aisle. But set that date - Lincoln Park, April the 4th. Senate versus the House - April the 4th. And this is coed, so let's be prepared. Get in shape, Ladies and Gentlemen. Get in shape. We must defend our championship.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senator Halvorson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. For a point of personal interest. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point of personal interest.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to introduce - while we're sitting here at ease a little bit - we have a group of Will County Farm Bureau gentlemen here who are watching the proceedings over the next couple of days and I just want to welcome them, from Will County. So, if the Senate will welcome our...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests from Will County please rise, from the Farm Bureau, and be welcomed to the Illinois Senate? Welcome.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

There will be a Rules Committee meeting behind the President's -- in the Anteroom immediately. A Rules Committee meeting immediately. Senator del Valle in the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Viverito, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Re-refer to Rules Committee - Senate Bill 894; refer to Agriculture and Conservation Committee - Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 2716 and Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2810; refer to Education Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 854, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 855, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2257, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2670, Floor Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2795 and Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2796; refer to Environment and Energy Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2285, Floor Amendment 1 to

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senate Bill 2580, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2807, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2845 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2884; refer to Executive Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 820, Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1214; Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1835, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1991, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2180, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2277, Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2302, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2558, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2981 and Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3086; refer to Financial Institutions Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 893, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2325, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2349 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2619; refer to Health and Human Services Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 893, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2325, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2349 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2619; {sic} refer to Higher Education Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 880, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2225 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2376; refer to Housing and Community Affairs Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2290; refer to Judiciary Committee -Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1183, Floor Amendments 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 2137; Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2243, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2284, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2303, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2368, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2374, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2515, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2962 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3016; {sic} refer to Labor Committee - Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill -- that's 2339; refer to Licensed Activities Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2608, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2745; refer to Local Government Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 821, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 841, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 843, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2798 and Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3046; refer to Pensions and Investments Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 789; refer to Revenue Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 819, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2369 and Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2872; refer to State Government Committee - Floor Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 2330 and

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2921; refer to Transportation Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1085, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1086, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1087, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2233, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2405, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2489, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2650 and Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2808; and Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Bills 619, 621, 679, 701, 702, 827, 835, 860 and 918.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Link, for what purpose do you rise? State your point.

SENATOR LINK:

I'd like to have the Senate welcome one of the largest farm bureaus in the State of Illinois, the Farm Bureau from Lake County, Illinois, who's sitting back in here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Welcome, gentlemen. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Viverito, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Agriculture and Conservation Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 621; refer to Education Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 860; refer to Environment and Energy Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 619; refer to Insurance Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 918; refer to Labor Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 827; refer to Local Government Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 701 and Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 835; and refer to Revenue Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 679 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 702.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Crotty, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR CROTTY:

Point of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Make your announcement, please.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you. Local Government will meet today at 3:30 in the Stratton Building, Room A-1.

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the purpose of two announcements. The Housing and Community Affairs will meet tomorrow in A-1 at 10:30 and today, at 4 o'clock, the Pensions and Investment Committee will meet in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Link, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. For an announcement. Senate Appropriations II will meet in Room 212 tomorrow at 2:30 p.m. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Purpose of an announcement. Licensed Activity will meet tomorrow at 2:30 in the Stratton Building in Room A-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HAINE:

Point of information, Mr. President. The -- the Insurance Committee will meet at 3:30 p.m. today in Room 400. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Lightford, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Two announcements, please. Education will meet at 3:30 today in Room 212, and Financial Institutions will meet tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. in Room 400. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HENDON:

Purposes of an announcement, Mr. President. The Environment and Energy Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. in Room 212. Environment and Energy, 8:30 a.m., tomorrow morning in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Forby, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR FORBY:

For announcement. Labor will meet tomorrow in Room 400 at

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

2:30. Room 400, at 2:30, tomorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

Purpose of two announcements, Mr. President. The Appropriations -- Appropriations I Committee will meet at 4 p.m. today in Room 212. And the Senate Higher Education Committee will meet tomorrow at 4 p.m. in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Garrett, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purpose of announcement. State Government will meet tomorrow at noon in A-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Ronen, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RONEN:

To announce, Mr. President, that the Health and Human Services Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Harmon, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HARMON:

For the purposes of two announcements. The Senate Judiciary Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10:30 a.m. in Room 212. And the Senate Revenue Committee will meet tomorrow at noon in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Munoz, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR MUNOZ:

For the purpose of announcement, Mr. President. Transportation Committee will meet tomorrow, 10:30 a.m. in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. For an announcement. Ag and Conservation will meet tomorrow morning at 8:30~a.m. in A-1 in the Stratton Building.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

81st Legislative Day

2/28/2006

Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HUNTER:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President. The Appropriations III Committee will meet tomorrow at -- in Room 212 at 4 o'clock p.m. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Hendon, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HENDON:

Purposes of an announcement. The Executive Committee will meet tomorrow at 12 noon in Room 212. Executive, tomorrow, 12 noon, in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Madam Secretary, Messages from the Governor.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message for the Governor by Joseph B. Handley, Deputy Chief of Staff for Legislative Affairs, February 16, 2006.

Mr. President - The Governor directs me to lay before the Senate the following Message:

To the Honorable Members of the Senate, 94th General Assembly - I have nominated and appointed the following named persons to the offices enumerated below and respectfully ask concurrence in and confirmation of these appointments of your Honorable Body.

Rod Blagojevich, Governor.

I have a like Message, dated February 24, 2006, from the Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, could you possibly let us know, now we're going to have committees, I believe, at 2:30 or a little later, and after that, are we done until tomorrow?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEL VALLE)

We will be making that announcement shortly, Senator. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 12:30 p.m., tomorrow, March 1st. 12:30. Senate stands adjourned.