50th Legislative Day 5/31/2007

HB0025	Recalled	107
HB0025	Third Reading	113
HB0232	First Reading	62
HB0374	Out Of Record	6
HB0374	Third Reading	6
HB0743	Recalled	6
HB0743	Third Reading	7
HB0828	Recalled	8
HB0828	Third Reading	10
HB1292	Recalled	15
HB1292	Third Reading	16
HB1685	Recalled	24
HB1685	Third Reading	25
HB1888	Third Reading	66
HB3425	Postponed Consideration	68
SB0005	Recalled	172
SB0015	Concurrence	36
SB0065	Concurrence	86
SB0241	Concurrence	145
SB0253	Concurrence	37
SB0319	Concurrence	39
SB0340	Concurrence	41
SB0345	Concurrence	42
SB0446	Concurrence	43
SB0472	Concurrence	82
SB0486	Concurrence	44
SB0532	Concurrence	45
SB0547	Concurrence	46
SB0595	Concurrence	47
SB0599	Concurrence	49
SB0641	Concurrence	51
SB0680	Concurrence	52
SB0705	Concurrence	87
SB0715	Concurrence	147
SB0841	Concurrence	52
SB0890	Recalled	179
SB0935	Concurrence	88
SB1097	Concurrence	56
SB1165	Concurrence	56
SB1169	Concurrence	57
SB1201	Concurrence	89

50th Legislative Day		5/31/2007
SB1244 SB1245 SB1346	Concurrence Concurrence Concurrence	90 94 95
SB1350	Concurrence	96
SB1360	Concurrence	98
SB1368	Concurrence	100
SB1379	Concurrence	101
SB1380	Concurrence	102
SB1544	Concurrence	155
SB1544	Vote Intention	172
SR0232	Resolution Offered	2
SR0233	Resolution Offered	60
SR0234	Resolution Offered	61
SR0235	Resolution Offered	61
SR0236	Resolution Offered	80
Senate to Order-Senator Halvorson Prayer-Dr. Richard Ahlgrim Pledge of Allegiance		1 1 1
Journal-Approved		1
Committee Reports		2
Messages from the House		3
Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes		60
Messages from the Ho	60	
Messages from the House		62
Committee Reports Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes		74 80
Messages from the House		80
Committee Reports		81
Messages from the House		105
Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes		106
Committee Reports		106
Senate Stands in Rec	107	
Remarks regarding La	181	
Communications from	182	
Adjournment		184

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The regular Session of the 95th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will the guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given Dr. Richard Ahlgrim, Berean Baptist Church in Springfield, Illinois.

DR. RICHARD AHLGRIM:

(Prayer by Dr. Richard Ahlgrim)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

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

SENATOR MALONEY:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Maloney)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Journal of Wednesday, May 30th, 2007.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Madam President, I move that the Journal just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senators has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hunter moves to approve the Journals just read by the Secretary. There being no objection, so ordered. ABC 7 in Chicago wishes to videotape the -- the proceedings if leave is granted. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Illinois Information Service also wishes to videotape. Seeing no

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

objection, leave is also granted to them. Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 232, offered by Senators Emil Jones and Hunter and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator -- Cullerton, Co-Chairperson, and Senator Dillard, Co-Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary-Civil Law, reports Motions to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 319, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 486 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Crotty, Chairperson of the Committee on Local Government, reports Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1685 and Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1752, along with Motions to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 253, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 345 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 599 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Garrett, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Health, reports Senate Amendment No. 7 to Senate Bill 5 and Motions to Concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 15 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 547 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Wilhelmi, Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary-Criminal Law, reports a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 532 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Clayborne, Chairperson of the Committee on

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Environment and Energy, reports Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 828, Senate Amendment -- No. 2 to House Bill 1292 and a Motion to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 680 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Meeks, Chairperson of the Committee on Human Services, reports a Motion to Concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 340 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 595 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Lightford, Chairperson of the Committee on Education, reports a Motion to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 446, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 641, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 841 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1165 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Sandoval, Chairperson of the Committee on Commerce and Economic Development, reports a Motion to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1097 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Collins, Chairperson of the Committee on Financial Institutions, reports a Motion to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1169 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports House Bill -- 1750 Do Pass, along with Senate Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 25 recommend Do Adopt.

And Senator Demuzio, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs, reports Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 743 recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Madam Secretary, Messages.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

A Message from the Clerk -- from the House by Mr. Mahoney,

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Clerk.

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

Senate Bill 1380 $\{ sic \}$ (65), together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1380 {sic} (65).

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 705, with House Amendments 1 and 2, and Senate Bill 1380, with House Amendment No. 1.

All passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

I have a like Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, Clerk.

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

Senate Bill 1244, together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1244.

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 241, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 1245, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1346, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1348, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 1350, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 1360, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 1379, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 1426, with House -- House

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 1544, with House Amendments 1 and 2; and Senate Bill 1674, with House Amendments 1 and 3.

All passed the House, as amended, May 30th, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

And a final Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, Clerk.

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

Senate Bill 182, together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 182.

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 435, with House Amendments 1, 3 and 4; Senate Bill 1201, with House Amendments No. 1 and 2; and Senate Bill 1580, with House Amendment No. 1. All passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

All Members please come to the Senate Chambers. We are going immediately to House Bills 3rd Reading. They expire today. The deadline is today. If you wish to move your bill, it has to be done. And we're going to be going to that order of business right now. CBS Channel 2 in Chicago seeks leave to videotape the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Channel 19 ABC seeks leave to videotape the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. We will be starting on page 30, House Bills 3rd Reading. Our first one is going to be Senator Viverito. Senator Viverito. House Bill 29.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senator Demuzio. In case -- so -- any of you do not know, today is the deadline day. We would like for all Members to come to the Senate so we can begin our work. We are on House Bill 29. Senator Demuzio. With leave of the Body, we'll be returning to that. Senator Holmes, on House Bill 38. Senator Sullivan, on House Bill 118. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 260. Top of page 31. Senator Althoff, on 334. Senator Link, on House Bill 374. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 374.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link. Out of the record. Channel 20 News wishes to videotape the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Demuzio, on House Bill 415. Senator Delgado, on House Bill 427. Senator Koehler, on House Bill 699. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 703. Senator Link, do you wish to proceed on House Bill 743? Senator Link seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 743 to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 743. Senator Link. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR LINK:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you, Madam President. This changes just some technical changes. It's agreed-upon change. I'll be more than happy to talk about it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, Senator Link moves the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 743. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 743. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 743.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. This creates the Prompt Payment Act. Provides for all contractors, unless -- expressly excluded, shall be -- deemed provider if the contractor performed -- accordance with the provisions in the contract, the billing and provide -- by the owner and owner's agent. This is an agreed-upon bill. I know of no opposition now with the amendment. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 743 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 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 743, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Journal-Register wishes to take pictures. If there's no objection, leave is granted. Senator Harmon, on House Bill 824. Senator Haine, on House Bill 828. Senator Haine seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 828 to 2nd -- Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 828. Madam Secretary, have there been any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President. This is Amendment No. 2. This is an agreed amendment between the wireless characters {sic}, the public safety community and the Illinois Commerce Commission. This bill came over from the House and it had a dollar and a half for all users of cell phones outside the City of Chicago. The -- all the groups agreed to lower the wireless fee from seventy-five cents to seventy-three cents. In addition, there's a one-time transfer from the Carrier Fund to the public safety community for some of their infrastructure

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

needs and for a definitive consultant's study of their future needs. Everyone agreed -- agreed with that. That's Amendment 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any discussion on the amendment? Senator Righter, on the amendment? Senator Haine moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 828. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Yes, Madam President. Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine, to explain Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment changes a part of the bill, allowing the ICC more discretion in choosing a consultant. And this was made at the request of the ICC. Again, everyone agreed to this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, Senator Haine moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 828. See -- all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine, to explain Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment was quite recent. It -- the proponent is the City of Chicago. And the City of Chicago came in and asked if they could amend the bill to allow an increase for cellular fees in the City from a dollar and a quarter to two-fifty. The reason for this was the complexity of Chicago's law enforcement apparatus, given the highly urban densities there. The second reason is the fact that this money would be used for emergency preparedness and homeland security efforts which are necessary in order for the City to be given great weight in its application for the Olympic Games. This was run by the 9-1-1 community and the wireless carriers and they agreed. There was no disagreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, Senator Haine moves the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 828. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Mr. Secretary, have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 828. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

House Bill 828.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

I -- I would ask support for this bill. This bill was brought forward and -- and Senator Frerichs was the initial sponsor. I picked up the amendments because Representative Don Moffitt was the sponsor in the House and we are respectively Chairs of our fire caucuses. This was initially a fire caucus bill and a 9-1-1 bill in order to assist 9-1-1 -- or 9-1-1 operations throughout the State. And the City of Chicago's addition also assists their 9-1-1 operation and, again, is necessary for the implementation of measures to have them be given great weight in their application for the Olympic Games, which is, of course, a terrific benefit for the entire region and the State of Illinois generally, including my district. The -- it is important to note lastly that Chicago's a Tier 1 terrorist target and this money will be used to mitigate that threat, number one. Number two, we are merely, by this bill, authorizing the City of Chicago to implement the fee. So we are not implementing the fee in the City of Chicago. We are giving that authority to his Honor, the Mayor, and the fifty members of the City Council to do so in their sound discretion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Phil Rogers of NBC Chicago TV seeks leave to record the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Haine, I would like to clarify a little bit the language that was adopted onto the bill through Amendment 4, and that is, specifically, the surcharge and the potential increase in the surcharge through approval of the Chicago City Council. Now, what is the surcharge now and what can it be moved up to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank -- thank you. It is a current one-dollar-twenty-five per month. And it would go up -- it would authorize the City to impose up to two dollars and fifty cents per month.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And who would pay that? I mean, how is that -- how are they going to decide who is subject to that, Senator Haine?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, again, Madam President and Senator. This is -- anyone with a cell phone with a mailing address -- billing

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

address, I presume, in the City of Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

...question -- last question. Thank you, Madam President. And the monies from this fee are required to go into a dedicated fund for a dedicated purpose. Could you outline that again just very briefly, please, Senator Haine?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you for that question, Senator, and Madam President. Yes, that's correct. It goes into a dedicated fund to be used for these antiterrorism measures and the improvement of the 9-1-1 response. It's a dedicated fund, cannot be used, as I understand it - and that would be the intent of this legislation - for General Revenue Fund purposes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Sorry. Thank you very much, Madam President. Are there any direct or indirect funds from the State budget in this bill?

I -- I believe that there's not. But either directly or indirectly in a substitute?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President, and, Senator, for that question. The answer's no. There's nothing that... I'm sorry.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

I stand to be corrected. There is -- for the downstate portion, there is a one-time transfer, in consideration of the reduction, of eight point some million into the 9-1-1 communities to upgrade their -- their services. But that's -- that's it. And that was to do a study and to enable them to upgrade their infrastructure in consideration for reducing the cellular rate to seventy-three cents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Munoz.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: As the sponsor stated, the revenue generated would be allocated only to emergency preparedness and homeland security. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine, to close.

SENATOR HAINE:

I -- I would urge an Aye vote. This is a bill that benefits the entire State and it improves 9-1-1 services. It improves the antiterrorism capabilities of the City of Chicago that is now attempting to achieve a huge benefit for the entire Midwest and the United States with the Olympic Games. So, I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall House Bill 828 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 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 828,

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cullerton, on House Bill 830. On the top of page 32, Senator Cullerton, on House Bill 1050. With leave of the Body, we will possibly return to 1074. Senator Munoz, on House Bill 1100. Senator Ronen, on House Bill 1284. Senator Clayborne, on -- Senator Clayborne seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1292 to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave -- or -- leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1292. Mr. Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Floor -- Floor Amendment No. -- Floor Amendment No. 2 is a extension of the telecommunications rewrite from -- July 1st, 2007 to July 1st, 2009.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Senator Clayborne moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1292. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Mr. Secretary, have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 1292. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

House Bill 1292.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. I've discussed 1292 before and basically it makes changes and requires the ICC greater discretion in licensing third-party agents, brokers, consultants, engaged in the procurement or sale of electricity. It also sunsets -- extends the sunset of the telecommunications rewrite from July 1st, 2007 to July 1st, 2009.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Is there any -- will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, could you tell me who's for and who's against this bill? Is there any opposition to the bill that you've been made aware of?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

As recently as Tuesday, I was told that the brokers are probably against this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Is there -- is there some -- are there some brokers that are exempt under the -- the way the bill is drafted and others that have to be covered? Is that the -- the nature of the opposition of the -- as far as you know?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

No. What the -- what the brokers are saying, that -- that they have to register, but the retail suppliers they're saying are exempt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton. Any further discussion? Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Senator Clayborne, I have actually received several calls from the energy providers - brokers, I -- I'm assuming - who are concerned because what they're saying is that they are going to have to make available their customer list. They find that to be extremely noncompetitive. And I think when I talked to you, you said there was going to be an amendment that was added on

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

that would -- would reverse that. Has that happened?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

My understanding, that there's a -- possibly going to be a -- an amendment added to a House bill. I'm -- I'm thinking it's either 1346 or 1366. 1366 in the -- in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

But we don't have any assurances that that's going to happen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

...was told by the sponsor that that would -- that that would happen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

And when -- when would that happen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I'm -- I'm not in the House. I guess whenever he gets to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

This is not a detail. This is -- I think if we're really looking for fairness and equity, we want to make sure that there is a level playing field and that brokers, especially, don't have to jump through hoops to provide information that, in all fairness, I don't know other industries that -- that do this - have to give their customer list out. And, you know, it's going to be a tough vote for me, especially, to vote for this, because I think what we're doing is taking sides. And, I think, ultimately, that can lead to some real problems down the field. If you -- if you believe sincerely that this amendment's going to be added -- and you talked about Representative Holbrook, I believe, is adding this amendment. And you haven't had any further discussions with him?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I talked to him the other day. But, obviously, I've had so much on my plate, I have not followed up with this. I assume that that's what he's going to do. But to answer your question, Senator, this is not about the brokers. It's not about the retailers. The brokers didn't bring this bill forward. The retailers did to protect consumers, because in other states, brokers, retailers have taken advantage of consumers and they've had them to buy contracts and enter into contracts and had no intention of providing them power. Because what happens is, if they don't have a presence here, they could come here and allow our consumers to enter into contracts and pay it and then they go somewhere else. This is a measure designed to protect consumers. So, if you're not for protecting consumers, then you

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

probably would vote against this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Hultgren.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Will the sponsor yield for a quick question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Just wanted to check, Senator, again, just to understand a little bit more about this legislation. I had supported it in committee. I just had gotten a call from someone who lives in my district who is a broker, who is very concerned that this would be very detrimental to his business. And I wasn't able to talk directly with him, so I was just trying to decipher his message. Could you help me understand a little bit more, with someone who is a -- a local energy broker, what the negative impact would be for somebody like that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Well -- well, to answer your question, the reality of it is they don't want to be regulated. They want to just be allowed to come into the State and just operate and -- and perform -- conduct their business. So, what -- what you see in this bill is an -- is a compromise that came up between the retail supplier and suggestions that came from the Illinois Commerce Commission. If you don't pass this, then they're allowed to function free of any restrictions; nobody legitimizing them to say that they're truly a legitimate business. They will be

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

allowed to come in here and function with no accountability, with -- with -- with the consumers not being able to say that they've met certain standards. So, if you vote against this, you're voting not to protect the consumer from companies that may come in and take advantage of -- of our consumers. The other point, too, is, if you remember, I passed a bill out probably back in February - same identical bill except we made changes because the universities had problems and there were certain municipalities and political subdivisions that had problems. So, the brokers are -- are late - and I'm not discounting that, but the point I'm saying is this is to try to help the consumer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hultgren.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Thank you, Madam President. Just real quickly again. Quick question. It sounds like they weren't -- maybe they were kind of late coming to the table. Were they involved at all in discussions on this bill? Some of the brokers, some of the smaller providers, were they involved in the negotiations or the compromise on this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

The brokers came to see me May 28th, which was, I think, Monday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hultgren.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you, Madam President. Just to the bill: Again, I -- I did support this in committee and feel similar. I have great respect for the Senator sponsoring this. I just am concerned. I -- I don't feel like I have all the information, and for that reason, I'm going to need to vote No on this. I'd encourage other people to take a close look at this as well. I don't know if it'll affect -- obviously we're all concerned about making sure our consumers are protected, but there's other interests here as well. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

I have a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Senator Clayborne, were consultants, people who don't really procure the energy services for someone else, but consultants that would go into a company or a school district and assess that company or school district and then come up with an energy savings plan - those are known as consultants - were they at the table?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Whoever -- whoever wanted to come to the table were allowed to come to the table. As I said, we passed a bill out of here in February. If I don't hear from the brokers until May 28th, how do I know that there's a problem? I mean, the real issue

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

here is none of the retail suppliers want to be regulated. They don't want to be regulated. They don't want to be required to come in here and establish standards. They just want to be able to come in here, operate, sell contracts, and go back home.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

My question wasn't for the retailers. My question was for the consultants. And I know that we've had discussion. even -- even in my discussions with persons that were at the table and have supported this, at first, in that scenario, they said, no, those consultants would not be in the bill. And then after they looked a little bit more, they came back and told me that those - and these are licensed consultants in the State of Illinois - still fall under this bill, even though they don't procure, but they will come up with a recommendation after -and also giving all the information from all the other energy sellers out there. Just that alone would put them underneath this -- this bill. And I also have a person that happened to call me, was -- didn't realize that this was there, and I -after me working on it, I realize that they're also in this, even though they're not procuring or selling or have anything to do with energy companies out there. So...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

The law applies to consultants, who -- as -- as the laws read, brokers and consultants engaged in the procurement or sale of electricity. If they're not helping them to procure or sell

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

electricity, then I would say that they're -- they are not -they do not come within -- up under this law and they don't have
to participate. It only deals with those who are helping
procure or sell electricity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Clayborne, do you wish to close?

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I would just ask for your favorable vote in that this -- if we don't do anything, then we are not protecting the consumers. They will be taken advantage of because we have no way -- they will have no way to measure or check and determine whether this is a legitimate company or not. And I would say, let's vote to protect the consumers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Question is, shall House Bill 1292 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 49 Yeas, 6 voting Nay, none voting Present. And House Bill 1292, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Watson, on House Bill 1514. Senator Link, on House Bill 1685. Senator Link seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1685 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1685. Madam Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Link.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. The amendment becomes the bill. I'll be more than happy to speak on it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, Senator Link seeks approval to adopt Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1685. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 1685. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 1685.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill is the amendment that would create the Agreement Among States to Elect the President by the National Popular Vote Act. This Act is an interstate agreement among members of states to elect the President and Vice President by statewide popular vote. It is -

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

- it is to establish a process by which a presidential slate receives the largest popular vote by national -- shall be instead of a slate of delegates by the Electoral College. It's basically electing people for President and Vice President the same way every individual in this room is elected, by the people directly, not indirectly in other ways. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Senator Link, can you let me know how many other states have taken this action?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

About thirteen states have had this under action right now. One has totally ratified it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

And is there a purpose behind this? My understanding is that there is some type of a compact agreement out there with regard to this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR LINK:

This is the compact agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I -- I guess my -- my caution to the bill -- my caution would be to the Body, that we're taking an action that only one other State has currently ratified with an anticipation of some action. Currently, the process in place has worked well. So, I would caution the Body as they move forward to consider their vote very carefully. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of this bill. And maybe I'm part of a minority of my party that believes that we should make Illinois relevant again with respect to presidential elections. I believe that both parties have ignored this State and our whole of the populace would be much better off if Illinois were put into play for a presidential election. There was just a survey done by the Associated Press out of Washington that said that Illinois was the most average state in America. And I think I take average to be the best and most quintessential state in this country and we ought to have a bigger role in the say with respect to the presidency. This will inform our voters. Both political parties will be able to, I think, see their presidential candidates more often. And just very similarly to the bill we passed for Senator Obama, moving our

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

primary, this bill is good for Illinois voters. It's good for us, regardless of political party. I mean, it's interesting, if you look at the early history of the Electoral College, very few states ever had "winner take all". And you hear a lot of historical arguments. I know there's a lot of trepidation - I felt 'em - about changing a basic tenet of American political life, and that's the Electoral College. But if you go back and look at the history, there really were not states that did "winner take all" back in the early days. I might prefer that we divide our electoral votes by congressional district, but nonetheless I believe this is a good step. And with all due respect to our founding fathers, I don't think they ever dreamed of television, the Internet and all the ways that the presidential campaigns are run today versus how they were run in the 1700s. So, I rise in support of this bill. It's good for Illinois voters. It's good for both political parties. then the bottom line is, what part of, you know, the majority of the people voting in the United States for a candidate shouldn't have their candidate for president elected. So I urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: I, too, rise in support of this legislation. It's ironic that this bill is being presented two hundred and twenty years to the week to the time the delegates got together and created the system. If you think about back then when they created this system, there was a division amongst the Southern states and the Northern states and

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

the system was developed on the basis of apportioning congressional districts and accounting for population by counting slaves, and counting slaves and people of color, like myself, as three-fifth of a person. Now that went into counting the electoral votes, yet the -- those who were counted as three-fifth of a person for the apportionment of the electoral votes could not vote. So, I beg to differ with my colleague, Senator Althoff, on the other side of the aisle that this system has worked. Quite frankly, I don't think it's worked in the past two elections. So, I think it's time for us to change this system and -- and -- and to reflect upon how the system was developed and to divorce ourselves from that part of history and to allow the people of the United States - all of the people of the United States - to elect its leader.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Madam President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I also stand in support of this legislation. We have reached a time and point which I think we can trust every American with the right to their vote. And their vote should be weighed equally, regardless of what state they live in. I hope you'll help support this important piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber. I rise in opposition to this measure. I -- I think -- I -- I agree with the comments of Senator Raoul, and I think as

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

a result of that, as you look at how the function of the Electoral College has changed by practice and by amendment to the Constitution, it is not the same system as it was over two hundred years ago. We do -- each state popularly elects the electors. My concern is just this, that I believe minority representation is stronger in the Electoral College system than it would be in a nationwide election. A small -- a minority of, say, ten or fifteen percent in one state can make a difference and influence the outcome of that election. That ten or twelve percent in one state becomes a smaller and smaller minority nationwide and I fear that -- that people lose representation. I believe that the Electoral College supports minorities, and that's why I oppose this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I wasn't intending on speaking on the bill, but I realize that this is a very important issue that we're about to address. I also rise in opposition to this proposal. I certainly respect the arguments of speakers who have presented their proponent arguments, but the two factors that probably concentrated the power away from the people into the hands of federal government were the passage of the federal income tax and then the popular election of U.S. Senators, where the U.S. Senators used to be, as you know, used to come out of the Chamber of the -- the General Assemblies of the state governments and they owed a -- an allegiance then back to the folks who sent them, and there was a control, a check and balance. We're being asked today to either side with founding

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

fathers -- and I respectfully disagree with a comment that was made earlier that, well, this system hasn't worked. I believe that the system that has created the strongest, freest country in the world has worked and we're being asked either to side with the -- the wisdom of the founding fathers or the wisdom of our current political thinking in this country. And, frankly, I'm casting a No vote in honor and respect for our founding fathers' wisdom over our current wisdom.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

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:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Excuse me, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

It's getting pretty loud in here. Please keep it down so we can hear.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Link, one of the troubling trends that we've seen in election cycles, particularly presidential elections in the last couple of cycles, is this desire to hire a bunch of lawyers - and both

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

parties do it - and we go someplace and we contest the election results. And what we've seen, at least in the last couple cycles, is that those legal contests have been confined to states that can make the difference in terms of the electoral vote. And obviously, the most celebrated one was in Florida in -- in 2000. Are you concerned that if Illinois and the nation went to a popular vote system, then rather than just having isolated pockets where isolated states are subject to litigation, that we're going to have lawyers for both parties suing everywhere because they're just looking to pick up votes anywhere?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Senator Righter. You know, obviously I'm not a lawyer, but I'm a proponent of lawyers, and I know you're a lawyer, so I -- I'm very much a proponent of lawyers. But actually you just made my case for me, because had we had the popular vote in the year 2000, we would have not been in Florida, because there would have been President Gore, who would have won by five hundred thousand votes in a popular vote, and we wouldn't have needed to had a challenge in the State of Florida to worry about the electoral vote. It would have been over with the popular vote. We wouldn't have never had to go through that nonsense. We would have never had to worry about the Supreme Court. We would have never had to worry about any of the court challenges. It would have been over election night. Al Gore would have been sworn in as President in January, and we would have had a lot better society today.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Wow! Madam President, first, I want to thank Senator Link first for complimenting my profession, then helping solidify my No vote on the bill. Actually I think that, with all due respect to Senator Link, he's wrong about the litigation. Right now, we are moving - like it or not - we are moving in a direction where parties are, on an increasing basis, hiring lawyers to contest the election results. And in the Presidential elections, they're doing it in certain states to move the electoral votes. If you go to a popular vote system, one of the risks that you run is, is that we're not going to just have a suit in Florida or another state that can make the difference and tip the balance in the election contest, we're going to have suits everywhere, because we're just trying to move popular vote numbers, and I think that that could lead to chaos. For that reason alone, Madam President, I oppose the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

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

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. We -- we've heard some very interesting comments, but one of the largest comments are we're in -- we're in a lot of different technology than we were in 1776. I don't think we had the Internet then. I don't think we had television then. I don't think we had radio then. I don't think we had a lot of things back then that we would have been

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

able to broadcast a message throughout the United States. the Electoral College was probably needed back then. And a lot of other things were probably needed then. We never needed what Senator Raoul talked about. That never was needed in this country and I'm glad we changed that. But I want to tell you, in the last election, twenty-seven states, twenty-seven states out of fifty were uncontested states one way or the other, Republican or Democrat. So the people of those states didn't even know basically who was running for President in the way other states were known. They didn't have the opportunity of seeing President Bush or John Kerry coming into their state, because twenty-seven states were declared they were going to go one way or the other because of the electoral vote. If we have a popular vote, we will be able to see the message of either presidential candidate and they will be coming to our State. They will understand they need to get the popular vote. will need to get the message to every voter. They will need to have the people like we have to, where we go to every part of our State. And I want to address one message: When we talk about minority participation, in the State of Texas - almost twelve percent African-American, over thirty-two percent Latino - it was a state that was uncontested. Neither presidential candidate went into the State of Texas. Maybe the results would have been different in a popular vote had we done it different. I ask you to ratify this so -- we may only be the second state to do it, but it's a beginning, it's got to start somewhere, and I think Illinois should be on the forefront. I ask for a affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

The question is, shall House Bill 1685 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 37 Yeas, 22 Nays, 0 voting Present. And House Bill 1685, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Forby, for what purpose do you rise?

Personal -- privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR FORBY:

I got a guy here from my hometown. He's the Mayor of Sesser, Illinois. He's a fantastic mayor. He's got a small town. And you go in his town, it looks like a -- a -- sort of a city. The streets are fantastic. He's done a fantastic job. Another thing about this guy, he used to have my seat here. He used to be a State Senator. I want you to welcome Ned Mitchell from Franklin County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

It's so good to have you here, Mr. Mitchell. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Koehler, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR KOEHLER:

Madam President, point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Today we have with us a teacher from Pekin High School. I guess they're out of school now, but he's a wonderful teacher.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Teaches government and civics. His name is John McCabe. He's been teaching for over twenty-three years. I'd like to have you welcome him to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Will our guest rise? Welcome to Springfield. It's good to have you here. Senator Link, on House Bill 1752. Senator Link, on 1876. 1876. Senator Clayborne, on House Bill 1888. Bill 1888. With leave of the Body, we will come back to House Bill 1888. On the top of page 33, we have Senator Link on House Bill 1917. Senator Link. House Bill 1926. Senator Haine. House Bill 1979. Senator Millner. House Bill 2035. Senator Crotty. House Bill 2106. Senator Demuzio. House Bill 2179. Senator Demuzio. Senator Sullivan, on House Bill 3667. Senator Althoff, on House Bill 3728. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will be going to your Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Everybody should have a copy of that on their desk. The first one is Senate Bill 15. Senator Harmon. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 15.

Signed, Senator Don Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any... Oh! Senator Harmon, to explain your motion. SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The underlying bill is the Perinatal Mental Health Disorders Prevention and Treatment Act, commonly known around here as the postpartum depression bill. The amendments in the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

House were the amendments we agreed to here in the Senate to address concerns raised by the Illinois State Medical Society. With the amendment, there is no opposition to the bill. And I ask you to join me in my motion to concur with the House.

Is there any discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 15. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 57 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 15. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Luechtefeld, on Senate Bill 253. Madam Secretary, please read

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

the motion.

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 253.

Signed, Senator David Luechtefeld.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Luechtefeld, to explain your motion.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Madam President. Basically, the amendment to this bill becomes the bill. If you'll remember, I had a bill that we passed unanimously out of here to allow a person to go into the military and -- and be gone maybe a year or two and then come back to a community and run for office, that he would not lose his eligibility because of residency. The House has

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

changed the bill a little bit, but it passed over there unanimously also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

There any discussion? Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Illinois Senate. Just like to add some comments and ask of the -- I have some questions for purposes of legislative intent...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

...for the sponsor of the bill. For the purpose of legislative intent, the Senator originally intended that the returning military service men or women must move back to the same ward or district that they previously lived in order to seek local elected office. But, obviously, the House did not include this language in their amendment. Senator Luechtefeld, is it your intent that this legislation would require the service men or women to return to the same ward or district for residency purposes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

And also, Senator Luechtefeld, would you agree that it is your intention that this requirement is satisfied by the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

requirement in the bill that the service men or women who wishes to run for local office must meet all other qualifications as required by law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 253. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 253. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Haine, on Senate Bill 319. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 319.

Signed, Senator William Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine, to explain your motion.

SENATOR HAINE:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This was a bill which, in the last days before the deadline, as you recall, passed out of here. It had to do with a -- establishing a Uniform Real Property Electronic Recording Act to assist the recorders of deeds and the Secretary of State, whose responsibilities primarily are the recording of important documents. And this was being negotiated when it went over to the House. The negotiations were complete between the banks, the recorders of deeds, the title companies, and they came up with an agreement called House Amendment No. 1, which -establishes a -- a -- within the Office of the Secretary of State, an Electronic Recording Commission, sets up the duties of the commission, the numbers of commissioners. And their duties will be to implement this Act to establish uniform standards throughout the State, with the cooperation of the Secretary of State and the recorders of deeds and the banks and the title companies, all of whom had an interest in accurate and quick electronic recording of -- of documents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 319. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 319. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you rise?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

I have a couple of constituents here with us today I'd like welcomed to Springfield. Kent and Sandy Prather are up in the gallery and their daughter, Allison. Sandy is a teacher. Kent is on the -- a farmer and on the Farm Bureau in Schuyler County. I'd like them to be welcomed. And also -- the other folks left. Like to welcome 'em to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Will our guests please rise? Welcome to Springfield. Senator Forby, on -- 340. Madam Secretary, read the motion. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 340.

Signed, Senator Gary Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Forby, to explain your motion.

SENATOR FORBY:

Amendment No. 1 is the same bill that I ran out of here the other day, 734 that we passed out of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 becomes the bill. I'll explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Forby, continue on your motion. It is on final... SENATOR FORBY:

And what it does, it just allows the Director of Department of Aging -- appoint additional members to the Community Care

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Program Council. AAR -- this is an AARP bill. It came out of the House with no opposition. I know of no opposition on this. It came out of committee with no -- no issues.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 340. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 340. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Peterson, on Senate Bill 345. Madam Secretary, read the motion. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 345.

Signed, Senator William Peterson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Peterson, to explain your motion.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Madam President. The original bill had to do with a substantial amount of language for a county sales tax referendum proposal on the ballot. The House amendment was very technical in nature. It just changed three sentences, three words, from "may" to "shall". Ask for your support of Senate Bill 345.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action, and the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 345. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 345. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Martinez, on Senate Bill 446. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 446.

Signed, Senator Iris Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Martinez, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Thank you. The bill -- the bill -- all we do is to clarify the -- the program budget shall include the cost of child care and other direct {sic} expenses, such as transportation, tutoring, technology, and technology report {sic} (support). They wanted us just to explain in detail what the indirect expense meant, and this is what the amendment is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I wish to concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 446. All those

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 446. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. WMBD NewsChannel 31 seeks leave to record the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 486. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 486.

Signed, Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill, as it passed out of the Senate, amended the Code of Civil Procedure and it dealt with what's called a cy pres doctrine in common law which deals with residual funds remaining from a class action lawsuit and it -- and it -- it dealt with the distribution of those class action funds. What the amendment does, which I agree with, over in the House is to retain the bill but provide that the new Section concerning residual funds applies to all actions pending on the effective date of the Act where there's been no court order that has -- has been entered preliminarily approving a proposed settlement for a class of plaintiffs, instead of the current language which applies to all

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

actions pending on the effective date. Has no opposition, and I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 486. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 486. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 532. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 532.

Signed, Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton, to explain your motion.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I want to make sure everybody understands, with this concurrence, that I'm not trying to sneak anything through. I want to make sure people know what they're voting for here. I don't want people to -- to say that I muttered this and they didn't know what this -- this did. The -- in the House, they amended my bill, 532, which, by the way, was an initiative of the Motion Picture Association of America and the Recording Industry Association of America, and it clarified the definition of manufacturer and

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

clarified the scope of the offense of unlawful use of unidentified recordings. But the House did amend the bill. Senator -- former Senator Molaro passed an amendment that said on page 3, line 16, we want to replace the word "a" with "the". And that's what they did and I concur. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 532. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 532. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Delgado, on Senate Bill 547. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 549 $\{ sic \}$.

Signed, Senator William Delgado.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Delgado, to explain your motion.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. I do ask your concurrence on Amendment No. 1. Deletes the bill and it retains 547 passed by the Senate. Makes minor substantive and technical changes. Creates the Health Data Task Force. Describes the composition of the task force. Requires the task

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

force to be convened to create a system for public access to integrated health data. It also mandates the task force to be advised -- plan with a phased in and prioritized implementation timetable focusing on assuring access to the quality of data necessary to understand health disparities. The initial report is due by -- July 1 of '08, and progress reports of July 1 of subsequent years through 211 {sic} (2011). And finally, the amendment adds an immediate effective date. And I would ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Before we go into discussion, Madam Secretary, for the record, could you please reread the motion?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Yes. Pardon me, Mr. -- Madam President. It was on Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 547, not 549.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 547. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 547. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. FOX TV requests leave to videotape the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Koehler, on Senate Bill 595. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 595.

Signed, Senator Dave Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Koehler, to explain your motion.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 595 removes the detailed language from the bill and substitutes a new Section which simply calls for the Department of Aging to establish a -- medication management program to assist persons age sixty or older in managing their medications. The detail of the program are left to administrative rule. This was brought to us by AARP and they agreed to those changes. I would ask for your approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Senator, my understanding is the original bill was subject to appropriation. Is this still subject to appropriation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you for that question. Yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? This is final action, and

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 595. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 595. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Viverito, on Senate Bill 599. Madam Secretary, read the motion. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 599.

Signed, Senator Louis Viverito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Viverito, to explain your motion.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. House Amendment No. 1 in the House specified that these fees in total do not exceed the equalized assessed valuation in the areas outside of Cook County multiplied by the district's annual stormwater tax rate. The Southwest {sic} (South) Suburban Mayors and Managers Association, which represents the largest area of Cook County impacted by the bill, is a proponent of this legislation. And there was no opposition to my knowledge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

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

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. Senator Viverito, this is still an increase, however, is it not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

No. This is not. This is only the work that is being performed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I -- I would just like to take a moment. And actually we had raised a concern in committee with regard to capping some of the expenditures. That was taken care of over in the House. I'm extremely appreciative of your follow-through and ensuring that our concerns were met. But I would disagree with you; I still think this is a fee increase. But I intend to vote Yes. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Viverito, to close.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

...you very much for those comments, Senator. And I do appreciate what you've asked. But actually this is really not a tax at all. This is something that is needed outside of Cook County. So I would appreciate a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 599. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Yeas, 3 voting Nay, none voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 599. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Demuzio, on Senate Bill 641. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 641.

Signed, Senator Deanna Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Demuzio, to explain your motion.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Madam Chairman and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 641 with House Amendment No. 1, actually the amendment -- deletes all and becomes the bill. The bill, as amended by -- by House Amendment 1, would require children entering kindergarten or enrolling in school for the first time to show proof by October the 15th of the school year for having an eye examination.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

There any discussion? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 641. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senate Bill 641. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Bond, on Senate Bill 680. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 680.

Signed, Senator Michael Bond.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Bond, to explain your motion.

SENATOR BOND:

Thank you, Madam President. This is the concurrence of the net metering bill. This is identical to the House version that we passed. This is an agreed-upon bill. The -- this bill puts Illinois at the forefront of great access to alternative energy. I'd ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 680. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Yeas, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 680. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Munoz, on Senate Bill 841. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 841.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Signed, Senator Antonio Munoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Munoz, to explain your motion.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

Thank you, Madam President. House Amendment 1 basically does two things. Limits the scope of the program by tying it to the College and Career Success for All Students program. It makes the fee waiver subject to appropriation. The College and Career Success for All Students program aims to increase the number of low-income students benefiting from AP courses. The program sets out to train AP and Pre-AP teachers on the content, knowledge and instructional skills geared towards preparing students for postsecondary coursework and AP exams.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator, while I think the -- the goal that you have is -- is laudable and I think you're headed in the right direction, I -- I do have a concern. I have just a couple of questions to ask you. I don't think they've changed since the bill was originally here in the Senate. But it's my understanding that any student - any student - regardless of income, in a school district that has at least forty percent of free or reduced-price lunch children in it can qualify for a fee waiver on their AP exams. Is that correct?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Munoz.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

Yes. That's correct, Senator. We're trying to tie it in for them to be able to take the test for the AP.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Well, I'd just like to point out to the Body that students in other schools have to pay for those exams. Sometimes they can be quite expensive. I don't necessarily have a problem with us helping assist with the cost for those students who need some assistance because of income thresholds or levels. I certainly don't have a problem with that, but I do have a problem when we waive the fee for every student in a school that only has forty percent of its students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunches. The rest of us, the students in our schools, are going to be paying for those exams, and I would encourage a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? Senator -- Senator Luechtefeld. SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, just a question. Why wouldn't you have basically made this bill that anyone who qualifies with low income would get -- would -- would not have to pay that fee? Why would you

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

allow or actually make students, who really might have a lot of money, also - because they happen to go to a school that has forty percent low income - that they -- they then do not have to pay? It just doesn't seem fair to other schools.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Munoz.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

Senator, some kids already get a waiver from other sources. And again, we're just trying to tie it in for them to prepare them for the AP exam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Again, Senator, I'm not real sure you answered that question. I -- I understand what you're trying to do for low-income students. Why wouldn't you just have put that in the bill, that those who are in low income would then not have to pay that fee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Munoz.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

Again, the -- the only way I can answer you, Senator, I mean, we're just trying to do this preparation for them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Any further discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 841. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

that question, there are 40 voting Yea, 18 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 841. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Bond, on Senate Bill 1097. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1097.

Signed, Senator Michael Bond.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Bond.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

SENATOR BOND:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill, it adds -- the amendment adds some clarity to expectations of the advanced science zone study. This is the precursor to the creation of advanced science zones. The zones would be the structure we would use to create clusters of biotechnology or aerospace research centers around the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1097. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1097. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Demuzio, on Senate Bill 1165. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1165.

Signed, Senator Deanna Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Demuzio, to explain your motion.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 1165 with House Amendment No. 1 would only repeal the required additional reporting from the regional superintendent's office and retain the existing reporting requirements by the school board. Current law requires each regional superintendent to report to the State Board the number and ages of dropouts, as well as any efforts or activities and program undertaken, established, or --implemented. What this would do, House Amendment 1, would remove those -- provisions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1165. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1165. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Collins, on Senate Bill 1169. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1169.

Signed, Senator Jacqueline Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Collins, to explain your motion.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 1169 went from this Chamber to the House known as the Sudan Divestment Act. In the House -- we have House Amendment No. 1 and it does basically three things. First of all, it excludes all our local downstate fire and police pension funds, as well as those with assets over five million dollars. So that would be all the downstate public employees are excluded from this legislation. There's also a stipulation where we specifically define or put into the language of the legislation that mutual funds are exempt. That was a question on the Floor. We read in the intent of the original legislation, but in the House, it's explicitly outlined that mutual funds are And the third thing that it does, it requires that Illinois finance entities must certify to meet the requirements of the High Risk Home Loan Act. And this was -- the High Risk Loan Act {sic} was unanimously supported by the Senate when it passed in 2003. So, basically, those are the changes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Madam -- Madam President, thank you. Just to bolster what Senator Collins had just made comment on, because I know this bill, or at least this subject matter, has been around for discussions from previous years and has been with us again this

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

During the debate on the original bill, Senator Collins and I had an exchange of discussion as to whether it included mutual funds or not. We had made it very clear on the Floor that our interpretation was that it did not. What has happened over in the Illinois House now is they put in specific language to eliminate a question of that regard. A second point was with regards to the size of the funds. We had actually had discussion on the Floor here to verify that it was for funds with assets of over five million dollars. The amendment in the House is taking that threshold completely out. It does not include them whatsoever. And, Senator Collins, please correct me if anything I'm saying here is not accurate, but I think you and I have gone through this enough. But the last point that I think is of note here, and particularly for those that had some concern on it the last time, was that by doing this now, it basically limits this to -- to the State funds unto themselves. What this does do, though, that's in addition to what we had talked about previously is that it does take -- that all institutions that take State deposits must comply with the requirements of the High Risk Home Loan Act. With that being said, for further clarity here, I stand in support of Senator Collins' concurrence motion to the original bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1169. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Yeas, none voting Nay,

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

none voting Present. And the Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1169. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 233, offered by Senator Dillard and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Resolutions -- Consent Calendar. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will soon be recessing to the call of the Chair, but let me tell you, do not go far, because it won't be long. So at this point, we are in recess till the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Messages, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

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

Senate Bill 13, together with the following amendments which are attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 13 and House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 13.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 194, with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3; Senate Bill 336, with House -- House Amendments 1 and 3; Senate Bill 1261, with House Amendment 2; and Senate Bill 1453, with House Amendment 1.

All passed the House, as amended, May 30th $\{sic\}$ (31st), 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

I have another Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, Clerk.

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

Senate Bill 545, together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 545.

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 684, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1327, with House Amendment 1; and Senate Bill 1481, with House Amendment 1.

All passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Madam Secretary, Resolutions, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 234, offered by Senator Emil Jones and all Members.

And Senate Resolution 235, offered by Senator Wilhelmi and all Members.

They're both death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 232, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Madam Secretary, Messages from the House, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

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

Senate Bill 1566, together with the following amendments which are attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1566 and House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1566.

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 531, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 607, with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3; Senate Bill 1579, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1617, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1619, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1621, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 1625, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1627, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1653, with House Amendment 1; and Senate Bill 1664, with House Amendments 1 and 2.

All passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's the intention of the Chair -- we will be going to page 30 of your Calendar. We'll be going through House Bills 3rd Reading one more time. House Bills 3rd Reading. I'd ask you to turn your Calendars to page 30, in the middle of page 30. Senator Viverito, on House Bill 25, sir. Madam Secretary, out of the record. Senator Demuzio, on House Bill 29, ma'am. Out of the record. Senator Holmes, on House Bill 38, ma'am. Out of the record. Senator Sullivan. Senator John Sullivan. House Bill 118, sir. Out of the record. Senator Don Harmon. Senator Harmon. The gentleman from Oak Park, sir. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd ask you to turn your Calendars to page 31. Page 31. On the top of page 31 of the Calendar is House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Althoff. Senator Pam Althoff, how are you today, ma'am? Nice to see you. Out of the record? Out of the record. Senator Terry Link. Leader Link. Senator Link, on House Bill 374. Out of the record. Senator Cullerton, are you seeking recognition, sir? Nice to see you this afternoon, Senator. Senator Demuzio, on House Bill 415, ma'am. Out of the record. Senator Delgado. Senator Willie Delgado, on House Bill 427. 427, sir. Out of the record. Senator Koehler, on 699, sir. Senator Koehler, on 699. Senator Koehler. 699. House Bill 699, sir. Out of the record. Madam Secretary, let's try House Bill 703. Senator Harmon. Senator Harmon, on House Bill -- out of the record. Senator Link, on -- out of the -- 743, out of the record. House Bill 824. Senator Don Harmon. Out of the record. Senator John Cullerton. Senator John Cullerton, on House Bill 830, sir. Would you be interested in calling that today, sir? Oh, you're going to amend it. So, you'd like to --

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

take this out of the record, sir, and we'll come back to it. Are you sure? Thank you. Thank you for your indulgence. No, thank you, sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd ask you to turn your Calendars to page 32 of your Calendar. Page 32 of your Calendar is House Bill 1050. Senator John Cullerton. Out of the record, Madam Secretary. Leader Halvorson, on House Bill 1074, ma'am. Those are some beautiful flowers you have there, Leader. They're very, very pretty. Senator Munoz. Senator Winoz. Senator Munoz. Senator Munoz.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm fine, Mr. President. How are you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Very good. Thank you.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Please state your inquiry.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

A number of the Members on this side of the aisle, Mr. President, are curious as to whether or not there's any truth to the rumors that the flowers that are sitting on the Majority Leader's desk were sent to her by someone congratulating for --her to making sure the Illinois Senate adjourned by its May 31st deadline. Can you confirm whether or not those rumors are true? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The card says, "Please come home", from her husband.

Leader Halvorson, are -- Leader Halvorson, are you seeking

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

recognition, ma'am?

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. As to the rumor that Senator Righter talks about with getting out of here today, that is just what that sounds like, is a rumor. My flowers aren't about that. It's just a little thank you from a secret admirer. I have one fan. So... But as far as getting out here on time, good luck.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Collins, are you seeking recognition, ma'am? For what purpose are you seeking recognition, Senator Collins?

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Please state your point, ma'am.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you. Someone mentioned to me earlier today that one of our colleagues will be celebrating her birthday this Saturday. And I hope we don't have to join with her on the Floor in celebrating her birthday, but I would like to recognize her here. I'm being cautiously optimistic that we won't be here Saturday. So I would like my colleagues to join with me in wishing Senator Mattie Hunter a happy birthday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hunter, a very happy birthday. Senator Hunter, would you please stand and be recognized by the Illinois Senate? Ladies and Gentlemen, Senator Hunter. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing on House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

1084. Senator Carol Ronen. 1284. I'm sorry. Let the record show 1284. Senator Carol Ronen. Out of the record. Senate -- House Bill 3rd Reading. 1514. Leader Watson. Leader Watson, on 1514. Out of the record. Senator Link. Senator Terry Link, on 1752, sir. Out of the record. Senator Link, on 1876. Senator Link, on 1876. Out of the record. On the bottom of page 32, in House Bills 3rd Reading, Ladies and Gentlemen, is House Bill 1888. Senator James Clayborne. Senator James Clayborne. Out of the record. Oh! I'm sorry. Do you wish to proceed, Senator Clayborne? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 1888.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne, to the bill, sir.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The proposed legislation will correct the situation that has deprived QSWEFs of the interest-free loan that they're entitled to under Section 8-403.1 of the Public Utilities Act. Under that Section of the law, the QSWEFs are entitled to a loan payment each month equal to amount by which the average rate per kilowatt paid to the utility by the unit of government where the QSWEF is located exceeds the purchasing utilities avoided cost. The loan has allowed Illinois to benefit from the development of renewable electric generation fueled by landfill gas. I would ask for your favorable support.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Risinger, for what purpose you rise, sir? SENATOR RISINGER:

To the bill, Mr. President. The...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, sir.

SENATOR RISINGER:

In committee, there weren't any opponents to this bill and it passed out unanimously.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...you. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 1888 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 1888, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn your Calendars to page 33. On the top of page 33 is House Bills 3rd Reading. Continuing on House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 1917. Senator Link. Senator Terry Link, on 1917. Out of the record. House Bill 1926. Senator Haine. Senator Haine. Senator "Class Action" 1926, sir. Out of the record. Senator Millner. Senator John Millner, on 1979, sir. Good afternoon, Senator Millner. Out of the record, sir? Thank you. Senator Crotty, on 2035, ma'am. House Bill 2035. Out of the record. Demuzio. Senator Demuzio, on 2106, ma'am. Out of the record. Senator Demuzio, on 2179, ma'am. Out of the record. Senator

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Sullivan. Senator John Sullivan, on 3667. House Bill 3667. Out of the record. Senator Althoff, on 3728, ma'am. House Bill 3728. Are you sure? You're positive? You look very nice today, Senator Althoff. Nice to see you. Pinstripes. Senator Demuzio. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you seek recognition, ma'am?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Please state your point, ma'am.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. In the gallery behind you, I would like to recognize that we have with us the central division of the AFSCME employees. And would you please stand up and be recognized? And let's give 'em a big hand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Would our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized? Welcome to the Illinois State Senate. Welcome to Springfield, Illinois. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask your attention, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd ask you to turn to page 38 of your Calendar. On page 38 of your Calendar is the Order of Consideration Postponed, is House Bill 3425. The bill has already been presented and been debated on the Floor. Debate on this bill will be limited to one proponent and one

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

opponent. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. House Bill 3425, ma'am.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 3425.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Garrett, to the bill, ma'am.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. President. This bill we discussed a couple weeks ago and it really allows the municipalities in the State who have high deer populations to work with the Department of Natural Resources to control the deer. It's a specified program administered by the University of Wisconsin. The proponents of the bill are the Illinois Municipal League and the Northwest Municipal Conference. was opposed to it. I met with DNR. I tried to get their support. They, you know, in all fairness, aren't willing to do that. But as we've talked about this so many times, there really is a difference between what happens in southern Illinois and how southern Illinoisans are able to cull their deer through shooting and hunting. In northern Illinois, we don't have those same luxuries. One of the questions that DNR did have is they said that they were really losing control of the process. And I just want to specify, just read from the actual legislation, that that really is not the case, because in the bottom line of the -- of the legislation it says, "The municipality or unit of local government must report to the Department, on an annual basis, the local deer population count, as required by

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

administrative rule." It talks about a scientific study to be approved by the Department and then it -- it also talks about the Department and municipality working together to implement this alternative method of deer population control. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Sieben, you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Yes. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, sir.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Yes, as I understood your instruction, Mr. President, since this is a -- since this bill is on Postponed Consideration, there'll be one proponent, which is the sponsor, and one opponent. I rise to speak as the opponent on this legislation. We had good discussion of this legislation a couple weeks ago when Senator Garrett presented it, and she did a good explanation of the -- the problem that they're having in a community in her district with overpopulation of deer. I spoke in opposition to this legislation, as did Senator Sullivan, when we described the opposition of the Department of Resources and -- and why they oppose this legislation. Historically in the State, the management of wildlife throughout our State has always been under the jurisdiction and the management of the Department of Natural Resources. And the sponsor is well-intentioned and she has a problem locally with the high population of deer that are causing some damage in

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

residential areas and of deer you may see walking down the streets or eating flowers and shrubs in people's backyards. there's no question that there needs to be some management techniques or a control process applied here. The question is, should we go to Wisconsin and implement some kind of a model program that they suggest might help in this situation. - their program involves some type of -- of putting the deer down, capturing them, putting 'em under a net, shooting 'em with a tranquilizer or doing something to -- to stun the deer, essentially, and then -- performing a surgical procedure to either spay or neuter the deer, and hoping that that -- that process will then result in a reduced population and breeding of the deer herd. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources does not believe that that method is effective and they do not support this legislation for that reason. So I think we're going down the wrong road here with the legislation. Senator is well-intentioned. I think the appropriate method here is to work with the Department of Natural Resources and increase the opportunity for deer permits, deer tags, harvesting by bow and arrow or shotgun, whatever is -- is done in -- in -or allowed in that area, to reduce the population through -through biological and hunting management. For those reasons, I would urge people to continue to vote No. And I would encourage the sponsor to continue her efforts to work with the Department of Natural Resources to develop a program that -- that they have found through their experience of managing wildlife in Illinois that will be effective in -- this is not the way to do it. And I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Okay. Senator Garrett, to close, ma'am. SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you to Senator I think what we have really here is, you know, a population divide. We, in the northern part of -- of the State, appreciate and respect what southern Illinoisans do to hunt deer and cull deer. We just don't have the same abilities and resources in the northern part of the State. This isn't just one community. This is a program that -- that one community is working with, and it's the University of Wisconsin at Madison. We certainly intend to and it's written very specifically in the legislation to work closely with the Department of Natural Resources. What we're asking for is a pilot program. There is a sunset on this. It is supported and endorsed by the Illinois Municipal League, which covers the entire State. So, I ask for your consideration to give us a Yes vote on this. It's a very important bill for some of the areas in the northern part of the State. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 3425 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 23 Nays, 1 voting Present. House Bill 3425, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Yes. We'd like to verify the roll call on that last bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, the gentleman has request a verification. We'd ask all Members please be in their seats. The Secretary will read the -- those voting in the affirmative. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Althoff, Bond, Clayborne, Collins, Cronin, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, Delgado, Garrett, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Holmes, Hunter, Kotowski, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Munoz, Murphy, Noland, Peterson, Radogno, Raoul, Ronen, Schoenberg, Silverstein, Trotter, Viverito and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much, Madam Secretary. Senator, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative, sir?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yes. Thank you. What about Senator Hendon? Do I see him on the Floor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon. Senator Rickey Hendon is in the Chamber. Senator Hendon's sitting in Senator DeLeo's seat.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Where is he, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

He's very difficult to miss, sir.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

It's -- it's difficult in the sun to see the shade of blue on that jacket. But I -- I do believe that might be Senator

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Hendon. Okay. But I'm not sure. I'd like to see his face still. All right. There you go. Great. That -- that -- that's even worse. Senator Hunter. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator -- Mattie Hunter is right in the aisle here, sir.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. I see her. Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Terry Link.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is back in the corner of the Chamber, near the press box where he's normally at.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Senator, I $\operatorname{--}$ I must applaud you. I believe I $\operatorname{--}$ I see almost everybody here, if not everyone here. So, thank you very much for your patience.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Ladies and Gentlemen, on a verified roll call, there are 33 Ayes, 23 Nays, 1 Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, it's declared passed. Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, for the purposes of an announcement. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the President's Anteroom. All members of the Rules Committee will report to the Anteroom immediately for a Rules Committee meeting. Thank you. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senator Halvorson, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Executive Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 824; refer to Human Services Committee - a Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1245 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1368; refer Insurance Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. and 2 to Senate Bill 935; refer to Judiciary-Civil Law Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 472 and Floor Amendment No. 7 to House Bill 830; refer to Judiciary-Criminal Law Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 705, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1346, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1348, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1379, Floor -- and Floor Amendment 2 and 3 to House Bill 1979; refer to Local Government Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1201, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1244, Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1752 and Floor Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1876; refer to Pensions and Investments Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 65, and a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1380; refer to Public Health Committee - a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1350; refer to Revenue Committee - a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1360; and Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 25.

Senator Debbie Halvorson, Chairman. May 31st, 2007.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much, Madam Secretary. Senator John Cullerton. Senator -- Senator John Cullerton, do you have an announcement to make, sir?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

A personal announcement or committee announcement? SENATOR CULLERTON:

Both. I'd like to introduce my Secretary, who is on maternity leave, Ms. Underwood, who's returned with her little baby, Kaiya, who -- who is so pretty. Isn't she?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Welcome. Please register baby as a Democrat. Senator Cullerton, for a committee announcement.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. The Judiciary-Civil Law Committee will meet at 6:15 in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...you, sir. Senator Garrett, what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR GARRETT:

For purpose of announcing the fact that Public Health will be meeting today in Room 400 -- or tonight, I should say, at 6:15. Dinner time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Crotty, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR CROTTY:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Also on a point of an announcement. At 6:15 in Room 409, Local Government will be meeting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much. Senator Wilhelmi.

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purpose of announcement. I'd like to let the Body know that the Judiciary-Criminal Law Committee will be meeting tonight at 6:30 in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm so happy to announce that the Committee on Pensions and Investment will be meeting at 6:45 in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Meeks. Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

Thank you, sir. For purpose of an announcement. The Human Services Committee will meet tonight at 7 o'clock in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, sir. Senator Silverstein. Senator Silverstein. Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Yes. Committee...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

How are you, Senator?

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

A little tired. Committee announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Please state your announcement, sir.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

7:15, Executive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Who -- who's going to meet at 7:15?

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Executive Committee at 7:15.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Room 212, sir?

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Senate Revenue Committee will meet tonight at 7:15 p.m. in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

How are you feeling today, sir?

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I feel great. Senate Bill 4 went to the Governor's desk today. The Appropriations II Committee will meet in Room 212 at 7:30, Mr. President. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, and I'm glad you're feeling well. Senator Haine, how are you today, sir?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR HAINE:

I'm just peachy, Mr. President. And I appreciate you asking.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Do you have an announcement, sir? Do you have an announcement, sir?

SENATOR HAINE:

Yes, sir. The Insurance Committee will meet at 7:30 p.m. in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much. Senator Jacobs, are you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes, Mr. President. Just a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Please state your point, sir.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I'd like to ensure that everyone understands that the Titanic had a terrible mishap and there were several people in the engine room who reported that the Titanic was in trouble, but it still hit the iceberg. So I want to make sure that the Leadership understands that the Titanic is ahead and everybody have a great day.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. With that very profound announcement, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. We will be coming back to the Floor after committees for further Floor action and final action. The Senate stands in recess to call of the Chair.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Messages from the House, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

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

Senate Bill 153, together with the following amendment which is attached, in adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 153.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 234, with House Amendment 1, and Senate Bill 678, with House Amendments 4 and 5.

All passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Madam Secretary, Resolutions, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 236, offered by Senator Forby and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, Committee

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Reports, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Garrett, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Health, reports a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1350 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Crotty, Chairperson of the Committee on Local Government, reports Senate Amendment 3 to -- Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1752 and Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1876, along with Motions to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1201 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1244 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Cullerton, Chairperson, and Senator Dillard, Co-Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary-Civil Law, reports Senate Amendment No. 7 to House Bill 830 and a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 472 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Wilhelmi, Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary-Criminal Law, reports Senate Amendments No. 2 and 3 to House Bill 1979, along with Motions to Concur House -- in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill -- 705, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1346, House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1348 {sic} and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1379 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Raoul, Chairperson of the Committee on Pensions and Investments, reports a Motion -- Motions to Concur on House Amendments No. -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 65 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1380 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Meeks, Chairperson of the Committee on Human Services, reports Motions to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senate Bill 1245 and House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1368 recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports a Motion to Concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1360 recommend Do Adopt.

And Senator Haine, Chairperson of the Committee on Insurance, reports a Motion to Concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 935.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. For the purposes of an announcement, ask all Members, please report to the Senate Floor immediately. We will be going to the Senate Calendar, Supplemental Calendar No. 2. It's been printed and distributed. It's on all Members' desks. This is final passage. This is concurrence of Senate Bills, final passage. So, all Members within the sound of my voice, please come to the Senate Floor immediately for concurrences, final passage. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd ask you to look at the Calendars that's been distributed on each Member's desk, Supplemental Calendar No. 2, in the Order of Concurrence. Senator Silverstein, on Senate Bill 65. Senate Bill 65. Senator Silverstein. Senator Ira Silverstein, do you wish to proceed with that? Out of the record. Leave of the Body, we'll come back to it. Motion to Concur, Senate Bill... On a Motion to Concur is Senate Bill 472. Senator Cullerton, do you wish to proceed, sir? Senator Cullerton, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 472.

Signed, Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Cullerton, explain your motion, sir. SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a bill which is supported by the Bar Associations, the Trial Lawyers, the Medical Society and the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. It's an amendment that the House put on amending the Code of Civil Procedure to clarify the handling of medical records for copy purposes and to --It expands the establish a fee structure for electronic copies. exceptions to the physician-patient privilege against disclosure of information to which information sought by subpoenas for a professional regulation case under the Medical Practice Act can be sought. So this if very important for the Director of Public -- Regulation so that he can get medical records to investigate It also clarifies that electronic and digital records are not to be considered microfiche or microfilm. indicated in committee, there is a fee structure for the copying of records and there will be a change to one of those structure -- fee structures with a trailer bill, which is House Bill 830. The Hospital Association is not in favor of this bill yet, although they were neutral when the bill passed. There are some hospitals that are neutral. I'd ask for an Aye vote. And happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

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

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Gentleman indicates he'll yield for a question, sir. SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator -- Senator Cullerton, when someone came to my office to speak to me about this bill, they also referenced a potential trailer bill. Can you explain what that bill is and what it would do, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, Senator. Thank you. When the bill came over, there was one provision that I did not agree with and that's going to be changed by the trailer bill. It had to do with electronic and digital records and the House version of the bill would only allow, for on electronic disk, for you to charge as -- as if it was only one page. And I thought that was unfair, because it could have thousands of pages on one disk. So the trailer bill switches this provision that's found in 472, it switches it so that it's back to a per page charge. So, the trailer bill is a very good bill. It's one that the -- would improve the bill that -- that flew out of the House. I slowed it down and took the time to make sure I could amend it with that trailer bill and that's -- that's what it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you, Mr. President. So, Senator, it's fair to say that the trailer bill is an effort to make the bill more palatable for the people who are going to be making copies of the records and the electronic records. Is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DELEO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, that's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Dillard. SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of Senate Bill It's a unique day when you have both the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association and the State Medical Society as proponents on the same bill. And as it's been alluded to, there are questions by the Illinois Hospital Association here, but I think Senator Cullerton will take care of their concerns over the next six months or so with the trailer bill. But very importantly, and I did not hear if Senator Cullerton said it in his opening remarks, there is a provision in here that the Department of Professional Regulation needs in a very bad way and it's not contained in this amendment. But the underlying bill is -- is very important for their attempt to weed out bad physicians in this State. So, we need the underlying bill in the worst way and I do trust very much Senator Cullerton to mitigate, if not remove, all opposition some time in the next few months of the Illinois Hospital Association. We need this bill and I rise in support of Senator Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you, Senator. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Cullerton, to close, sir.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Just ask for an Aye vote, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 472. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, 3 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 472, having received -- concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 472. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will return to the top of this page on the Supplemental Calendar No. 2 to Senate Bill 65. Senator Silverstein, on Senate Bill -- your motion to concur, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 65.

Signed, Senator Ira Silverstein.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Silverstein, to the motion, sir. SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. What -- what it does is it kept the whole bill, but it added portability regarding to the board

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

within thirty days. I'll -- I'll take any questions. A little complicated, but I'll take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is - this is final action - shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 65. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 65 -- House -- excuse me. Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 65, the Senate concurs. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 705. Senator Wilhelmi. Do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 705.

Signed, Senator A.J. Wilhelmi.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator, to explain your motion, sir. SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Amendment No. 2 becomes the bill. It amends the Illinois Controlled Substances Act to create the new offense of unauthorized possession of prescription form. It puts this under the Controlled Substance Act where it belongs, this

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

offense. And it -- the -- the amendment also makes it a knowing -- you have to knowingly violate the provisions in order to be in violation of the Act. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, once again, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 705. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 705. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 935. Senator Link, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 935.

Signed, Senator Terry Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link, to the motion, sir.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the agreed-upon bill on the amino acid element formulas. It's been worked out. Everybody's in agreement with it and I know of no opposition on

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 935. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 935. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on the Supplemental Calendar is Senate Bill 1201 on the Order of Concurrence. Senator Halvorson, do you wish to proceed? Leader Halvorson. She indicates she does. Madam Secretary, please read the lady's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1201.

Signed, Senator Debbie Halvorson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson, to explain your motion, ma'am.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. In 2005, we merged NIPC and CATS and this is just the agreed-upon language to finalize some of the merging procedures of putting the two agencies together. There's a number of things; if -- if the Body so chooses, I can explain some them. I'm open to any

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Senator Halvorson, to close, ma'am. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 1201. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, 5 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate 1201. The bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1244. Senator Sullivan, do you wish He indicates he wishes to proceed. to proceed? Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1244.

Signed, Senator John Sullivan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Sullivan, to the -- explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1244, with the amendment, amends the Township Code, the Municipal Code and the Fire Protection District Act. It, of course, retains the original bill and adds the provisions that allows for townships

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

and municipalities and fire protection districts to assess reasonable fees for specialized rescue services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, ma'am.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. Senator, there was some discussion in committee with regard to this legislation, which passed out unanimously, and I think is -- is a good bill. However, for clarification, if I'm sitting in my house and I dial 9-1-1 and I'm a resident of the community, can I be charged a fee for them to respond to me? The fire department.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

No. I do not. As a matter of fact, I'm glad you asked that, because for the purpose of legislative intent, I'd like to read this statement and it might clarify your questions, and that is that no fees will be charged for any other rescues that do not involve the OSHA and Department of Labor violations. The primary purpose of this legislation is intended to apply to construction in commercial instances where OSHA and the Department of -- Labor standards are to be known and should be a part of the safe business practices.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Further discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

So, my understanding -- understanding, Senator, this is actually an opportunity for the taxpayers to save money, because we actually are going to initiate a fee so that the taxpayer doesn't underwrite the costs of these emergency situations. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Further -- Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Sullivan, what's the -- can you give me an idea, what's the difference between a specialized rescue as opposed to a normal rescue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Specialized rescue services includes, but is not limited to, structural collapse, tactical rescue, high angle rescue, underwater rescue and recovery, confined space rescue, below grade rescue, and trench rescues.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Who -- who would pay the fee under the bill? I mean, there are going to be some -- there are some who would make the argument, Senator Sullivan, that that's why we pay taxes, is to have these emergency services available to us, and if I have a two-story home and I need to be rescued off of the second story of my house, which I guess could be a high angle rescue, then that's -- that's why I pay, you know, my taxes and that's why we have a fire department in my town.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you. I think, again, that would -- in my opinion, that would not be considered to be a specialized rescue. It'd be under unusual circumstances, obviously, the ones that I outlined to you. But if we're dealing with our home, for example, around, you know, where we normally would live and reside, obviously I do not believe that that would be considered to be a specialized rescue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, seeing no further discussion, Senator Sullivan, to close, sir.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Just ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1244. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1244. The bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on -- on the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1245. Senator Link, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, would you read the gentleman's motion?

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1245.

Signed, Senator Terry Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Link, to explain your motion, sir. SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This basically just changes it that there -- the DHS shall conduct regular, on-going site inspections that shall occur at least annually and the provision including unannounced visits is removed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you.

SENATOR LINK:

I know of no...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Link. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1245. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1245. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1346. Senator Clayborne, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1346.

Signed, Senator James Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Clayborne, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you. I make a motion to concur with the House Amendment No. 1 that provides that the county coroner shall provide to the State Police or to the local law enforcement a sample of dried blood and buccal specimen from a dead body for - to be used for DNA fingerprint analysis. This is when the State Police or the local law enforcement agency has determined that the sample may be useful in a criminal investigation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1346. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who -- wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 1346, the House -- the Senate will concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1346. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will go to page 2 of Supplemental Calendar No. 2. On Concurrence, Senate Bills comes -- on the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1350. Senator Ronen. Does the lady wish to proceed? She indicates she does. Madam Secretary, please read the lady's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption their -- of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1350.

Signed, Senator Carol Ronen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Ronen, to explain your motion, ma'am.

SENATOR RONEN:

Yes, I will. Thank you, Mr. President. The minor change made by the House to this bill: it exempts providers that receive federal funding under Section 5307, because those providers already have training for safety as part of their federal mandate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield for a question, ma'am.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Senator, when this passed out of here, I believe it got twenty No votes and some of the concerns that were expressed at that time were that there was no problem identified. We had no data to indicate that there was a problem with these medi-cars. And then the second issue that was identified was that there is only one company that provides this service. So that by mandating it, we're sort of setting up a customer base for this company, and is that an appropriate thing to do? So I'm wondering if the amendment that was put on in the House addresses those concerns at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Well, you know that they don't. And when this bill came up in committee, the -- I don't think that those were raised when we put the amendment on. You say those were concerns. I'm -- I'm -- I'm not sure. I thought that they were addressed. I saw a letter sent to you that addressed these concerns when the bill passed the Senate and before it went to the -- the House. So, I don't know why you're raising this now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Further discussion? Senator Radogno. SENATOR RADOGNO:

Well, those concerns were raised when we had the Floor debate on this bill before. They were raised in committee. They were raised then. It did get twenty No votes when it went out of here because of those concerns. So my question is whether or not the House amendment addresses those concerns. Because if it doesn't, that's fine. I mean, I would just encourage if people had those concerns, that they stick with their No vote. And if it does address the concerns, then obviously we need to reconsider.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Ronen, to close, ma'am.

SENATOR RONEN:

I'd appreciate a concurrence vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1350. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 41 Ayes, 18 Nays, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1350. This -- and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. ...the order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1360. Senator Haine. Senator Haine, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1360.

Signed, Senator William Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Haine, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR HAINE:

This is a bill which granted some exemptions to small rural water companies that -- from paying sales tax to the Department of Revenue on items used in building water lines. And -- and this amendment, all this does is further narrow that so that they don't get an exemption for anything involving operations. This is purely construction and maintenance. These are limited-income small water companies designed to bring water to places which really have wells that are -- that are dry at the moment. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1360. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1360. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Concurrence is Senate Bill 1368. Senator Cullerton, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1368.

Signed, Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Cullerton, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. How you doing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Fine. How are you doing?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Fine. How are you? Okay. This bill, as it passed the Senate, transferred powers of the Department of Human Services Office of the Inspector General from the Abused and Neglected Long Term Care Facility Residents Reporting Act to the Department of Human Services Act. It also changed the name of the Department of Public Health's "nurse aide registry" to the "health care workers {sic} (worker) registry". Then the House added a amendment that added powers and duties of the Inspector General of this Department to investigate alleged or suspected cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of adults with disabilities living in domestic settings in the community pursuant to the Abuse of Adults in Domestic Intervention Act {sic}.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1368. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1368. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1379. Senator Raoul, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1379.

Signed, Senator Kwame Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur with House Amendment 1 of Senate Bill 1379. House Amendment 1 retains Senate Bill 1379 and requires DCFS to conduct a criminal background check of the prospective foster or adoptive parent. Final approval of placement shall not be granted if the record check reveals certain felony convictions. It also requires that the court consult with minor -- the minor in an age-appropriate manner in setting permanency goals and to consider both in-State

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

and out-of-State placement options.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1379. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1379. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator -- on the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1380. Senator Raoul, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of -- of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1380.

Signed, Senator Kwame Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam -- Secretary. Senator, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur with House Amendment 1 of Senate Bill 1380, which deletes the underlying bill. And -- and House Amendment 1 allows the transfer of up to six years of service from the Downstate Police Pension Fund to the -- to the Cook

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

County Fund and allows the Chicago Municipal Employee Fund members to transfer credits to IMRF. It also requires employer and employee contributions plus interest to be paid from the original fund to the fund to which they are being transferred. House Amendment 1 also amends the Chicago Police Article to allow certain widows to qualify for annuity -- an annuity and provides that no age limitation applies for child annuity payments for children who are physically or mentally handicapped -- are so physically or mentally handicapped so as to be unable to support themselves. I urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Leader Watson, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Just to remind the Chair that this is exact language that you and I discussed on the Floor the other day that you said was going nowhere. Just so you know that, that the City of Chicago is opposed to this. We added provisions that were going to impact the downstate widows of fire -- and chiefs of police and the downstate provision is taken out; but sure enough, here comes Chicago. So those of you who are all big Chicago supporters and want to rip off downstate widows, this is the bill to vote on - so be my guest. We'll watch the roll call. Thank you - for nothing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Raoul, to -- to close, sir.

SENATOR RAOUL:

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. I urge your support for this. I -- I should remind the prior speaker that earlier in this General Assembly,

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

we sponsored -- we passed out a bill unanimously for the spouse of specifically downstate officers and downstate officers only. So I urge your support on this. And it was the previous speaker's bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. He's -- that -- that's right. I sponsored a bill for downstate widows. Downstate widows of fire chiefs and police. I believe it was just for police. I believe is what it was. Goes to the House. Thanks to Senator Munoz, Eddie Acevedo. They tried to help us over there for our downstate widows. Nope. Can't do it. But sure enough -- and I talked to you, Mr. President, about this and you said, well, this isn't going anywhere because the City's got a down arrow. This isn't going to go anywhere. So we agreed not to put the provision on in the House. They killed the widows' bill for downstate and here we are dealing with Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1380. All those in favor will say Aye -- all those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 16 Nays, 3 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1380. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, Messages.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

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

Senate Bill 8, together with the following amendments which are attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 8 and House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 8.

We have like Messages on Senate Bill 82, with House Amendment No. 3; Senate Bill 144, with House Amendments 1 and 3; Senate Bill 158, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 314, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 337, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 574, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 697, with House Amendment No. 1 and 2; Senate Bill 710, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 715, with House Amendment No. 2; Senate Bill 729, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 853, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 1094, with House Amendments 1 and 4; Senate Bill 1183, with House Amendment No. 1; and Senate Bill 1746, with House Amendments 1 and 3.

All passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2007. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the purpose of an announcement. There'll be a Rules Committee. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the President's Anteroom. All members of the Rules Committee, we'd ask 'em to please

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

report immediately to the Anteroom. The Senate will stand at ease for just a moment while the Rules Committee meets.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Madam Secretary, Committee Reports, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Halvorson, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Judiciary-Civil Law Committee - House Bill 291; Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 241, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 715, Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1544, and Floor Amendment No. 6 to House Bill 25.

Senator Debbie Halvorson, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, if -- have your attention, please. I'd ask you to turn your Calendar to House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bills 3rd Reading. Page 30 of your Calendar. There's been a change of sponsorship in House Bill 25 to Senator James Clayborne. I understand that Senator Clayborne -- would seek leave of the Body to return this to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. But before we do that, Senator Clayborne, Senator Righter is seeking recognition. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

Thank you, Mr. President. The Senate Republicans would

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

request a caucus immediately in Senator Watson's Office. We'd request one-half hour, if you might, Mr. President. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Senator, that request is always in order. But unfortunately and it's a -- very untimely, due to the hour. So we will -- your request will be granted and the Senate will return to Session at the hour of 10:15. Senate stands in recess to call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The Senate will come to order. All Members within the sound of my voice, we ask 'em to come to the Senate Floor. We'll be doing House Bills 3rd Reading, final action. All Members within the sound of my voice, please come to the Senate Floor. House Bills 3rd Reading, final action. Senator Clayborne, on House Bill 25, is seeking leave of the Body to return House Bill 25 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is that correct, sir? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 25. Madam Secretary, has there been any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Yes, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Clayborne, to explain your amendment, sir.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes, basically this creates three new riverboats, a Chicago casino, publicly owned, and it -- it makes various -- it creates a -- a impact fee that creates a horse equity fund for the racetracks, and provides other help to depressed communities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

First, so I understand procedurally where we're going, Senator Clayborne, you're going to adopt this amendment and then there are two others, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Clayborne, with regards -- can -- can you walk through, briefly, the distribution of the money that will come from these -- the new boats with regards to the horseracing industry?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Basically, there's an impact fee, that any boat that has gaming -- annual gaming receipts including fifty -- including up to fifty thousand {sic} dollars pay .5 percent. Any that have in excess of fifty thousand dollars -- fifty million dollars, I'm sorry, and less than a hundred thousand {sic} will pay one percent. And any boat -- gaming gross receipts of one hundred million but less than two hundred fifty million will pay 1.5 percent. And any license in excess -- boat or gaming casino with excess than -- excess gross receipts of two hundred and fifty million will pay a 3.5 percent -- in excess of three hundred million, I'm sorry, would pay 3.5 percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, for your indulgence. I would request a roll call vote, please, on the adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 25.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Your request is in order, sir. Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Okay. Senator Clayborne moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 25. The question -- all in favor will vote Aye. All opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 30 Ayes, 29 Nays, 0 voting Present. And the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary? Has there been any further Floor amendments approved

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Hendon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon, to explain your amendment, sir.

SENATOR HENDON:

Amendment -- Amendment No. 4 -- thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 4 is -- we had left a few things out, so it's a corrective amendment and it just adds a few of the -- another small area to the economically depressed communities. I'll be happy to explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, is this the one that lowers the impact fees that are paid by the riverboats?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

The one we talked about. Does it mean that the racetracks will get less money because we're charging less money for the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

riverboats on the impact fee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

No, it doesn't.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, then, where does the money come from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

The money comes from the organizational licensees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, we're lowering the tax for the riverboats and we're giving the same amount to the racetracks. I believe the money comes from the State. So the -- we must be reducing the amount of the tax that we're collecting from the riverboats, so the State would be making up the difference. That's the -- I just want to verify that in this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

The amount that they pay for the impact fee is now no longer subject to the privilege tax. So we've actually made it easier for those who might have a boat in their area to vote for the bill.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Hendon moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 25. All those in favor will say Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 6, offered by Senators Hendon and Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Floor Amendment No. 6. Senator Hendon, to explain your amendment, sir.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This just clarifies and clears up the number of positions that the riverboats and the casino can have. I'll be happy to explain it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no -- no discussion, Senator Hendon moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 6 to House Bill 25. All those in favor will say Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. 3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 25. Senator Clayborne, do you wish to proceed,

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 25.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Harmon, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR HARMON:

I move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. The gentleman has moved the previous question. There's eleven people seeking recognition on this issue. The Parliamentarian to please take the names of the people seeking recognition. Thank you. Senator Clayborne, to the bill, sir. SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 25, as amended, creates three new riverboats and one publicly owned boat -- casino in -- in Chicago. Existing boats will have the opportunity to increase their positions by eight hundred positions. Any unused positions will be competitively bid. It also provides for an impact fee paid to the Horse Racing Equity Fund. Provides funding for -- depressed communities and poor communities near riverboats and the casino. Authorizes one hundred electronic poker positions at the riverboats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno, are you seeking

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

recognition, ma'am?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have questions of the sponsor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he -- he'll yield for a question, ma'am. SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you. As we discussed in committee earlier, one of my big concerns about this bill is the magnitude of the expansion of gaming. As you indicated, there's three new riverboats, plus a land-based casino in Chicago. But I want to talk a little bit about the positions that will now be added to even the existing boats. You mentioned that -- that in addition -- what is the current level of -- number of positions the boats have?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Twelve hundred.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Just -- just for the record, Ladies and Gentlemen, when -there's eleven people seeking recognition on your side of the
aisle; there's four on the Democratic side of the aisle. So the
-- for the purposes of fairness, the Chair will use the debate
clock. We will go to three minutes -- minutes per speaker, so
we'll set the debate clock and -- starting now. So, Senator
Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Well, thank you for the freebie. You know, I guess what -- what my concern is, is that in addition to the twelve hundred that they currently have, they can have another eight hundred on

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

the existing boats, if I understand it correctly. I also understand that the new boats will have thirty-five hundred positions; the Chicago casino, four thousand positions. And correct me if I'm wrong, that there's also some exemptions from that, in that the electronic poker positions that are new don't count towards those increased number of positions. And then the final question I have is, it's my understanding that there is a provision that allows minority and female businesses to purchase fifty positions and then lease those to the operators and that those positions, as well, do not count towards the total positions that are authorized under the bill. Is -- are all those exemptions correct and are those additional positions that I've outlined correct, in addition to the -- the additional boats and casino?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

No, the boats can only have a maximum of thirty-five hundred positions, but the -- they initially are afforded an opportunity to add eight hundred. The exemptions are correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to this bill. While I think Chicago logically should have a casino, especially near O'Hare, and I think it probably makes sense for Senator Jones to have one down in the south suburbs, especially with Indiana taking in more gambling money today than the State of Illinois, it makes sense economically. But when you can't

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

put together a State budget on the last scheduled night of Session, take care of electric rate relief or have any school reform, I don't know how at the eleventh hour you get it together for gambling. This is a gigantic gambling expansion - the largest expansion in the history of the United States with respect to gambling. Illinois now will take in twice the amount of money from gambling as Nevada. Five times more than New Jersey. It is sick. So with all due respect to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, I think you all ought to call 1-800-gambler, 'cause this is out of control and this will addict the State of Illinois even more than it is today on gambling. Illinois should not have its major source of revenue come from gambling, twice as much as even the State of Nevada. It's just wrong.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Pankau, you seeking recognition, ma'am?

SENATOR PANKAU:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for some questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, ma'am. SENATOR PANKAU:

I'd like to ask about the O'Hare boat. Is this meant -well, first the bill started out at an eight-mile radius of
O'Hare and now it's -- and I live about five miles from O'Hare,
so my husband was starting to renovate our family room, but then
I see that you moved it back to four miles within O'Hare. Is
this meant for Rosemont?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Is this meant for Des Plaines?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

It's meant for the Gaming Board to make that determination, based upon a competitive bid.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau, you have to use your button, ma'am.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Okay. So why the change, then? Why do we keep narrowing in? It looks like we've got a target all specified; it just --you just don't want to name it here. Why don't you just tell us what it is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

It's a shorter commute for people coming through the airport.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Yes, but -- but, Senator, you have to take a taxi or you

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

have to get there in some way. So it's not like it's walking distance. It's not like you get off the airplane and you're going to go get your luggage and you're going to gamble in between. You're going to have to get there. So this is meant for some particular location. What is it? Why won't you just tell us what you're looking for?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

The other issue, Senator Pankau, is to make sure that we don't impose on other boats in the area. So we don't want to unfairly create a disadvantage for those boats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

...the bill -- to the bill, Mr. -- or, Mr. President. This is obviously meant for some position. Obviously the sponsor isn't going to tell us what it is. You're going to have to get on some means of transportation to get there. This is all programmed out for somebody, somewhere to benefit. I urge a strong No vote to this. And -- and besides that, I don't know of anywhere at O'Hare Airport where you could put a boat. There is no water there, as far as I know. So it's going to have to be off of O'Hare Airport somewhere, in some sort of body of water. This just doesn't smell right. I urge an Aye -- or I urge a negative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Burzynski, you seeking recognition, sir?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I find it ironic that we're -- we're here tonight and all of a sudden the bill is called - we know the bill is coming - and within ten seconds someone moves the previous question on perhaps one of the -- the largest issues that we've dealt with yet this spring and perhaps in the coming -- summer months. I suppose we'll deal with larger issues. But it seems to me like this bill certainly does need to have a lot of debate, a lot of openness, a lot of -- a lot of discussion. You know, we talked about it in Executive Committee probably a couple of different times or a couple different iterations of the bill. And, you know, I have a lot of concerns when it comes to the expansion of gaming in the State of Illinois, certainly as we talk about it being extremely addictive. And as I look at this bill, one of the most addictive things that we can have, I think, is that of video gaming, video poker or whatever. And certainly this bill does have that aspect in it. And I find that to be unconscionable. We used to talk about video slot machines being the -- the crack cocaine of the gaming industry. certainly I don't think this bill is going to do anything but add to that. Having said that, I'd like to ask just a couple of questions relative to the distribution of funds for higher education, because I know that two percent of the receipts are set aside for higher education. In our initial bills that we saw, there was initially, I think, two percent of that was going to Chicago State University. Then it was back down to one percent or approximately fourteen million dollars - a little over fourteen million dollars was going to Chicago State;

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

another one percent to be distributed among the universities. So, Senator, can you tell me how those funds are going to be distributed at this point for higher education?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Two percent of the gross revenues from the new riverboats, casinos and additional positions of existing riverboats will go to the public universities in the State of Illinois -- divided equally.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Are they -- you said divided equally. Is that based on the amount of -- of students that a university might have? Whereas, you've got some systems, for instance, U of I with seventy-one thousand students; Northern, for instance, with about twenty-five thousand; et cetera - will they be receiving an equal sum from the distribution?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

There are nine public universities and each one will receive one-ninth of the two percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski, your time has expired. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

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

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, originally when the initial gambling legislation was introduced, one of the things they looked at was making sure that these boats were going to go into economically depressed areas to -- to help them, as well as serve as an economic engine for the State. And obviously, looking at where some of these new boats are -- are going to, they're ones that are going to be along the border areas. With that in mind, my question is, previous proposals in the past few years have included Rockford in there as a community outside of the Chicago area that fits that criteria of being a large urban economically depressed area that is along the Wisconsin border and, in fact, earlier this year, Rockford was in the original proposal. Can you tell me why Rockford was taken out of this proposal and just those Chicago area ones were left in?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

There's never been a proposal that I have seen during this Session where Rockford was in -- in the proposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Well, you can turn and ask Senator Hendon. I think it was in the original proposal of this year and it was something that clearly was -- was discussed this year and has been discussed in the past. I know former Mayor Doug Scott has been down here.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

As you know, there's been an amendment that's been introduced. But I think it is pretty clear that most individuals that have been involved in this negotiations knew that Rockford was in. Again, Rockford doesn't compete with any of the other areas. It is along the Wisconsin border. And from a standpoint of an economic development, not only for this -- for economically depressed community, but for a chance to bring Wisconsin dollars back into Illinois, I -- I guess I'm not sure why we don't consider having a community in there that has supported and sought this position for many years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Well, it wasn't a question, but since I've been -- been negotiating and dealing with this bill over the last few weeks, Rockford has not been a part. It has never come up in a discussion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Syverson, bring your remarks to a close, sir. SENATOR SYVERSON:

As this legislation moves over to the House, I guess my -my question to you is, do you have opposition to the idea of -of a community outside of the Chicago area being involved in
part of this -- in part of this mix, if, in fact, this

legislation does move forward?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I -- I can never feel that way, because there's a boat in

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

my district that's outside of the community. So, I can never feel that way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

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

Will the gentleman yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The gentleman will yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you. Senator Clayborne, the last time the General Assembly contemplated the -- the casino gambling issue, there were many legal questions, which were subsequently raised and addressed by the Attorney General. That process took a number of years. Wanted to ask if you have been in consultation at all with the Attorney General's Office during the course of these negotiations?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Unfortunately, they've called me on other issues. They haven't called me on this one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Have you sought their input?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

No, I have not sought their input.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. To the bill: I rise in strong opposition to House Bill 25. The last time the General Assembly deliberated the issue of casino gambling, there was a formula for distribution to municipalities. I represent a host of suburban communities on the north shore. I had municipalities who made a conscious decision that they did not wish to participate in this distribution formula because they felt that on principle this was not something that they wished to be party to. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, there are a number of elements in this bill which I find questionable. electronic poker issue, I think, crosses a number of lines. impact fees defy economic logic. And the issue of where we draw resources to meet some of our most critical needs, starting with how we educate our children, is nothing short of regressive. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, at a certain point, how we invest in our children's future should not depend on how many chips get left on the blackjack table. I rise in opposition to House Bill 25. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, sir. Further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld, you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, if there is interest on this side of the aisle in the -- in the gambling industry, I think it lies more with the horseracing industry than it does with a lot of other things. I -- I -- as -- as we go over the language in this bill, is there an impact fee from the Chicago casino for horseracing industry?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

It -- it's actually -- yes. It's actually paid out of the -- the Authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

And as -- is that at the 3.5 level?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

The reason I bring that up, it -- it appears that in the language - and this may have to be corrected - there -- there are -- there -- there seems to be two contradicting -- contradicting sentences in -- in this language. One says they do not have to pay and the other says they do. In your -- your impression of -- of -- what is correct? And we can show you

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

those two -- those two sentences if you would like later.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Legislative intent is that they have to pay. The 3.5 percent will come out of the Authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you. I -- as I watch this process at the end of the Session, and I've watched twelve of 'em now, I can't say that I've ever seen one that is more -- almost embarrassing. I think -- you know, I -- I know that you're in the majority and -- and that you have to -- you have to stick together, but this is -- this is not just this bill. But the -- but this end of the Session without a budget, without any direction of where we're going, with a huge majority, this has to even be embarrassing to the people on that side of the aisle. And I can't help believing that the press can look out at you and see that embarrassment. This is -- this is ugly. If people back home could see what's going on, on this Floor, they would be angry. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Brady, you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR BRADY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, there was some early discussion about the number of positions currently in the State of Illinois. Can you tell me how many positions do we currently have prior to the enactment of this legislation in this State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Well, you would assume that there are, what, twelve thousand?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

So you are saying there are existing today twelve thousand positions in the State? How many positions will there be if this legislation's enacted?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I'm sorry. To go back, there -- there are ten licenses, but only nine are active. So, nine times twelve. Eleven -- eleven -- I'm sorry. Thirteen {sic} thousand eight hundred.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, my question, in addition to that, was, if you enact this piece of legislation, how many positions will there be in the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Twenty-eight thousand positions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

If I understand it right, there's closer to eleven thousand current positions. Twenty-eight -- almost a tripling of the positions in the State at this late date. Can I ask you a question? Have you negotiated this bill with the Governor's Office?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

So you have no idea whether or not the Governor's Office is in support of this bill or not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne, sir.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I have not talked to him. No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

How about the Speaker's Office?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I -- I have not talked to the Speaker either.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

...you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to this piece of legislation. This is a tripling of the positions in this State. Here we are today at the final hour of the calendar year. We don't have a budget. You can't seem to solve rate relief for the people of this State who are paying horrendous rate increases. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not the time to be tripling the gambling positions of this State. It's a time to focus on priorities - balancing our budget, providing rate relief, providing a capital bill that will make our schools safer and our roads safer. Please vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Risinger. SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise with grave concern about this bill because of the -- the huge expansion that it provides in gaming in the State of Illinois and -- and our great reliance on revenues from gaming. And while I've said that I don't personally object to a casino in Chicago, I do object to one that's publicly owned and not owned by a -- a private entity and under the Gaming Board like all the other casinos are. In fact, I don't quite understand why this one should be any different than the others. As I read this, I see that the license in Chicago is going to be in perpetuity, never subject to

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

suspension, never subject to revocation or renewal or any limitation of the license itself. So what is the control over the license and the -- to prevent corruption in the -- the gaming that we have in place over the other gaming boats in the State of Illinois that seems to be working rather well right now? I would ask a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Senator, could you -- could you give me an explanation of why the boat in Chicago is a publicly owned boat versus a private-owned boat like the rest of the boats are? Or -- I -- I know it's a land-based casino, but why is it publicly owned rather than privately owned and under the Gaming Board like all the rest of the gaming boats in the State of Illinois?

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

We thought that more of the profits should go to benefit the public.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Well, where are the controls for this boat if -- if the license can never be suspended or -- or there's no revocation or no renewal? Where are the controls if -- if things get out of hand with this facility?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Controls are, this is controlled by a public board where those members can be removed; the license can be suspended. So, those are the -- and the casino operator, obviously, who runs the license can be terminated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Well, I rise and tell you that I think that we ought to have grave concern about the amount of expansion of gaming in the State of Illinois and our overreliance on its revenues to provide monies for the operations of the State. I don't think that's the way we ought to go. I don't think we ought to be getting into it that large. And I think we -- there are several questions that remain to be answered that haven't been brought out in such a short period of time for such a major expansion of gaming.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Link, seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong support of this bill. We've talked about this bill and I've talked to a number of Members on both sides of the aisle about this bill. And when I talked about that here's the engine for the capital development -- and I've heard this mentioned by a number of Members tonight, that we need a capital development bill. And we've been criticized in years past, how are we going to pay for a capital development bill? Well, here's how we're going to pay

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

for it. And I'd like these Members to go back to their districts, tell their school districts, tell their highways, tell them that they can't be built because they couldn't vote for gaming. And you know what? I'm tired of hearing the excuse, well, there's too many boats, there's not enough this, there's a little bit too much of this, we're allowing this, we're allowing that. You know what? If we narrowed this down more, if we changed this, it still would not be good enough. There would be excuses. What we're doing is generating approximately two billion dollars up front, 1.4 billion dollars annually, to pay for the money we need to do a capital development bill, to help our schools. I agree with colleague that this might not be the greatest way to fund our schools, but no one wanted to vote for GRT, no one wanted to vote for an income tax increase, because I was on the show with one of my colleagues from the other side who said we don't want to vote for an income tax increase. Well, you got to vote for something if you want more money in this State. Well, I don't care how you figure it out. This is a sin tax in the way you want to figure it out. It's the same thing if we raise taxes on cigarettes, if we raise taxes on alcohol. The last time we did a capital development bill, we did it on alcohol, we did it on beer. Oh, by the way, it was okay to raise the taxes on every license plate in the State of Illinois. We didn't care about those people then. We could raise it then. We're raising it on a user tax right now. We're expanding gaming. People don't have to go on these riverboats if they don't want to. They don't ever have to step foot on 'em if they don't want to. But they are going to 'em. They're going to Indiana. They're going

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

to Wisconsin. They're going to Missouri. We want to keep this money in the State of Illinois. We want better schools. We want better highways. We need it in the State of Illinois. Let's stop the excuses. Let's do this tonight and let's get it done. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Link. Further discussion? Senator Righter, you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Clayborne, I want to follow up on an answer that you gave to Senator Risinger about the nature of the license for the Chicago casino. Specifically, I think you told him that the Gaming Board has the authority to suspend that license. I'm reading from page 170 of the current text of the bill, under the Section that outlines the Gaming Board's authorities. Beginning on line 18, it describes the Board's authority to revoke or suspend licenses, and then your bill adds the language, "other than the license issued to the Authority". Now I read that to mean that the Gaming Board does not have the authority to either revoke or suspend the Chicago casino's license. Am I reading that incorrectly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

But what I said was the operator's license.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, if the Authority wouldn't operate the license, Senator Clayborne, who would?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

They -- they will hire an operator who will build and manage and operate the casino, subject to competitive -- bidding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Clayborne, is there anywhere else in Illinois law where we prohibit the Gaming Board from suspending or revoking a gaming license anywhere?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

We still don't prohibit it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have to give Senator Clayborne credit. He is trying to dress up an ugly, ugly provision in this law, but you just can't do it. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've only been a Member of this Senate for about five years, and like a lot of Members, at the time I first ran for the Senate, voters were growing weary, and I think since then they've only grown more weary, of public corruption. tired of public corrupt officials. They're tired of corrupt institutions and, Ladies and Gentlemen, by telling the Gaming Board, the one entity that we rely on to enforce the rules and regulations and abide by the laws, that they can't suspend or revoke the Chicago license - and that's the only one we do it for - you are sending a message to the people who sent you here to Springfield, back home, that you're okay with that, that you think the Chicago casino deserves immunity from the Gaming Board on its actions. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't want to send that message back to the people who sent me here and I don't think many of you do either. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Righter. Further discussion? Senator Hendon, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR HENDON:

Yes, Mr. President. You know, I've been here sixteen years now and it blows my mind when intelligent people twist the truth, contort what they know to be the facts for political means. And it seems like tonight's the night for it. I'm going to start very quickly with the fact that Senator Clayborne and I made a number of changes that were requested on that side of the aisle. Still don't make any difference. We changed things for

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

you. We -- we give you what you say you want and you're still against it. You know what that makes you? An obstructionist. Obstructionist. You're not for anything. You're not for the GRT. You're not for any kind of tax increase. You're not for any revenue enhancement. You are obstructionists. So you may as well get up and say it. It also blows my mind to see a person who ran against Governor Blagojevich all of a sudden tonight concerned about whether we talked to him or not. Well, there was an election. He won. Get over it. Okay? pretend as if you are concerned whether we spoke to the Governor or not? This is the Senate. We make up our own minds. far as Rockford is concerned, I got to deal with it, because I personally -- I personally went and spoke with the esteemed Senator from the Rockford area, a friend of mine. Personally asked him several months ago, at least a month ago, would Rockford like to participate? I was told that the Mayor of Rockford was not on board. Well, if the Mayor is not on board, how can Rockford participate? I'm like Senator Clayborne, I'd still love to have Rockford be able to be a player. But you have to bring boats to the table and you have to have your Mayor on board. So let's put the truth out here, instead of just, you know, turning it and -- and being -- twisting it and knowing that -- that you're not telling the truth. As far as the Chicago license go, Senator Clayborne has said very clearly that the Gaming Board can get rid of the license that goes to the operator. It's simple. It's simple. How do we fund anything if there is no revenue? The Indiana boat, you know what they call it? The Chicago boat. The Horseshoe is called Chicago's casino. You want to know why? Because eighty percent of the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

people that go there are from the City of Chicago. Eighty percent. Eighty percent. So our gambling dollar is going to Indiana right now. The other one, they call -- it's called a Chicago resort. And if you listen to their commercials on -- on radio, they say Chicago-style hotdogs, Chicago restaurants, take the Chicago Skyway. They never say the word "Indiana". When are we going to get smart and do...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator -- Senator -- Senator Hendon. Senator Hendon, could you -- could you -- could you please bring your remarks to a close, sir? Your time has expired. ...you very much, Senator. Further discussion? Leader Watson, are you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I'm glad that we now have the truth in front of us from the previous speaker. In regard to one of the speakers who talked about a capital bill, I don't know if you're aware of this or not, but there's only two billion - and I think that's what James said in -- in the Executive Committee - there's two billion dollars in capital here. Now, what's that going to do for the RTA, the CTA, the roads and bridges and schools? It's not going to do much. bill that you talked about that we supported, called Illinois FIRST, was twelve billion dollars. Twelve billion dollars. This is nothing. This is pittance. This is absolutely an embarrassment. So don't bring that issue up at this point in time. And those of you that voted for Amendment No. 3, I don't think you realized what was in that amendment. There's a higher education fund that's established and twenty-five percent of the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

money that goes into the higher education fund in Amendment No. 3 goes to that wonderful university flagship of this State, Chicago State University, which the Auditor General has had many, many, many comments about. They like to take cruises. They like to be -- take advantage of taxpayers' money. That's where twenty -- in Amendment No. 3, that's exactly what thirty of you did. This bill is dead on arrival in the House. And I'd -- I'm disappointed that the sponsor hasn't gone over, as I have gone over, and talked to those who make those kinds of decisions and asked, what's the future of this legislation in the House? What's the potential of this legislation for -- even have a hearing? It's dead on arrival. Why would you put your Members on a roll call on the last night at 11 o'clock to ask them to vote for the most egregious piece of legislation in gambling advancement that this has -- this State has ever seen, when we don't even have a budget? We don't even have a budget. willing to work with you, Senator Clayborne, as I have told -with others on your side of the aisle. The horseracing industry is important to all of us. It should be to all of us, because it impacts this State greatly. And I appreciate the fact that you've addressed that in this piece of legislation - the one who finally gets together and says "let's have a meeting." Somebody take some leadership role around here and let's have a meeting and let's talk with the House, let's talk to the Governor, and let's bring some people into the room who can make a decision that'll get some sort of an agreement that we can all vote for. This is not it. This is not it. This is absolutely an embarrassment for this time of night to be voting on a bill such as this, Senator. So, I urge a No vote.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Watson. Last person seeking recognition and speaking is President Jones. President Jones and then Senator Clayborne, to close, sir. President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yeah. Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Sometime Members have a tendency to forget those who have served here for a number of years. And I recall back in, I believe, it was the year 1999, many of you on that side of the aisle on the tenth license. And the previous speaker, number one, was right on board to help move that license to Rosemont that the AG found all those problems with. But it was okay, because your Leader over there then, Mr. Pate Philip, Stan Weaver, said it's all right. I heard you talk about the higher education funds. That casino was supposed to be located in Cook County, but it was all right if you take those dollars and send 'em down to Champaign, University of Illinois. You didn't think about sending it to any colleges up north. It was all right then. It was great. I appreciate the remarks the individual made as it relate to funding of education and budgetary items. But yet and still, they talk but they don't bring anything to the table. It's not the Jones' boat in the south suburbs. It's the area that I felt the tenth license should have been located. You talk about economically depressed communities - the southern suburbs. But you -- you stood strong to make sure that it went to a -- a very wealthy community. You talk out of both sides of your mouth. The AG is not a member of the General Assembly - not a member of the General Assembly. Once served here. She can look at the laws that we pass. There's no reason we have to check with her.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

She want to come back to the General Assembly, there may be a open seat somewhere on that side of the aisle. No, I don't want to run against you, Cullerton. I vote for you. But what I'm saying to you is that the sponsor of this bill did his job. And, Mr. Minority Leader, you called me about Rockford. I said it's rather late in the game. I didn't know that Senator Syverson had already talked to Senator Hendon maybe a month ago. But had he did what Senator Syverson requested, would you still have said, "Oh, it's too much gambling and so forth." You would not have even supported your own Member on that side of the aisle. So I don't expect you to support this. Link said it right. We need a capital program. We need a road program. We need a revenue source to get it done. And the two billion dollars of upfront money can be the vehicle we can use. For every one hundred million dollars in bonding, we can do a billion dollars in bond. Take care of mass transit - RTA region. Take care of the roads and so forth. You're going to vote against it. I know that. But you're going to be the first in line, saying "Where's my road project?" "Where is money for my schools?" Why don't you stand up front and say, "Hey, I'll support this because I need this." If you come up with some recommendations, it'd be considered. But let's not criticize the sponsor about Chicago, the premier city in this State. would be nice to have Chicago with a casino. You voted against that, but you want all the revenue that Chicago will generate to come to your respective districts. So let's stop playing games. I recall when the last bill on casinos came - I was here; many of you on the other side of the aisle were here - right after we passed that twelve-billion-dollar bonding authorization for the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

State of Illinois. I supported that. Some of you on the other side supported it. And then came the tenth license. And many of you on that side of the aisle, who are still here, voted for it. You didn't care about the economically depressed communities. It didn't make you any difference just as long as you got what you wanted. But in this bill, there's a fund set up to deal with many economically depressed communities across the entire State of Illinois. So if you were genuinely sincere about looking out for those communities, you would vote Yes on this bill. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, President Jones. Senator Clayborne, to close, sir.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, and -- and Members of the Senate. And I truly appreciate the words of -- of President Jones and -- and my friend, Senator Link. What's ironic about what has transpired in the last week to month is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are supposed to be about jobs. Well, this is a jobs bill. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle -- like I go in -- in -- in the Minority Leader's Office and there's Ronald Reagan, and he talked about trickledown economics. If you empower the disadvantaged, then they will support businesses, as one of my colleagues out of Aurora talked about. They will have health care. They will be able to build in their community. They will be able to support their community. But you know what's ironic? And I talked to the Minority Leader the other day. Free-market Republicans are voting for price controls. Now, they're getting ready to vote

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

against jobs, which creates taxes, which creates revenue, which supports our general fund. When we talk about bonding, there's three hundred and fifty million dollars that will go to school construction, that will go to a capital program. I told one of my colleagues in the -- in the committee - she said it wasn't enough - I said give me a call and we'll sit down and talk about it. I haven't received a call. So she wasn't sincere. When you talk about funding going to higher education, 54. -- 57.4 million dollars will go to our public universities that they are not expecting. Yet, this is not the right bill, as my colleagues on the other side talked about. They talked about FIRST -- Illinois FIRST. Well, that was a 2.2-billion-dollar program over five years. Five years. A twelve-billion-dollar program over five years. It wasn't all in one year. So, there's a little misleading, just like it was told about the -the -- the -- Amendment No. 3. Well, that was corrected in the subsequent amendment. If you truly care about this State and you want to empower people and give them a chance to work, pay taxes and be -- be productive, you'll vote for this bill. If you true -- truly care about the kids and the schools and the roads, you'll vote for this bill. If you truly care about making this State more competitive and not allowing our dollars to leave and go to other states, you will vote for this bill. I say to -- to all of you all here, this is not perfect. I have a community that has a boat and it has afforded people the opportunity - whose -- who have low skills - to go to work every day, live a productive life and provide for their children. the only thing that I ask you all is to give others in this community -- in these communities where these boats and the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

casino will go the same opportunity. Give them a chance to live a productive life. Give them a chance to be able to make sure that their kids have the things that they need on a daily basis. Give them the chance to show their kids that they can be productive, that they can work hard and make this State a better place. I ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 25 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 30 Yeses, 29 Nays, 0 voting Present. House Bill 25, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Leader Watson, for what purpose you seek recognition? SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. We'd like to verify the vote, please. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

That request is always in order. The gentleman has asked for a verification. I'd ask all Members, please, to be in their seats. Madam Secretary, please read the affirmative votes, please. Those Members voting in the affirmative.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Bond, Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, Delgado, Demuzio, Forby, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Holmes, Hunter, Jacobs, Koehler, Kotowski, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Noland, Raoul, Ronen, Silverstein, Sullivan, Trotter, Wilhelmi and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, I do. Thank you. Senator Holmes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

I'm sorry, sir.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Holmes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Holmes in the Chamber? Senator Linda Holmes in the Chamber? Linda Holmes is at the rear of the Chamber on the Republican side.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any other Member, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Senator Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Jacobs...

SENATOR WATSON:

Oh, yes. I see him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...is in his chair. Very dilatory. Senator Watson, do you question any other presence of any Member voting in the...

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Martinez.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Martinez is in her chair.

SENATOR WATSON:

We appreciate those of you who acknowledge the fact when --when you're called, you do raise your hand. That makes it much easier for us. So, if you would do that, we wouldn't have to call on you that may be here. I believe you're all here. So, thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Do you -- okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, on a verified roll call, there are 30 -- 30 Ayes, 29 Nays, 0 voting Present. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'd ask you to go to Supplemental Calendar No. 3. Supplemental Calendar No. 3. On the top of that is Secretary's Desk, Concurrence. Concurrence, Senate Bills is Senate Bill 241. Senator Trotter, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 241.

Signed, Senator Donne Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Trotter, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, thank you very much, sir. House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 241 is our fourth edition of the '07 Supplemental request. It is for one billion four hundred twenty-seven

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

million five hundred and fifty thousand dollars. It has ninetynine percent of the things that's been in the other three bills with the addition of adding one hundred and fifty million dollars for school construction grants pursuant to the School Construction Law. It also has eleven million three hundred and ninety-eight thousand dollars GRF transferred into the Worker Compensation Revolving Fund. And also, under Central Management Services, it has that same money that'd be transferred to -- up from other State funds of eleven million three hundred ninetyeight thousand dollars to satisfy settlements of -- of workers' comp cases. Potentially, savings of 41.6 million dollars. has in here, to the Comptroller, one million four hundred and sixty-one dollars of -- which -- from GRF, which will go for COLA increases to members of the Executive and Legislative Branches per the Compensation Board. It has an additional seventeen thousand dollars which will deal with our COLA inclusion -- seventeen million dollars for our COLA inclusions for the COLA increases for the years of '03, '04 and '05. It has dollars in here for the line of duty awards of seven million seven hundred and twenty-three thousand. And it also, of course, has the one billion two hundred and fifteen million two hundred thousand dollars for payments pursuant to the hospital assessment. Has, again, various other lines. And the total of this, again, will be one billion four hundred twenty-seven million five hundred and fifty thousand dollars. And I'm prepared to answer questions if necessary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, once

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

again, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 241. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 37 Ayes, 21 Nays, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 241, the Senate concurs in House Bill -- Amendment No. 1 and Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 241. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on -- on the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 715. Senator Trotter, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 715.

Signed, Senator Donne Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Trotter, to explain your motion, sir.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, thank you very much. House Amendment No. 2 amends the underlining {sic} bill which created school health centers. It specifically deals with providing that all students in the school under the age of eighteen are eligible for services if they have obtained written parental consent or if they are otherwise permitted under Illinois law to consent on their own behalf to such care. It provides that all students eighteen years of age or older are eligible for the services. Provides that the school health centers shall provide a list of the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

health services available and provides for consent form containing a statement that a parent, legal guardian or student who's permitted under Illinois law to consent onto his or her behalf has a right to refuse any health care services. It particularly just only addresses two Sections of the bill and that's Section 10 and Section 15 - eligibility and consent.

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am? SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Madam - Madam - Mr. President. Sorry. remind the -- the Body that this passed out of here with a number of No votes. It also passed out of the House with a number of No votes. A couple of issues that were raised, just to remind people, is the fact that this does have the potential to provide certain services through clinics that parents may disagree with. I understand the amendment tries to address that. But for those people that are sensitive to that issue, that is still in the bill. And secondly, there was a concern about where these clinics would be located - to be sure that they would be located throughout the State, rather than just in Cook County. We did note earlier that Cook County had actually closed some of the clinics that they had, and the concern was that the State then would pick up funding of what had been a county service. So, just -- you might want to think about what your vote was previously. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you -- thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Lauzen, are you seeking recognition, sir?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator, could you give a definition -- beside parent and legal guardian, who can provide consent for the health care in these clinics at schools?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Are you seeking leave to ask the gentleman a question, Senator Lauzen?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Gentleman will so yield for a question. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Illinois law has already enumerated, in fact, that if you're an -- emancipated minor, that you can do this. Women who are pregnant can seek various services under these clinics. And there are a few other examples as well. It's all in the Public Health Act, Consent to {sic} (by) Minors to Medical Procedures Act, which is 410 ILCS 210.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter, are you seeking recognition on this matter, sir?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Trotter, I want to follow up for a moment on

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Senator Lauzen's question about the consent, and I appreciate that House Amendment 2, that you're moving to concur in, has language in it with regards to the consent. But it talks about they have to have parental consent or if they are otherwise permitted under Illinois law to consent on their own behalf to such care. Now, you talked about emancipated minors, but it's not restricted to emancipated minors, is it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

No, it is not. As I also mentioned that it is a minor, by a pregnant woman who is a minor, by any person eighteen years of age, not because of such minority and, of such purpose, a married person, and it goes on. And again there's several categories here in the Section in the Illinois Code that I mentioned earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, Mr. President. To the bill, Mr....

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Trotter. I'm -- excuse me. I'm sorry. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm sorry, Mr. President. I asked -- I asked for permission to speak to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sometimes you look alike. I'm -- I get confused.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber, you know, we've just passed this big gaming bill and everyone's kind of loosened up a little bit and I hope we pay a little bit attention here to this bill, which failed its first time around, passed narrowly its second time around. Now there's language before you that tries to make us feel a little better about the parental consent that is required. But there is a loophole in this bill that you could drive a truck the width of this Chamber through and it says that you do not have to have parental consent if that person could obtain that on their own with regards to any other provision in Illinois law. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are a number - and Senator Trotter talked to -about a few of them - there are a laundry list of areas in which a minor can have these services at one of these centers without -- without parental consent. If you're concerned about parental consent, you should vote No on this bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you -- thank you, Senator Righter. And I apologize for ...(microphone cutoff)... recognizing you. Senator Martinez, are you seeking recognition on this issue, ma'am?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Yes, I am, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Martinez.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Thank you. Senate. I -- I stand in very strong support of this bill. I have a high school in my district that has a health center and I got to say that you'd be surprised how many of our young people actually utilize this health center. Some of the students are afraid to talk to their parents and they'll go and talk to a nurse or encourage their friends to go and seek medical attention, something they don't do on their own sometimes. And so I really believe that we should have health centers in every school -- every high school, because I think that our young people need to be able to visit a clinic in their own schools when they're not feeling well. So I encourage an Aye vote from everyone in this Chamber, because it is a very important asset for our young people to have in their high schools. So I -- I would encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Martinez. Further discussion? Senator Lightford, are you seeking recognition on this?

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, ma'am.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I, too, rise in strong support of this legislation. In fact, a couple years ago, I helped put a health clinic in Proviso East High School and it's done many improvements for the attendance at the high school. It's so important that when students are at school if they're taken ill, many want to be

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

excused for the day. But with the nurse at the school, with the health facility at the school, it gives them a chance to be checked out, to be referred to a doctor if needed at a later date, but it -- it's an immediate -- an immediate ramification to some problems. And so -- many of the other diseases and problems that many students wouldn't know about, awareness is at an ultimate high with the health center actually in the school, and for many other problems. And so I do feel that having a health center in a high school really improves on their academics ultimately. The bottom line is keeping students in school, keeping them healthy and giving them health choices. And so I support this legislation and I would urge all of us to vote for -- vote for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Trotter, to close, sir.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Currently there are forty-one school-based clinics in Illinois. This bill will allow the creation of twenty additional ones. Through their use of immunizations, physical exams, asthma care, mental health counseling, we are contributing to, one, cutting down on absenteeism and also to -- to a healthy student population. I ask all for its Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 715. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 715. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing on the Supplemental Calendar on the Order of Concurrence now comes Senate Bill 1544. Senator Hendon, do you wish to proceed, sir? He indicates he wishes to proceed. ...moment, Senator Hendon. Senator Righter, for what purpose are you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, I apologize for hitting my speak light late. I would like to verify that last roll call, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator -- Senator Hendon. Senator Righter, I am very, very sorry, but we have already moved on to the next order of business and the bill was -- Senate Bill 1544, sir, was on the board and we were already -- we're on the Order of Concurrence. The -- the sponsor indicated he wanted to proceed. Your light did not come on in a timely fashion. We will continue on the Order of Concurrence of Senate Bill 1544. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, I appreciate that. Are you confident that you have all of your Members here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

I can tell you by a visual, except for Senator DeLeo - he's not in his seat.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Members are here.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

We'll go -- we'll go with your good word, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Thank you very much for your consideration, sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, returning to the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1544. Senator Hendon, do you wish to proceed? He indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the gentleman's motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1544.

Signed, Senator Rickey Hendon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon, to the motion, sir.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a concurrence motion with the -- with the House Majority Leader Representative Currie, so that should make everybody feel very, very comfortable, because the House is -- we're concurring with what they did over in the other Chamber. So everybody should be with this since we were so concerned and want to make sure that the Speaker is with us. So, I urge an Aye vote and I'll be happy to answer any questions. This is closing the corporate loopholes and should raise around two hundred and thirty-two million for the State.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson, for what purpose do you seek recognition, ma'am?

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the previous question. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, the lady has moved the previous question. I'd ask the Parliamentarian to please take recognition. Please make a list of the lights being lit, the speakers. Okay. Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, let me just -- let me -- just let me interrupt you for one second, please. For the purposes of consideration to all Members seeking to speak on this issue, we will go back to the debate timer. We will go to the three-minute clock and your time will start now. Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to make a couple of observations. I know others are going to speak to a number of items that are in this bill, but I want to point out a problem I have with the process. This amendment, which contains over two hundred million dollars' worth of tax increases, has not been heard in committee. We've had committees on very technical and minor amendments and we failed to have a committee hearing on this huge bill. It was particularly important in that Representative Currie acknowledged in the House that there are,

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

in fact, problems with this bill that still need to be worked out. And I feel that it's much too large of an issue just to come right to the Floor in the eleventh hour. The only thing I can imagine that is going on right now is that this particular item couldn't possibly pass tomorrow with -- because it would require thirty-six votes at this -- at that time. And that's the real reason that we've skipped a committee hearing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Pankau, you seeking recognition, ma'am? SENATOR PANKAU:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question, ma'am. SENATOR PANKAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, I'd like to talk a little bit about the franchise tax and license fee part. I believe this will generate about twenty-five million dollars. Why -- why was this one particularly chosen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Well, there are a number of closing the corporate loopholes that were chosen and this is not a tax increase as the previous speaker said. This is closing the corporate loopholes and this is just one of them that they chose in the House, and -- with their wisdom - you know, they're quite intelligent over there. Majority Leader Currie. They chose this one and I -- and I concur with it.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Yes, but this particular one deals with Subchapter S and LLC corporations. These are not huge corporations. These are small mom-and-pop businesses that have incorporated for reasons of liability. They're Subchapter Ss and LLCs. Why are -- why are you zeroing in on the little guy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

This is for people who live outside of Illinois. So we're just trying to tax people who live outside Illinois and then we don't have to tax the good people of this State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

With -- with all due respect, I believe this is for LLCs and Subchapter Ss within the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

The individuals may live outside of Illinois that we are attempting to tax here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

One more. The real estate investment trust - why did you pick this particular one, other than the fact that it generates

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

thirty-five million?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

We could use the thirty-five million.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...bill, ma'am.

SENATOR PANKAU:

It seems to me that all you did was looked and see where you could grab some easy money. These are not major, huge corporations that we're going to fix and we're going to -- we're going to really tighten the loopholes and make these huge corporations pay their taxes again. These are Subchapter Ss. These are LLCs. These are people that have real estate investment trusts. I urge a strong No vote on this. Until you know exactly what you're doing, don't start picking on people, the little guys.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much. We have to bring your remarks to a close, ma'am. Senator Syverson, are you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yes, Mr. President. Thank you. You know, first, I'm a little bit, you know, frustrated. For six months we've sat here, many days coming in hours late, and yet here we're

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

debating hundreds of millions of dollars of tax issues and we're limiting it to three minutes of discussions. And I guess that's a little frustrating and I don't know why we have to be in such a hurry when we're talking about these taxes that are this important. But a question for the sponsor. I'm looking at line -- or page 134, lines 23 through 26 and then lines 1 through 9 on page 35 {sic} (135), if you have that in front of you. This is to do -- this is dealing with the taxation on aircraft and the -- taxation on air business. Can you give me an idea of how this is going to be -- how much we're talking about, number one, and how is this going to be affecting the airline services both at O'Hare and all of the other downstate airports?

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Well, it reads providing services other than airline services. So I don't think it will negatively affect air passenger business at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, I -- I -- I don't see that here. I see that this says the tax is weighted as to the -- based on the cost of the -- value of the aircraft and by the type. If you can, can you point out where it says it's not dealing with...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

If you look at line 18, it says other than by the airlines.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Well, that's a whole different formula. That's a whole different Section. We're not talking about that Section. Line 18 is dealing with lines 1 through 22 before that. I'm talking about point (4) that starts on line 23. Starting on -- point (4) starting on line 23 going to page 135.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

If you -- if you will read -- you have to read the bill and that Section in its entirety, Senator. It's clear to us that it is not going to affect -- negatively affect the airline industry whatsoever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Syverson, please bring...

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Are you saying that there is -- there is no...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...please bring your remarks to a close.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

...on this legislation here, there is no tax being taken away or no new tax being added to the airline industry or those providing airline services in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

What I said -- what -- it was not going to negatively

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

affect that industry. There is no tax being added. We're closing the corporate loophole, but it won't negatively affect the industry whatsoever. By the way, these were chosen -- this is a concurrence motion, which came over from the -- the House, which means Speaker Madigan and Leader Currie chose these if that gives you a level of comfort.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lauzen, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Let's -- let's make no mistake about what we're doing on this bill. The effect of this legislation is to increase taxes. Just -- I'd like to give just a little background information and then ask one question of the sponsor. First of all, on the apportionment formula, this legislation gives authority to the Director of Revenue to apportion tax liability, rather than the formula being specified in law, if the Director judges that a business has not paid enough in taxes. So, it creates a rule of the Director rather than the rule of law. That is a really bad precedent to be setting. Secondly, when other states have made changes of this magnitude - two hundred and thirty-two million dollars - to their tax laws, they've spent months and years studying the alternatives and working with all of their affected taxpayer groups to reach workable solutions. There's been no such effort here. We're being asked to vote on this legislation without any opportunity for comment or input - not even in a committee, as Senator Radogno pointed out - by the industries that are most affected by its proposal. These last minute changes to some of the most fundamental provisions of our tax law will have a

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

profound effect on our State's economy and that will not be in keeping with the best interests of the citizens of this State. Just one example, provisions in this bill that affect financial institutions will lead to major changes in how banking is done in the State. Illinois is the most competitive banking market in the country. This bill will result in the loss of business to competitors headquartered in other states with more favorable The provisions of this bill will increase the cost of credit in this State, resulting in less credit availability for both businesses and Illinois residents. Finally, to the question that I'd like to ask you, Senator. An example of how ill-conceived this bill is, is the withholding for nonresidents in Sub S corporations. Here's the question: Tax liabilities in an S corporation is calculated on the profit that's earned, not on the amount that's paid out or disbursed. If a profit is retained for working capital and no distribution is made, how can there be any withholding that you're counting twenty million it's held within the corporation, not dollars for? Ιf distributed, how can there be a withholding for the taxpayer? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lauzen, your time has expired. Senator -- Senator Hendon, you can...

SENATOR HENDON:

My esteemed colleague asked about five, six questions in -in one convoluted statement. So, let me just try to deal with a
couple of 'em very quickly. First of all, only Missouri and
Illinois do follow the rule of law, as you described earlier, on
the apportionments. And we trust that the Director of Revenue
will be able to do the right job. As far as the Sub S

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

corporations go, I've already answered that and explained it and we're simply closing the corporate loopholes. You got to be for something. You're not for GRT. You're not for gaming bringing in revenue. We're for...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Hultgren. Senator Hultgren, are you seeking recognition on this issue, sir?

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...bill, sir.

SENATOR HULTGREN:

Again, it's amazing, coming to the supposedly last night of a Session and again feeling this buildup over the last couple years of -- and going back to even the Governor's speech a couple months ago, where the number one enemy here in the State of Illinois isn't our criminals, it isn't drug dealers, it isn't gangs; the number one enemy, again, is business here in the State - employers, people providing jobs. Once again, I think we go through this list of -- everybody wants to call these tax loopholes. What they are, were very intentional incentives to have people create jobs. We realize for every job that's created, literally we save tens of thousands of dollars of State money that would be paid out if we can be creating jobs. So, it's a tax savings for us to -- be providing these incentives. It drives me crazy when people keep bringing up loopholes when reality is -- what -- what that's saying is Legislatures weren't smart enough to understand the legislation and were -- missed these things. And that's just not true.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

There was a very intentional thought there to make sure that we're keeping businesses here and encouraging our businesses to do business here in the State of Illinois, create jobs, have employers want to be here, want to have this be a climate where they're going to grow their business, create more jobs, have more money coming into our economy. And instead, we're doing everything we possibly can to work against that job creation, that risk that people are taking to go out and start businesses. Again, this is just one more step, one more message that is sent out from a -- really a -- a very poor Session. One more message on this final night stating that we don't care about our business owners, we don't care about -- our employers, we're going to do everything we can to drive 'em out of the State of Illinois. And again, it's a horrible message that we've sent and I think it's a horrible finale here. Right now we're fortyfifth worst in the nation to do business, and I think this is one more argument for that ranking, to say maybe we should even slip a little bit further. It's a shame. It really is. And again, when there's so many other important issues for us to be dealing with, again, to be pushing more jobs out of the State of Illinois is the wrong direction to go. I encourage everybody to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill and then a question. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we all know you can't bring more revenues in the State of Illinois without increasing taxes. Senator, we know this is a tax increase. First question of you

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

is, what do you intend to do with this over two million -- two hundred million dollars in tax increases.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

...it. Spend it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Well, we know you're good at that, Rickey. We know you're good at that. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's -- let's -- let me ask another question. You've -- you've clarified that the House is for this. How about the Governor's Office, or the Governor, himself? Since we're trying to clarify who's for this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

I believe the Governor would take the money and help us spend it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

To the bill: That doesn't surprise me as well. Ladies and Gentlemen, Ronald Reagan was quoted earlier by Senator Clayborne. He talked about creating jobs. Some statistics: Illinois is the fifth-largest State in the nation. We should be proud of that. But instead, the tax policies and the fee policies of the last four years of this administration and -- and the Democrats have put us in a position where Forbes

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

magazine ranks us the forty-forth worst state in the nation to do business. In fact, the U.S. Department of Labor just gave its most recent findings, and where we're the fifth-largest State in the nation, in fact, over the last four years, while you have increased taxes and fees three hundred million dollars a year on businesses and taken away three hundred million dollars in incentives for businesses to invest in Illinois, Illinois has produced at the fifth worst job-performing State in the nation. Ladies and Gentlemen, wake up. These policies cost us jobs. They not only cost us the revenue associated with the jobs, which is over four thousand dollars per job - a loss of over one half a million jobs per year - over two billion dollars in revenue that you've left at the side - but that's five hundred thousand families that are without a quality of life that they would receive from gainful employment. When are you going to wake up? When are you going to stop dipping into the hands of businesses that increase the quality of life we have in this State? Vote No. Bring jobs to Illinois and work to balance our budget without reaching into the taxpayers' pockets yet once again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Thank you, Senator Brady. Final person seeking recognition is Leader Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. President. I -- I notice on the board it says the Film Production Tax Credit, which, of course, is a loophole that -- that the sponsor of the legislation has sponsored for the last several years, and we've -- we've helped him with this. And we -- we know the importance

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

of incentives for businesses to come to Illinois. And -- and because of this film industry loophole, we've done very well in Illinois. So I -- I applaud the sponsor for seeing the -- and recognizing the importance of loopholes in this State and what it can mean. But now, of course, he's amended this and now we're going in a different direction. We're becoming very antijob and anti-business. But I would like to ask the -- the sponsor a question, if I might. Sponsor, question, Mr. President. Mr. President. Yes. Thank you. Like to ask a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield for a question.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Thank you. Page 134 changes the apportionment formula for determining taxable Illinois business income from transportation. The Illinois factor includes all miles passing through the State. What is actually your intent here, as I read this language "passing through"?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

First of all, let me let you know that the film tax credit, we're -- we're -- we're closing that loophole as well, so that should give you some level of comfort. But passing through the State, is simply we have some people sometimes that'll set a P.O. box up, get a mortgage mailed to them at this P.O. box in a different State, and then not pay the taxes that they owe to the State of Illinois. So, we want money that pass through the State to stay in the State.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. Well, that becomes double taxation to the trucking industry. We -- we have heard from the trucking industry. They have major concerns with this. And if you may recall during the first year of this Governor's administration, he raised the fees and taxes on trucks in this State. Illinois trucking industry and especially the Mid-West Truckers -- seventeen thousand licenses. Seventeen thousand licenses were not renewed and that -- because of the negative climate on the trucking industry in this State. That's a lot of jobs. you've been talking about jobs over there on your side of the aisle all night. You've used that to -- excuse to expand the You've used excuse, excuse, after excuse. gaming industry. Well, here's an opportunity to have a positive impact on jobs by voting No. Two hundred and two million dollars -- or two hundred and thirteen million dollars in more taxes on the business community who we -- we rely on to employ the people we represent. It doesn't make any sense, Mr. -- Senator Hendon. It doesn't make any sense at all. And I'm disappointed to hear you say they're taking the film tax credit out, because that's been a successful tax credit in this State...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Please -- please. Leader Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

...which you have championed. You...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...please bring your remarks to a close, sir.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. It is a bad idea. We have to be careful what - what we do and the messages we send to those people who employ the good people of this State. And that you ought to be voting No. All of you ought to be voting No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 1544. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays, 0 voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 to Senate Bill 1544. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Watson, are you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, DeLeo, I am.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

I can hear you now.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. And I'm glad you're paying attention. I'd like to verify the roll call, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

So, the gentleman is requesting a verification. Will all Members please be in their seats? Madam Secretary, would you read the Members voting in the affirmative, please?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, Delgado, Demuzio, Forby, Frerichs, Garrett, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Holmes, Hunter, Koehler, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Noland, Raoul, Ronen, Schoenberg, Silverstein, Sullivan, Trotter, Viverito, Wilhelmi and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator, do you question any presence of any Member voting in the affirmative, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator -- oh, I'm sorry. Senator Meeks is here. Senator Demuzio. She is here also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio is in her seat.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Garrett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Susan Garrett's in her Chair. She never leaves.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Lightford's in the rear of the Chamber. Senator Lightford. Senator Lightford's here.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. On a verified roll call, there are 32 Ayes, 26 Nays. Senate Bill 1544, having received the required constitutional majority, is again declared passed. Senator Dahl, for what purpose you seek recognition, sir?

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

SENATOR DAHL:

Thank you, Mr. President. On Senate Bill 1544, I was a No vote. I intended to be recorded as -- I was -- as a No vote. I was down as a didn't vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The record will so reflect your intention, sir.

SENATOR DAHL:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to turn to page 3 of your Calendar. Page 3 of your Calendar comes Senate Bills 3rd Reading. On the top of page 3 is Senate Bill 5. Senate Bill 5. Okay, the sponsor has been changed to Senator Ronen. Senator Carol Ronen. Do you wish to proceed? Do you wish to proceed, ma'am? She indicates she wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the bill. Excuse me. I understand that, Senator Ronen, you're going to seek leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 5 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is that correct, ma'am? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 5. Madam Secretary, has there been any amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Ronen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Ronen, to explain your amendment, ma'am.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President. Happy to do this. Be happy to explain the substance of the bill when we get to 3rd

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Reading. This amendment, I believe, becomes the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, is there any discussion on the amendment? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would request a roll call vote on the adoption of Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 5, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, the gentleman has request -- so, Senator Ronen moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 5. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 29 Ayes, 28 Nays. And the amendment is adopted. Leader Watson, for what purpose you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. I'd like to verify one more time if I could. I've seen people come and go and nobody's in their seat. If everybody would be in their seat...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Gentleman has asked for a verification on the...

SENATOR WATSON:

...we wouldn't -- we wouldn't request these if people would sit in their...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

...adoption of the amendment. That request is in order. Senator Watson has requested a verification. Excuse me. Will the Members all be in their seats? Madam Secretary, would you

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

read the Members voting in the affirmative, please? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, Delgado, Demuzio, Forby, Garrett, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Koehler, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Noland, Raoul, Ronen, Sandoval, Schoenberg, Silverstein, Trotter, Wilhelmi and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

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

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Frerichs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR WATSON:

Oh, yeah. He didn't vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Frerichs is not voting.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson, do you question any other -- presence of any other Member, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

One more negative hole in the business climate. I tell you what, it's unbelievable what you're doing to us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

On a verified roll call, there are 29 Ayes, 28 Nays, 0 voting Present. Floor Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Madam

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Secretary, has there been any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Yes, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Ronen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen, to explain Floor Amendment No. 2, ma'am. SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This changes the Community Center Targeted Expansion Act {sic} to Community Health Provider Targeted Expansion Act. This is a technical change. A language problem in the original bill. A technical amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

If we could just hold on one second. The board still reads Floor Amendment No. 2. The board should be corrected to read Floor Amendment No. 2. I understand... Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senator Ronen moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 5. Senator Righter, are you seeking recognition? Okay, Senator Ronen moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 5. All those in favor will say Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Madam Secretary, have there been any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Koehler, to explain your amendment. Floor Amendment No. 6, sir.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 6 does a couple of things. One is that, in figuring out the assessment against an employer, it's important to not count against that employer any employee who has insurance from another employer. As an example, a spouse employee -- employed at another employer if you have your spouse covered, that employer doesn't have to have it counted against them. It also takes into consideration that in some companies where you have a few very high paid employees that you wouldn't have to use that whole amount again to figure out the four-percent threshold. So this protects employers who do offer insurance from not having to have trouble in meeting that formula. So, I'd -- I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Yes, Mr. President. The Senate Republicans request a caucus immediately in Senator Watson's Office, please. I appreciate, Mr. President, if you want to go ahead and allow Amendment 6 to be adopted onto that and then we'd be happy to go to caucus after that, sir. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senator Koehler moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 5. All those in favor will say Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

Floor Amendment No. 7, offered by Senator Hunter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator -- Senator Hunter, on Floor Amendment No. 7. Senator Hunter, to explain your amendment, ma'am. Floor Amendment No. 7.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment 7, in honor of the late Senator Margaret Smith, it adds her name onto this piece of legislation as the Margaret Smith Illinois Health Care Act For All {sic}. Because of -- Senator Smith, back in the 80s when it was not fashionable to deal with the issue of universal health care, Senator Smith introduced bills and she used her position as chairwoman of the Senate Public Health and Welfare Committee to conduct statewide hearings on this issue. She also worked relentlessly to realize the dream of universal health care in Illinois. But it never came to fruition in her lifetime. So due to her work on the universal health care and other issues, she was elected to the -- to the chairperson of various kinds of national organizations. And just basically, in her honor, we'd like to name this piece of important legislation after her, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Leader Watson, are you seeking recognition, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, for another request, but I tell you what, I -- I would echo what Senator Hunter just talked about with Margaret Smith. I had the ability and privilege to serve with her and

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

she's a wonderful lady and she treated everybody with a -- a lot of dignity. I think it's great that you're doing this. I think it's -- it's a fabulous gesture and I appreciate what you're doing. But I would like to -- and I understand - I just talked with the Senate President - this bill will not be called this evening. So our request for a caucus is -- will be rescinded. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Leader Watson. Senator Lightford, are you seeking recognition to speak to the amendment, ma'am?

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes, Mr. President. And I'll be brief. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the amendment.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you. I'd be remiss if I didn't, too, rise in support of this legislation and really acknowledge what a wonderful woman Senator Margaret Smith was. And she did lead the fight on many health care issues. And when she had taken ill, I'd gone over to St. John's Hospital to receive an award in her honor, and even in the midst of her -- on her way to glory, she was still being honored by health institutions across the State of Illinois. And I just want to thank Senator Hunter for remembering Margaret Smith with -- with her passion and it's such a blessing that we can honor her in this way. And I encourage all of us to vote Aye. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much. Senator -- seeing no further discussion, Senator Hunter moves the adoption of Floor Amendment

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

No. 7 to Senate Bill 5. All those in favor will say Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment's adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. 3rd Reading. Leave of the Body, we will turn your Senate Calendars to page 13. Page 13 of your Senate Calendars is Senate Bills 3rd Reading. We will go to Senate Bill 890. Senator James Clayborne. Senator Clayborne is seeking leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 890 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is that correct, sir? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 890. Madam Secretary, has there been any amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne, to explain your amendment, sir. SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

The amendment exempts all riverboat gaming facilities from the smoking ban for five years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator John Cullerton, are you seeking recognition to this amendment, sir?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes.

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the amendment, sir.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Does he want to... Is this the only amendment that's going to be offered on this bill, sir?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Secretary has indicated this would be the only amendment, sir.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

So we can adopt the amendment and debate it on 3rd Reading if it's going to be called? Maybe we should do with this bill what we did with the last one. We should adopt the amendment and then not call it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne, as the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman's request, are you -- going to move to the Order of 3rd Reading this evening, sir?

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne. Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

I'd like to ask for a roll call vote on this amendment, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay, the gentleman has requested a roll call on the

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

amendment. Senator Clayborne moves the adoption of Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 890. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 26 Ayes, 31 Nays, 0 voting Present. The -- the amendment fails. ...Secretary, are there any further amendments -- Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

3rd Reading. The sponsor would like to proceed with this, sir? President Jones, for what purpose you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. Many of you may have noticed that we, on this side of the aisle, are wearing these red and white buttons -- red, white and blue buttons that says "Tucker". Some of you may have mispronounced that last name. But Lawren Tucker is our policy director over here. He's been on our staff since 1984 when he started as a staff intern. He's one of the few staff members who have served on our staffs in -- in all three positions: communications, appropriations and substantive staff. Lawrence -- Lawren has quite a collection of campaign, antique literature, you know, and buttons going back for many, many years, which is why we chose this item to express our appreciation for his twenty-three years of service to our caucus as a good, good staff person. Lawren is leaving us today and today is his last day. Matter of fact, it is June 1st and

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

he'll be starting a new job as Chief Deputy Director of the State Library. And it's ironic that we're here on June 1st. We wanted to be here on June 1st, because today is his birthday. So -- so, -- I wish all of us -- you would join with me in giving him a tremendous round of applause for staying here this long and...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

President Jones, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR E. JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. For two consecutive days, we have worked late in the evening and times have changed, wherein there were times years ago that we would work this late for nearly the last two weeks of Session, and these are our first two late evening hours that we've served here in the Illinois Senate trying to take care of the business of the people of the State of Illinois. And -- and seeing to it that you all worked so hard, we will come back tomorrow at around 11 a.m. and work a few short hours. And perhaps if the Minority Leader is kind, we may go home and return next week. I'll see how kind he is tomorrow. He will determine whether or not we will be here Saturday or Sunday. So -- so -- so, if we happen to come in on Saturday and Sunday, then thank the Minority Leader for that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Madam Secretary, Communications.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I have a letter dated May 31st, 2007.

Dear Madam Secretary - Pursuant to Senate Rule 2-10, I hereby establish December 31st, 2007, as the committee deadline

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

and December 31st, 2007, as the 3rd Reading deadline for House Bill 291.

Sincerely, Emil Jones, Jr., Senate President.

I have a like letter dated May 31st, 2007.

Dear Madam Secretary - Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Rule 2-10, I hereby establish December 31st, 2007, as the 3rd Reading deadline for the following Legislative Measures: House Bill -- 1750, all House bills and all Senate bills on the Order of 3rd Reading on the May 31st, 2007 Senate Calendar. Sincerely, Emil Jones, Jr., Senate President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Good morning, Mr. President. I am. I would just like to rise for purposes of announcement, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Please state your announcement, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. For the benefit of the Members on our side of the aisle, we will be -- thank you, Mr. President. For the benefit of the Members on our side of the aisle, we will be having a caucus in Senator Watson's Office tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson, are you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you very much. After the speech from the President of the Senate, I just had to comment: The fact that here it is 12:20. With a majority of thirty-seven - with a

50th Legislative Day

5/31/2007

majority of thirty-seven - and you can't pass a budget. You can't -- you can't do the business of the Governor. The Gross Receipts Tax, we never even had a vote. We can't -- and you can't get it done, I think, is -- you have to be embarrassed, and I know many of you are. I know many of you are. This -- to have thirty-seven votes and pound your chest...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson, do you have an announcement? SENATOR WATSON:

...about how we are and how great we...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Ladies and Gentlemen, there being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 11 a.m., tomorrow, June 1st, the year 2007. The Senate stands adjourned.