### 172nd Legislative Day 9/23/2008

HB1533	Veto Action	7
	Recalled	12
	Third Reading	19
	Veto Action	7
	Veto Action	11
	Veto Action	3
	Recalled	36
	Third Reading	37
	Concurrence	72
	Concurrence	103
	Veto Action	4
	Veto Action	5
	Tabled	117
	Resolution Offered	1
	Resolution Offered	117
	Resolution Offered	2
Senate to Order-Senator Clayborne		1
Prayer-Pastor Barrie West		1
Pledge of Allegiance		1
Journal-Approved		1
Message from the House		2
Committee Reports		2
Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes		70
Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes		71
Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes		71
Committee Reports		71
Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes		72
Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted		117
Adjournment		118

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

The regular Session of the 95th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members be at their desk? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor Barrie West, Holy City Baptist Church, 1601 East Carpenter, Springfield, Illinois.

PASTOR BARRIE WEST:

(Prayer by Pastor Barrie West)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

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

SENATOR MALONEY:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Maloney)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Journal of September 22nd, 2008.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. 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 CLAYBORNE)

Senator Hunter moves the approval of the Journal just read by the Secretary. There being no objection, so ordered. Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 872, offered by Senator Millner and all -

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

- and all Members.

It is a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, Messages.

#### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I've got a Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 142.

Offered by Senator Clayborne, and adopted by the House, September 10th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

And it is substantive, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

#### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 780 and Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill -- I'm sorry, House Bill 2070 recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Any Members at the sound of my voice, we are proceeding to final action. Could you please come to the Floor? All Members at the sound of my voice, could you please come to the Floor for final action? Please come to the Floor. WICS Channel seeks leave to videotape. Seeing no objections, leave is granted. On middle of page 8 in the -- on the Calendar, in Order of Motions in Writing, Accept Specific Recommendations for Change, we'll

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

start with Senate Bill 546. Senator Cullerton. Do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, read the motion.

### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 546 in manner and form as follows:

Amendment to Senate Bill 546

In Acceptance of Governor's Recommendations

Filed -- filed by Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Cullerton, to -- to explain.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill had -- was an agreed bill that passed unanimously out of the Senate. It was in negotiations that took a long time to get that agreement. And we left in the bill the effective date of July 1st, 2008. And we realized after we passed it that that -- we needed more time to implement the bill, so we actually requested the Governor to do this amendatory veto. And basically what it does, it just extend the effective date to July 1st, 2009. It was at our request and I would ask that we accept the Governor's recommendation.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none -- oh, I'm -- I'm sorry. Senator Cullerton moves -- moves to -- Senator Cullerton moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 546. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 546 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Cullerton. Those in

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

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. There are 52 voting Yea, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor to Senate Bill 546, having received the constitutional majority vote of the Senators elected, are declared accepted. Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 2327. Do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, read the motion.

### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2327 in manner and form as follows:

Amendment to Senate Bill 2327

In Acceptance of Governor's Recommendations

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Cullerton, to explain.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This also was a bill that passed unanimously and the Governor's changes are acceptable. They're minor. All he's saying is that this study is subject to appropriation and he changes the effective date to the -- rather than the effective date being the effective date of this amendatory Act, that it be with the completion of the study. So it's not controversial. Would move to accept the Governor's recommended changes.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Cullerton moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2327. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2327 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Cullerton. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 57 voting Yea, none -- 56 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to 2327, having -- Senate Bill 2327, having received the constitutional majority vote of the Senators elected, are declared accepted. Senate Bill 2340. A.J. Wilhelmi, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the motion. SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2340 in manner and form as follows:

Amendment to Senate Bill 2340

In Acceptance of Governor's Recommendations Filed by Senator A.J. Wilhelmi.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator A.J. Wilhelmi, would you explain the bill? SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I find that the specific recommendations of the Governor are acceptable on this bill, Senate Bill 2340. As passed, the bill creates standards for the preservation of evidence for offenses involving heroine, cocaine, PCP, LSD and fentanyl. The bill also provides for minimum quantities of each listed controlled substance that must be -- preserved and provides for the destruction of excess quantities and the destruction of unneeded evidence after conviction and after

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

notice to the defendant. The Governor has added a requirement that notice must be given to the State's Attorney and that there must be a hearing prior to the destruction of any of this evidence. This is a problem in Cook County, where there are stores and stores of this kind of narcotic. We would like to be able to make it easier for the State's Attorney's Office and the -- the sheriff to be able to destroy this evidence. But we also want to make sure we preserve due process rights and we make sure there's a hearing before such destruction of that evidence. I find the -- the recommendations of the Governor acceptable. I'll be happy to answer any questions. And I ask for an Aye vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator A.J. Wilhelmi moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2340. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2340 in the manner and form just stated by Senator A.J. Wilhelmi. 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. There being 55 voting Yea, 1 Nay, none Present, the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 2340, having received the constitutional majority of the vote of the Senators elected, are declared accepted. Now we'll be moving down to Motions in Writing to Accept Specific Recommendations for Change for House bills. Senator Dillard, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1533 in manner and form as follows:

Amendment to House Bill 1533

In Acceptance of Governor's Recommendations Filed by Senator Kirk Dillard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Dillard, on House Bill 1533. Please explain. SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I am pleased to move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on a bill that deals with ALL KIDS cost sharing requirements. The Governor made a couple of minor changes to the public posting requirements. And I'm happy to accept your Governor's changes -- our Governor's changes to this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Dillard Senator moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1533. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1533 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Dillard. 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. There being 55 Yea, none Nay, none voting Present, the specific recommendations of the House Bill 1533, having received Governor to as constitutional majority of the Senators elected, are declared accepted. House Bill 3286. Senator Schoenberg, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 3286 in manner and form as follows:

Amendment to House Bill 3286

In Acceptance of Governor's Recommendations

Filed by Senator Jeff Schoenberg.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg, to explain.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's such a delight to be on the Calendar once again today. I haven't been called on this much since fourth grade. I -- I'm urging the Body to accept the Governor's amendatory veto of House Bill 3286. Makes a number of recommended changes that provide greater specificity on appointments and providing greater accountability to the General Assembly for how the Health Policy Center at the University of Illinois would spend its money and the research activities it undertakes. All this transparency is good. So I urge your support.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 3286. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Schoenberg, you said in

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

your comments that among the Governor's changes were alterations that would provide more specificity as to the appointments. Can you clarify what you mean by that? I know -- I know he's added people, all people from the Governor's office. But what kind of specificity do you think he's added?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The specificity I was referring to is that he -- he specifically designates which directors or designees - rather than just give the executive several appointments, rather they designate specifically which directors or their surrogates. And in this case - the Department of Health and Human Services, the Director of Healthcare and Family Services, Director of Public Health - three of those appointments would be -- are specified for who they are. There is an additional appointment at the discretion of the Governor. And as I mentioned also, that there's a reporting requirement, which does not exist, which goes -- provides considerable accountability for expenditures and research that's being done by the Health Policy Center.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, Senator Schoenberg, I'm looking at -- it's my understanding the original language gave him one appointment and now we've expanded that to five appointments. So, of the thirteen people on the board, the Governor has over a third of the appointments. Is that the way you read his amendatory veto language?

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Senator Righter, I think the reason why I'm accepting these changes and why they've been -- also endorsed by the Illinois Hospital Association, the Illinois State Medical Society, and the University of Illinois itself, is because we want to make sure that all the relevant agencies are looped in at the highest levels on this advisory board for the new Health Policy Center. In the end, I think we just need to stay focused on the original intent of this, which is to minimize the amount of money we outsource to study things like managed care and reimbursement rates and how to have more effective health care policy and do all of those, taking full advantage of our academic institutions here in State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the motion, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

You -- you may proceed.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator Schoenberg. And I -- I supported this, obviously, the first time around. Obviously, I was cosponsor of the bill. I think that it's the right thing to do. But I do think that it is -- we are on thin ice accepting these particular recommendations. Many, many would argue that in the State part of the problem that we've had with health care policy in the last five or six years is that the Governor's

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

tried to dominate the discussion and not sit down with other people. And it would appear that's what he's doing through this appointment process as well. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Seeing no further discussion, the question is -- oh, Senator Schoenberg, do you want to close?

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 3286 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Schoenberg. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 55 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 3286 -- House Bill 3286, having received the constitutional majority of the vote of the Senators elected, are declared accepted. House Bill 5318. Senator Maloney. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

#### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 5318 in manner and form as follows:

Amendment to House Bill 5318

In Acceptance of Governor's Recommendations

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Maloney, to explain the bill -- explain the motion. SENATOR MALONEY:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 5318 provides for the involvement of providers, consumers and workers in the implementation of the fingerprint check law we passed last year. The legislation gives oversight responsibilities to the existing Health Care Worker Task Force. And originally the bill shifted some of the appointment power away from the Governor to the task force. This returns that appointment power back to the Governor. He doesn't appoint all the members of the task force, certain number. This has been -- this -- the House sponsor is fine with this. And also, the main supporter of this bill, the Health Care Council of Illinois, is also willing to accept this recommendation by the Governor. And I urge its support.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Maloney moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 5318. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 5318 in the manner and form just stated by Senator Maloney. Those in favor -- favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 54 voting Yea, none voting Nay, none voting Present. The specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 5318, having received the constitutional majority of the -- of the Senators elected, are declared accepted. We will now proceed to the -page 2, order on the Calendar, House Bill 3rd Reading. Bill 2070. Senator DeLeo, do you wish to proceed? Senator DeLeo seeks leave of Body to return House Bill 2070 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2070. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo, to explain the amendment.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank -- thank you very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Let me explain what Floor Amendment No. 2 does. Floor number -- Floor Amendment No. 2 on House Bill 2070 actually becomes -- deletes all and becomes the bill. don't think there's anybody in this Chamber that doesn't know what this language does. Let me just brief you in case somebody has been out -- out of the planet for a couple years. House Bill 2070 is identical to Senate Bill 1900. We passed it out of this Chamber earlier this year on a vote of 50 to 4. It passed the House 113 to nothing. And then, over in that other Chamber, Senate Bill 1900 came back here with the anti-rulemaking language. We filed a motion to nonconcur and to date -- to date the House has not receded from that amendment. So, if you care about the autism community -- you know what's in here. There's a cap on there for thirty-six thousand dollars for reinsurance. It's a disability that's affecting the nation. The population is -- the autism community older -- getting older. I can't tell you how many children it's affecting. This is our fourth attempt. Our fourth attempt to pass this bill. It's passed unanimously in both Chambers, and because of political rhetoric

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

in both of these Chambers, this bill -- the autism community is caught in that vacuum. So I'd ask very strongly, for every Member, let's send this back over to the House for the fourth time and hope to God that we get a bill that helps the autism community. Mr. President, I'd ask the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2070, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Pankau.

#### SENATOR PANKAU:

From the last bill that you presented here on the Floor, which was also attached to a House bill, are there any changes? So, from the last version of 1900 to now, it's the exact same bill, no additions, anything?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

That's -- that's correct, Senator. There's -- the identical language in 1900 is in -- in this Floor amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Pankau.

#### SENATOR PANKAU:

And are there any estimates from either the business community or from the Autism Society as to what kind of impact this is going to have? Some of the business community says that this is going to be disastrous. Others say that they don't feel

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

there's hardly going to be any affect. Given the time that has passed, have you had any time to gather some statistics one way or the other?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Well, Senator Pankau, it's -- it's interesting. But from what our studies tell us and what we originally -- you and I had this debate in committee, the lifetime savings -- and I don't know about the initial costs and it could be in the hundreds of millions, but the lifetime savings, the annual cost will save about two hundred to four hundred billion. So, I look at it as further out - the -- the savings to the State to health care with this appropriate legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Pankau.

#### SENATOR PANKAU:

And -- and one final question. Are the -- is the business community still opposed to this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

Yes, they are.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Any further discussion? Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Couple questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, as before, are the -- are the large employers in this State, pretty much those that employ fifty employees or more, are they excluded from this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Yes, they're still exempt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

...under this -- so under this case, the -- the majority of your constituents that work for, then, large employers aren't covered by this. This is only something that's going to affect the small employers in the State. Do you think that's going to send a -- a lot -- some confusion among employees as they move from one employer to another? Or, if they think this is going to pass, what's going to happen to those employees that have children with autism that work for large employers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator Syverson, we can't -- we're following the federal law on this. We can't exempt or change that portion of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Guess my -- my question really goes to how do we explain that to your constituents that won't be covered by this -- this

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

legislation? And that may lead me to the next question. What happens to children then that work -- that their parents work in a -- a large employer? How are they going to be covered, if not then under this insurance mandate? How -- how are they covered under this in -- in Illinois now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Let's hold it down in the back a little bit. Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

They're not. And they can encourage their employer to -- to get this coverage. But, they're not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

### SENATOR SYVERSON:

There's -- there's currently no program out there currently that covers autism - programs in Illinois - for those that don't have insurance now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

Not -- not that we know of. I -- I don't -- I don't know, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Do we know what the cost of this is going to be to small employers? How much it's going to drive the -- the cost of their coverage up? Is -- any estimates on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator, I can't answer that. I don't -- I don't have any raw numbers. I -- I -- I would be guessing. I would -- I would be making up numbers. I don't have any raw data that would tell us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

In just wrapping it up, I guess that's my concern. We're asking today to pass a mandate onto small employers - the ones that are struggling the most in this State - excluding the large employers. We have no idea what the cost is. We're just going to tell them to absorb it, which is going to be a -- a significant cost and a problem to them. We already know that in Illinois more employers canceled their health insurance in this State than any other state in the country last year. one more step. Ultimately, what's going to happen is, the employers will drop the coverage and not only will children not get covered for autism, but they won't get covered for any other illness as well, because the employers won't be able to cover it. I would urge a Present vote on this until we can come back for a solution that'll help address all the children with autism across the State, where they can be treated equally and not just taking on small employers. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Hendon. And this is -- this is not the final vote. This is just on the amendment. Seeing no further discussion, Senator DeLeo moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to -- No. 2

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

- I'm sorry - Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2070. All those in favor will say -- 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, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 2070. Senator DeLeo, do you wish to proceed? Madam -- Madam -- Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 2070.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We just adopted the amendment, which is -- which is the bill. I don't know if there's any further discussion. If there is, I'd just like to hold my rights to close, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator DeLeo, I want to talk

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

not about the merits of the bill now, but about the process that -- that we are engaging in here. How -- how many bills have been sent over to the House that have this language?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

With the amendatory veto, Senate Bill 1900, I believe the other -- House Bill 415 and this will be a total of five bills with the autism language on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, Senator DeLeo, five bills with this language have been sent over to the other Chamber. And a little like the annoying salesman, we keep calling and we can't get anyone over there to even pick up the phone. And what I want to ask you is, do you not think it's time to change strategies here and maybe give a little with whoever's negotiating this bill over in the House? Because clearly there are problems with this bill over in the House or the business community, whatever those concerns are. And -- and this is the reason I ask that, Senator - with all due respect, because I know your concern on this issue is heartfelt - we're not getting anything done for anybody here. This will be the sixth time we've taken this over there and we are getting nowhere. Wouldn't we rather send something over there that the House can sign off on and get some progress done on this issue than continue to beat our heads against a brick wall?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator Righter, I couldn't agree with you more. There's a few people in this Chamber that are still left with a little institutional knowledge. And let me just give you a little history about that little salesman that went knocking at the There was a State Representative that represented the northwest side of Chicago; he came from the 39th Ward. He was a Representative by the name of William Laurino. When I came to Springfield in the early eighties, when I got elected to the House, every year he introduced this bill; it was called -- it was called - and it was his twenty-first year of introducing the same bill - it was called mandatory automobile insurance. on the twenty-first year, Representative William Laurino passed that bill and it became law in Illinois. And just like this autism bill, the insurance companies and small businesses fought the mandatory insurance bill. And after twenty-one years of introducing it, it became law in the State of Illinois. And if I have to introduce autism bill seventeen more times for it to become law, I'll be proud to do that and I'll stay around here until this becomes law in Illinois. It's about the families that bore these expenses. And if you went to the hearings and you listened to the testimony and you listened to families with the children who -- who've borne this cost and they've lost their mortgages, they're living with their relatives. They have accumulated a lot of debt. Some family -- one woman testified they went bankruptcy to try and finance the medical services for her children with autism. So I think that if I have to keep knocking at that door over there to get this, and we stop with the JCAR amendments and we stop with the political maneuvering

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

and we stop with the nonsense and we put the people first -- we put the people first yesterday with an ethics bill. Let's put the children with autism, the families, first and let's pass this bill and let's send it over to the House and let them play their games or whatever they have to do, but let's be a responsible Body here in the Illinois Senate and pass this legislation over there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the motion -- or to the bill, excuse me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

You may proceed.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, after five tries and an impassioned speech, we are exactly in the same place we were when the year started. All of us, every single one of us in this Chamber, if we are talking to our constituents at all, have heard from these families. And what I've heard from these families has changed over the last several months, Mr. President. We've gone from talking about, "Hey, this is a bill, this is a chance to move something forward" to "Hey, why aren't you guys getting anything done?" The families who have children who suffer from autism, with all due respect, are not impressed with the drawing of the line in the sand that the House and the Senate leaders are engaging into. They are not impressed with the debate that goes back and forth about whether or not the Governor ought to be able to put rules on these

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

pieces of legislation. They are not impressed with the impassioned speeches about "for the children" and then, when we leave here, the children haven't been served at all. They're not impressed. What they expect is for the legislators who have been elected to represent them to sit down and work something out that can pass the House, pass the Senate and be signed by the Governor. We can give all the speeches we want. We can be here for the next twenty years like Representative Laurino was. And in that next twenty years, Senator, not one child, not one child will be helped by this bill or anything close to it. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Lauzen.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Is this coverage that's contained in this bill contained for State employees and local schools? Is this coverage contained in government employee policies?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

Yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Are local government agencies also contained in -- I

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

understand that it's true for the State, how about for local government?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Because I -- let's see, I -- another question, I understand that the -- the thrust, the objective of your work on this bill, is to get care for children with autism. Is that coverage -- or can families get that coverage under the ALL KIDS program? I mean, it's for -- it's titled ALL KIDS. This is a -- an essential need. I think everyone in the Chamber agrees with that. Is it -- can people get -- under ALL KIDS, can they get that coverage?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

No, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Can you describe or can you -- I'm surprised that we would put it on the small business owners. We have local government, State government, but it's not contained in the ALL KIDS coverage? Could you describe why that -- why that exists?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

I -- I -- Senator Lauzen, I don't know. I didn't write the ALL KIDS legislation. And if I was part of that task force, I would have added autism to it. It just -- it just was not part of the ALL KIDS coverage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to be the angry one here so Senator DeLeo can remain calm, because I know he really wants to explode because this is about children. It's not about anything other than helping these babies. And I have nothing but respect for Members on the other side of the aisle over there, but it -- it's just troubling that we would be more concerned about the other Chamber today. We weren't concerned about the other Chamber all Session, except when it benefited individuals' political posturing. Here, Senator DeLeo is trying to do something that is good for the children of the State of Illinois, not for the adults. Helping the parents is fine, but these babies are suffering. Five tries, ten tries, if it takes a hundred tries. Take a hundred years for the Cubs to get to the World Series again. Nobody's saying stop trying, stop hitting, stop pitching. Senator DeLeo is doing a great thing here. Give the man his due. Give the children the help they need and quit playing these political games over something this damn serious. If makes no sense. I've been dealing with this all year, when Jimmy first started pushing it really, really hard. And the parents have come to my office. The -- the calls

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

are just -- you can't say "stop trying, Senator DeLeo", because you don't know what's going to happen across the Rotunda. Please, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, put partisan politics aside. I like the insurance industry, have friends in the insurance industry. Fine. This is about the babies. Everyone should vote with Senator DeLeo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just, again, a question for the sponsor. I -- I was shocked when I heard that we don't -- that we're not covering this under ALL KIDS. We just heard from -- from a couple speakers over there and then from Senator Hendon this is about all the kids. And then we find out that ALL KIDS doesn't cover this. I guess I want to verify if that is, in fact, true. And if it is, maybe we need to pull this out and look at making some changes to this. And if this truly care -- if we care about all the kids, that we should be at least putting this coverage onto the program that covers more children than does the small employers in Illinois cover.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

That's a statement, or...

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

No, that's a question of -- it's a request that we pull this out. If we're -- because the comment was made we're concerned about all the kids - if we have more children covered under ALL KIDS than we do under small employers, wouldn't it makes sense for us to take this out and let's amend this and let's make sure that all kids get this important coverage that

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

they need.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Hendon, to respond.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

...President. Since my esteemed colleague and friend mentioned my name, I just have to mention the hypocrisy here and how thick it is, because you were against ALL KIDS. So, if you were for ALL KIDS, you should have supported it when it first came up. Senator DeLeo has found something that was left out and said, "okay, now we want to fix it" and now you want to throw ALL KIDS up in his face and take it out of the record. Why don't you just be honest? Just be honest and say you don't give a damn about the kids who have autism and let 'em fend for theirself. Don't hide behind ALL KIDS program, which you were against when it was proposed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. I'd like to just stress that -- or ask that question again. If we're concerned about all the kids, is there a reason why we're opposed to the idea of having that same coverage under the ALL KIDS program? It should be -- normally when we pass mandates, it's something we've put on ourselves as well. Are you opposed to the idea of -- of putting autism on the ALL KIDS program so they can be treated the -- the same as small employers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

...not opposed to it. And if you'd like to sponsor the -the appropriation bill with me, I'd be glad to put it into ALL
KIDS, the -- the entire program. And we can deal with that
after what -- we see what the House does on House Bill 2070.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. I'll wrap it up with this. I would have -- I would look at sponsoring the appropriation side of it, but as you mentioned earlier, we have no idea what the cost of this program is. And we've heard that it's not going to be that expensive and it's not going to drive rates up that much. And if it's not going to cost that much, why wouldn't we give that to all kids in Illinois, especially if it's not that expensive of a rider to do? So, again, I would -- I would urge -- let's do something for all the kids in Illinois, as opposed to just the -- just one small segment of small employers. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Delgado.

### SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Let -- let's -- let's put this in perspective. Let's move forward and -- and think going forward. Not only were you -- we challenged with trying to provide secure medical services for young folks and others with autism, but let's talk about now, with more and more families through Autism Speaks and -- and Autism of America -- the Autism Society of America that continue to bring more families out. Let's take our children to the swimming pools in the park districts. What's going on in the

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

infrastructure? Can a family go and help their child change and be able to recognize the autism symptoms of a child? going to need a complete infrastructure. I see an entire Act coming out of here. Let's have some vision as we move forward, as pioneers in this area of something that's impacting our State. Let's talk about the families that are about to sue park districts because this summer they wanted their autistic child to swim and could not go into the swimming pool because Johnny couldn't change his own clothes, therefore a mother wasn't allowed to accommodate that child. Let's talk about having to build family centers for these families in those parks. talk about school and -- and -- and therapies and what's going to be necessary in the infrastructure of our educational system. You have not begun to address the issues of this community with this type of -- of challenge. We cannot -- we can build a bridge and say it's going to cost three million, but as we've discussed this before with a colleague of mine on the other side of the aisle in front of stakeholders recently this summer, we know that health care changes in your family and those dynamics change. And oh, yes, they do want to hear about us arguing for not only the children, but the moms and dads who need respite, who have become zombies in their own homes because they don't have the freedom and the moneys that it takes. It approximately would take about 3.2 million dollars to provide care for an autistic person over his or her lifetime. And already they're over twenty-one and we know someone who is forty-five. Poor mom and dad. Talk about the quality of the employee for that small employer. What kind of employee is going there? So let's talk about autism. Let's talk about all of the things we're going to

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

have to do and the dollars we'll have to spend putting together a comprehensive public health Act to address this needy population. And why go backwards? We can walk and chew gum at the same time. Let's continue. And I agree, we should have this in ALL KIDS. That's one of our faults. But let's not go ahead and throw the -- as you will - no pun intended - throw the baby out with the bathwater here. I commend the sponsor and I commend the organizations that are behind it. We have -- and to close, Mr. President, according to Dr. Michael Ganz, Assistant Professor of -- of Society, Human Development, and Health at Harvard School of Public Health, it is going to cost quite a bit to be able to take care of this population because of our own neglect and our inability to want to get up and do the right thing. So, when we start talking about this, get ready. I have a slew of bills that are going to come so that we can accommodate this population, because they live and pay taxes in Illinois just like we do. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Sandoval.

### SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to commend the sponsor, Senator DeLeo, on House Bill 2070. I was quite impressed and moved by the impassioned speech he gave just a few minutes ago. It's probably one of the more sincere and passionate speeches I've heard all year here in the Legislature. To see a statesman and a man of the caliber of Jimmy DeLeo speak on an issue like autism is quite inspiring. Nonetheless, let's really put it in perspective. I'm quite impressed with the homework that Senator Lauzen did on this bill. I see that he was able to find that --

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

that ALL KIDS does not provide that coverage. Doesn't hold back the fact that the issue of autism is important. It affects many families in the State of Illinois in our backyards. And I -although I support Senator DeLeo's bill, let's not hypocritical here in the General Assembly, in the Illinois Senate. Because it is government that serves to be the net for all those who are less fortunate in society. And it is to government that the people and the children look for, for coverage for issues like autism. And it is quite a sad day today, once again, that the State of Illinois, the government -and government exists for those people who don't -- can't -- who can't fend for themselves, those who need a hand. quite alarming to hear the fact that the ALL KIDS program does not provide coverage for all children in the State of Illinois as relates to autism. Government should lead by example. very rare that we -- that we see to the private sector to lead by example. It is the State of Illinois that should be at the forefront and, quite honestly, I think we've been caught with It's quite embarrassing. our pants down. It's quite embarrassing for all of us as State Senators and Representatives of the people of Illinois to sit here and do nothing or promise that ALL KIDS will be amended to include coverage for autism. Once again, I remind you that government should lead by example. And if we don't lead by example, we should not expect the private sector to do that for us. I support Senator DeLeo's sponsorship of this bill and I look for passage of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Thank you, Mr. President. To -- to the bill: You know, I suspect you're going to get support on this side of the aisle on what you do. I mean, I -- I understand the issue. I have a daughter-in-law who works with autistic children. But I -- I guess I sort of resent the idea that if there's questions about doing this that we don't care about kids. I hope you -- you know, and -- and I really do resent that because we care about kids. I think I do as much as anybody over there does. And -and that has been made over and over again. You know, I think there is a concern, obviously, on this side and I think it has to concern you too, and that is, where do we stop mandating things that insurance companies do that force the rates up on other people? I mean, there -- there is -- there is - I hope you would agree - a limit. And -- and that is one of the things I think that concerns many people on this side of the aisle. So, I -- I -- again, I -- I hope that you don't mean what you say, but -- but it appears some of you do. We care as much as you do about it, or at least I think I do. And you're going to get votes here. But there is a limit and -- and I guess I would ask Senator -- the sponsor the question, where does he think that limit is? And -- and I hope he -- and I -- and I hope he understands what I'm -- what I'm saying.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator Luechtefeld, as you know, we talked to people in the health insurance and that's why there's a cap in this bill of thirty-six thousand dollars, a ceiling. And so I think that -- that was a -- a fair negotiation.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

For anyone who is aware of autism, and -- and it -- and it appears that you have really researched this, it is -- there are many forms of it, many levels of it, many degrees of it. And also, I guess, in the bill is there a definition at all of -- of -- of autism? Because, you know, that's a tough one to -- to nail down. Is there some definition of what autism is? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Yes. Actually, in the bill, there is a definition what defines and who can define the patient, and what -- what can be prescribed by who and what doctor. So, there is a total definition in -- in the -- in the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Last speaker is Leader Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. President. I can't say much more than what Senator Luechtefeld did. There's nothing partisan about this at all. Autism is a -- is a serious, serious problem and it seems to be a growing problem. It used to be, you know, you knew of someone who had autism, but now we all know someone, of friends and neighbors and families, that -- that have this unfortunate affliction. And -- and something needs to be done, obviously. But what you don't seem to understand and what the real world is out there is who's providing this coverage. And when you mandate more and more

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

onto a policy, all it does is increase the cost. And you may be trying to do something for someone here in a family, and I appreciate that, but ultimately, in the end, you could very well be hurting them. Because these companies could very well just decide we can't afford health insurance anymore. The cost has just got prohibitive, and as a result, we throw these people out and -- and -- and they have no insurance. And maybe ultimately that's the goal of some people who want to nationalize health insurance, is just raise the cost so high that no one will be able to provide for it themselves anymore, whether it's businesses or individuals. I think there is a -- there is a theory there that that's exactly what's going on. And maybe -and I don't think that's what you're doing here, Senator DeLeo. But I think what all of us need to understand is that the -- in the real world somebody has to pay. Now, Senator Sandoval talked about the -- the government and the government is the safety net. Well, this isn't the government we're talking about This is the private sector who many -- who provide insurance for their employees. Decisions will be made all over the boardrooms throughout this State, throughout this country, as to whether or not health insurance will be provided for their employees. And these are the kinds of issues that determine those decisions. And it's the cost. And you've got to realize that as we do these things, as we do all mandates, and we sit over here and we vote for 'em as well as you do, but there ultimately has to be a price to pay. And maybe that threshold, as Senator Luechtefeld, is getting close. People decide it isn't worth it anymore. So I think we have to be very careful about what we're doing and it certainly isn't a partisan issue.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

It's not that we don't care about kids; it's ultimately about will this have the impact that will maybe take coverage away from the very people you're trying to help. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator DeLeo, to close.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd like to thank all my colleagues for that -- some very pointed questions and it seems to me that there's a real awareness to everybody in this Chamber about the importance of this bill. I'd just like to close and say just a couple things real quickly. Each day there's -- sixty-six children are diagnosed with autism. So, if you do the math, it's an estimate of about three per hour. It's been highly documented that when children with autism which -- that secure the appropriate health care and appropriate services while it's early in life, they make extraordinary strides in their -- in their future. So, we heard some talk about bridges. Illinois. This isn't Alaska. We're not asking to fund a bridge to nowhere. I'm asking you to fund -- pass this legislation so we have a bridge to somewhere for these children and these families. Mr. President, I ask an affirmative roll call on House Bill 2070, sir.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Thank you, Senator. Remind the Body that it takes three-fifths to pass, or thirty-six votes to -- to pass. The question is, shall House Bill 2070 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

the record. On the question, there are 47 voting Yea, 6 voting Nay, 2 Present. House Bill 2070, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Link in the Chair now. We'll be going to page 2. Top of page 2. Senate Bill 780. Senator DeLeo. Senator DeLeo seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 780 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 780. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator DeLeo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo, to explain your amendment.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

I -- thank you very much, Mr. President. I'd like to adopt the amendment. The amendment does become the bill on 780 and I could do discussion, full discussion on -- after the amendment is adopted, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator DeLeo moves the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 780. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Bill 780. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 780.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 780.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Yesterday, Executive Committee, we adopted Floor amendment to Senate Bill 780, and that came following -- after we passed ethic reform here earlier in the day, before we went down to the Executive Committee, Mr. President. We passed a bill for the first time in Illinois history and my colleague, Senator Radogno, got up and I was presiding over the Chamber yesterday - and she was very happy that finally, after a year of people asking for this change in the way that business is done and politics is played in Illinois, Mr. President, we passed it. Well, now comes Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 780 to the Executive Committee. This is a bill that's been asked for, language, by the second floor, the Office of Governor. And let me tell you what's in this amendment that now becomes the bill, Mr. President. Per the recommendations, this would ban outside employment for -for -- by legislators for any unit of State or municipal

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

government. Would now be -- in this bill, would be prohibitive. There's an exception in this prohibition - teachers, counselors, university instructors, police officers and firefighters. if you're elected to a township post, that's exempted also. of the other recommendations, Mr. President, is disclosure. Disclosure. We hear this in this Chamber all the time. Let's put a little bit of sunshine on the process. Let's open up the Well, in this legislation it's disclosure. Legislators, declared candidates, their spouses must disclose lobby activity before boards, commissions, units of local government, including their own clients who they lobby and they get fees from, Mr. President. We're going to find out who's lobbying people. Disclosure. Then we have -- this is the third part of this bill, Mr. President, is the Compensation Review report. Now, you know, as Members in this -- and I say this -this is directed to senior Members, freshman Members, sophomore Members. Every year when we have the compensation pay review report, Mr. President, yes is a no, no is a yes. Yellow means you're not here. Yellow means you're -- you're -- you're chicken. There's -- it doesn't -- we don't even know what yes, no. One Chamber has to reject it. No Chamber -- both Chambers can't reject it. How we get pay raises, it's hypocritical. We don't know, as Members of the General Assembly, how to vote on the Compensation Review report. So how does the public know? So let's take off the little disquise act. Let's take off the disguise act in both Chambers. In this piece of legislation, Mr. President, both Chambers -- both Chambers either accept the pay raise or reject the pay raise. It's that simple. So when the neighbors in your district and your -- and your colleagues

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

and your constituents open up the newspaper, they can look at a roll call that said, Legislator A, Legislator B voted for his or her pay raise. Let's stop this -- the game. One Chamber -- so that's in this bill, too, Mr. President. And last -- last, the fourth part of this legislation, Mr. President, it expands contribution bans. Campaign contribution restrictions will be all - all constitutional officers, Members of the General Assembly, candidates for office and State parties. So, you'd have to -- people who do business with the -- with the State, who have State contracts over fifty thousand dollars, they'd have to register. They'd have to disclose and there would be penalties and sanctions against people that gave contributions. And I said this in committee yesterday, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Chamber, if I'm a contractor and I'm a road builder and I'm a vendor that does business with the State of Illinois, I'd be jumping up and down with joy. I can't contribute any longer. I can't make that contribution to that Member or that constitutional officer. Now I have to bid on a contract and hope that I'm -- get it. And there -- I don't have to go to anymore rubber chicken dinners. I don't have to go to any of these parades. I'm a contractor. I will be a contractor. I'll be a vendor. So these four provisions, Mr. President, is what's contained in that amendment which -- just adopted on Senate Bill 780. And I ask that -- I'll be willing to answer any questions and let's keep this ethic ball rolling.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Can we keep the noise down in the Chamber, please? This is a very important piece of legislation. Senator Silverstein. SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, when this bill was in Executive last night, we had a very lively discussion about the And there are a lot of good points in this bill. However, I have a concern, because what's going on over here is that we're starting the games again. We're starting all the games again. Yesterday was a major step forward we took under the leadership of Senator Harmon, Senator Halvorson in passing that bill, that ethic bill. What this bill does is just, to me, face-saving legislation for the Governor. Lobbing it over to the House, where it's probably going to be DOA, does -- does nothing for ethics. Now, a lot of my colleagues will say it's part of the process, and they're right. That is the process. However, for the last year and a half or two, that process has not been working, plain and simple. We're fed up with it and so is the public. Now, we're all for ethics. We want something done concrete. My recommendation is, let's keep the bill here, work on it. Even in the Executive Committee, representations were made that this was going to be a work in process. And I was very encouraged when Cindi Canary told us that she was going to have negotiations with the Governor's Office. And I thought that was the first step. But by sending this over to the House, we're playing ping-pong again. And how long did it take to get that bill passed yesterday? Well, Senator Harmon will tell us. I don't want that to happen again. 'Cause we -- we, as a Body, must stand up to this and we must show our credibility to the public, which we are losing out there with these games we're playing. So, I'm requesting that we vote Present on this bill. Let the negotiations continue. Maybe we'll be working more expeditiously than the other bill. But please concentrate on

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

this bill. Look what this bill does and what the future does -- what it will bring. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon.

#### SENATOR HARMON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Sponsor indicates he will.

#### SENATOR HARMON:

Senator, this bill is identical to the Governor's specific recommendations for change to House Bill 824, which we unanimously rejected yesterday. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

The language -- yes, it's...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon.

### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. And -- and, Senator, you're aware that I've begun negotiating that very language in your bill with the Governor's Office, with the House sponsor, with the -- the advocates. You're -- you're aware of that negotiation, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Deleo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

I'm aware there -- there's been negotiations going on for about a year with the House and Members from the House and

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

yourself with the Governor's Office. Yes, that's correct. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon.

#### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, Senator. We've actually been negotiating the language in the amendatory veto for the last several weeks. We had a meeting scheduled for today, which we've cancelled because we're here. We're trying to get another meeting scheduled for later this week. And those negotiations were moving along nicely - until now. The effective date of your bill would not be until June of 2009, as I understand it. So I don't believe there's any urgency in passing this right now before we conduct any more negotiations. Ethics bills are a very difficult thing to negotiate, as we found out with House Once language is committed to paper, anyone Bill 824. attempting to revise it or improve it risks being painted as unethical or as attempting to water it down or to kill the bill. And it's even more difficult to negotiate once one Chamber has approved the language. So the language in your bill, the Governor's language, includes many good ideas. And I've said that from the beginning. But it's a rough draft. It's a first draft. It has not been subject to the legislative process as it's supposed to work. And even you admitted in committee that it is in need of refinement. If -- if you advance the legislation today, I think you not only undermine negotiating position with the Governor and the House, but you also put many of your own colleagues in a horrible place by suggesting with this bill that the way they conduct themselves in their private lives and their business is somehow unethical.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

So I would ask, Senator, please don't do that to your colleagues. Please don't do this to Members of your own caucus. Would you consider taking this bill out of the record, Senator? Would you consider taking this bill out of the record and giving us the chance to negotiate it in earnest without compromising your colleagues?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator Harmon, I believe that you -- you're not a freshman anymore. You've been around here a few years. I think six -six years. Is that correct, sir? As you know, we had a public hearing in a hearing room last night - quite a spirited debate, a lot of questions, members of the Executive Committee. This -this took quite a long time. This is the beginning of the legislative process. This is a work in progress that you asked about. This is a Senate bill. And if I have to give a -- a -a -- a -- a little background on how a bill becomes a law to the fifty-nine men and women in this Chamber, I'll be glad to do that this morning, but I don't think that's necessary. But as this progresses, like your bill, Senator Harmon - that went back and forth and changed fifty-two times and got stalled in different Rules Committees in different Chambers - this bill is a work in progress, which I told Cindi Canary last night. I'll be -- want to pass this, continue working on it. This -- it'll go over to the House. It -- a Senate bill sometimes - work with me - goes over to the House. They make necessary changes. They have hearings, and then it comes back have amendments. over here, and then sometimes we even have conference

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

committees. Sometimes we have concurrences, nonconcurrences. So, this bill -- you know, I don't want to undermine the institutional integrity of this -- of this Chamber. We made major strides yesterday and I want to continue that. And I think there's certain people in this building want to continue that. So let's not act like, oh, we passed the ethics bill of the century and we're okay now. Let's stop there. No, I don't think we should stop. The door's open and let's put integrity back into this Chamber. Let's do ethics. And so I want to continue working on this bill and I pledge to everyone -- Member in this -- in this Chamber and everybody that knows reputation, I -- when I say I will work with you, I will work with you. And if we need to make changes and we need to go to the House committee and we need to come back here, I will take any amendment and any language possible to make this become law in the State of Illinois. So I want to keep this working, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon.

### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill, then: And I appreciate Senator DeLeo's commitment to working on this. But I don't want us to repeat all the same mistakes we've made in the past with House Bill 1 and House Bill 824. And I'm very worried we're on the road to doing just that. We worked for the last two years on what is arguably the most stringent ethics bill in Illinois history and we just finished that work yesterday. The reason it was so difficult to do was because we were throwing bombs back and forth across the building. We weren't

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

negotiating beforehand. We were simply lobbing things back and forth at each other, which made the negotiations infinitely more difficult. And what we're doing today is just more of the same. We're throwing a bill over to the House and we hope that what comes back is going to be acceptable. This undermines our negotiation. We should simply negotiate. We should simply get together - Democrats, Republicans, House and Senate - and put together a bill that we can bring back to this Chamber knowing what's in it, fully vetted and ready to pass. accustomed to opposing ethics bills, but I'm opposed to this one at this present time in this present form. It's simply not ready for action by the full Chamber. I know it's difficult to vote against ethics bills. I know folks facing election, in particular, don't want to have to explain that. But there is strength in numbers and comfort in good company. So I will vote Present on this bill and I'd urge all of you who are committed to real ethics reform to do the same. We are all better off if we put the brakes on this effort right now and redouble our efforts to negotiate in good faith with the House, with the Then we can bring back to this Chamber a proposal Governor. that we can all be proud of. I urge a Present vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Murphy.

### SENATOR MURPHY:

To the -- to the bill: I -- well, before we go to the bill, I think -- I think somebody needs a hug. We can't have any fun here anymore, is that what this is... We did take a big step yesterday in ethics reform. And it was -- it was important. And I think it sent the right message to the people

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

of this State. Timing sometimes is everything in life. And it seems right now is a good time for us to continue that push. We've lost the faith of the people of this State. They don't believe in this Chamber anymore. And until we police ourselves, till we fix Springfield, that's going to continue to be the case. I commend the sponsor for trying to strike while the iron's hot, so to speak, and continue to push this. commend Senator Harmon and I understand where he's coming from. I would say no one who's opposed to this bill deserves the label of opposing ethics reform. This bill isn't ready yet, but we need to send the message to the people of this State that we take their concern about the ethical condition of government seriously and we are acting and we're acting now, and we're acting in a meaningful way. So I would urge a Yes vote on this imperfect and incomplete bill with the understanding that the negotiations that were fruitful with House Bill 824 will continue to go forward, will produce a final, better product than what we vote on today. But that in the end, that today we send the message that ethics reform is first and foremost on the mind of the Members of this Chamber. And that we send the message -- that message loud and clear to the people of this State. So, I'd urge a Yes vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Illinois Information Service seeks permission to videotape -- record the Session. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Dillard.

### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of Senator DeLeo's efforts here. Since the Governor first disclosed his

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

ideas to quote, unquote, "improve Senator Harmon's bill", I've said I've always been for the concepts that the Governor laid This is - at least the way Senator DeLeo is going about it - is the right way to do it - a real piece of legislation where there'll be negotiations, which will continue, and not some proclamation or some platitude or press release from the second floor, but real honest to goodness legislation. This is clearly The head of the Campaign for Political Reform has said there's constitutional issues in the way this is drafted and she's correct. But, nonetheless, I think we need to keep this process moving forward. I know a little bit, like Senator Harmon and Senator Garrett, about negotiating ethics bills. mean, I did the -- the first ethics change in the late 1990s, working with the former, late United States Senator Paul Simon. We hadn't passed an ethics bill of any kind in Illinois in nearly three decades. And the right way to do it, and this is my suggestion to you on the other side if you're serious - and we were asked over here on this side of the aisle last night for the first time what our input really was - is you need to get Governor's Office four caucuses and the together simultaneously. I mean, that's the way the process worked. Senator Garrett - when you took over the control of this Chamber - passed a major piece of ethics legislation - I think it was the first year that Governor Blagojevich was the Governor - and the way that process worked was we clearly had all four caucuses and the Governor's staff together. You know, doing one of these bills doesn't take three years, but it probably does take a few months to do it the right way. So, this is -- you know, I'm not going to vote against an ethics bill. It's out here. And I

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

guess just to close, Mr. President: I know our Governor on Friday said that he thought and warned that there might be a plot here, a Republican trap to make somebody look bad. That's not true. You know, there are some of us who have been around here a long time who have no motive other than to do the right thing, no games to be played. Just setting forth rules that cleanup our State government and give the public confidence in what we're doing. So I think we ought to move this to the other Chamber, keep the process working. But I clearly think, if you're serious, and I -- I -- I hope you are, the best way to do this is to have all four caucuses and a representative from the Governor's Office together in the same room, if that's possible today under these environments. That's the way to do the ethics bill the right way. So, I stand in support of this and hope that we'll have another final work product - not in three years like the last one took, but in a couple of months. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Garrett.

### SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I -- I would like to talk about how the process worked, since Senator Dillard did bring it up, when we did come out with a massive reform measure in 2003. And he is right. We did work collectively together, Republicans and Democrats, all the caucuses, and it did take a -- a great deal of time and effort, but the finished product was something I think we were all proud of. I am going to support this bill. This bill is not perfect, but I -- I'm beginning to think that -- that we are setting the stage for, sort of, either, if we vote for it, we're for or against the Governor and

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

going back and forth, and we're actually initiating this ourselves. I think we just have to look at what's in the ethics bill that Senator DeLeo is presenting and -- and work together and pull out parts of it that really aren't that good. But there are many, many good aspects to that bill. It is our responsibility to take a look and pick apart and make good public policy. We can't ignore this. This is not a Present vote. Either we are for good ethics, changing the way business has been done in Illinois for decades, or we're against that. I also believe that -- one of my favorite expressions is that democracy is messy. This isn't a bill that's going to make everybody happy. But I think, too, what Senator Dillard said, this is what our constituents expect from us. And for that reason, I would ask everybody for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul.

#### SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: And I -- I think for a rare occasion I'm going to agree with Senator Murphy. Not as to the hug, but to the fact that right now is -- the iron is hot and we need to strike while the iron is hot. But I'm going to also agree with Senator Harmon that this needs to go through a negotiations process. And I don't think the two are inconsistent. I think just as House Bill 1 came over here in a manner that was imperfect and incomplete and after further negotiations, it became 824. The negotiations took place. I want to reiterate some of the concerns -- specific concerns that I raised in committee, because, you know, one of the issues that this bill deals with is the double dippers. And -- and Senator

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Clayborne in committee pointed out that we are a part-time Legislature and it invites a diverse Legislature. People come -- come from all walks of life, including people who work in the public sector. I just happen to be one of those people. didn't get my job in the public sector from any political I sent in a resume and I was interviewed, and I was hired as a lawyer for the City Colleges of Chicago. And when I was appointed to the Senate, I continued to work. And quess what? We have a provision in the law that says that you cannot be paid when you're here on a Session day. That's a provision that prevents double dipping. I don't know whether we want to create a situation where you're deterring people who work in the public sector to seek public office if they have that interest. With regards to the Compensation Review Board, I expressed my concerns when we considered the pay raise that if there is a problem with the Compensation Review Board, we need to look at the Compensation Review Board. need to evaluate the appointments. We need to evaluate the standards. I don't believe that determinations, no matter how it's framed, no matter how it -- we vote on it, with regards to pay raise should be coming before this Chamber at all. I think it should be going before another Body, perhaps the judiciary, because political considerations come in and people don't really vote their conscience when issues with regards to compensation their own compensation - come before the legislative Body. think there's some very good provisions in here. There's a closure of a loophole. We banned contributions to the constitutional officers. But, you know, you can make that contribution to the political party and it -- it -- that -- that

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

contribution ends up in the fund of that constitutional office - officer anyway. So there are very good provisions in here.
And I don't think there's any inconsistency with advancing this bill, yet continuing negotiations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sandoval.

#### SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of Senate Bill 780. I think on the south side of Chicago -- after listening to some of my colleagues -- on the south side of Chicago, we say, "Either put up or shut up." And you know what? What happened just yesterday, in passing this ethics bill, was not a -- not a process of cleansing. Now that we're -- we should feel a lot purer and better and feel good. I think it's a darn shame that that's about as far as we went, was to put -just basically put a Denver boot on the Blago combine. 'Cause that's all we did, Ladies and Gentlemen, put a Denver boot on the Blago combine, nothing more, nothing less. You know, there -- there's also another saying, Senator Harmon, on the south side, "You just can't be a little pregnant." You just can't be a little ethical. You're either ethical or you're not. And so -- you know, when I started my federal career in the federal government, I -- federal employees - you might not know this but federal employees are some of the most ethical public employees in this country. When I was a federal employee -- and it exists. We talk about how it's -- we got to negotiate. got to deliberate. We got to talk about it. We got to go around the navel and we got to figure it all out. Well, you know, today there are federal employees that live by some of the

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

toughest ethical rules and regulations known to mankind. lived by them for sixteen years. I remember that when I decided to run for office or take office, I couldn't raise any money. I was prohibited. It's federal law to prohibit raising money while being a candidate. And, in fact, when I got elected, I had to leave my federal job - park sixteen years of a federal career to take on this new role as a Commissioner of the Water Reclamation District. I had to put up or shut up. Did I want to serve the greater good and serve the public as an elected official? Or did I want to keep both jobs and keep it -- keep my ninety-three-thousand-dollar-a-year job and take my fortythousand-dollar-a-year commissioner job and -- and fix it and figure it out, and live real well? No. I had to put up or shut up. I had to leave my job. I couldn't raise money as a federal employee. And, in fact, when I left federal government, I was a And as a contracts manager, I awarded contracts manager. multimillion-dollar contracts to a number of environmental firms and firms in the federal sector. And you know what? I was prohibited from working for any of those contractors for three years, this strong revolving-door policy that exists. There's such a thing called -- there's the Hatch Act - the Hatch Act in the federal sector that has a myriad of prohibitions for federal employees. We should have a State Hatch Act. We should have prohibitions about double dippers. We should have stronger legislation and ethics rules regarding contributions. What just has happened in the last couple years during this Blagojevich administration is a damn shame. And I didn't come here to serve Springfield. I didn't -- I wasn't sent here as -- to fix Springfield. I was sent here to fix the southwest side of

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Chicago, the Town of Cicero, Berwyn and Stickney. I refuse to fix Springfield. I need to fix the roads and the bridges and the schools and the parks and the libraries back home. We just cannot be a little pregnant. We cannot be just a little You know what? We should take advantage of the shamefulness of Governor Rod Blagojevich and what he's done over the last couple years, now that he wants to set the record straight. Now that it's a year before the next election, he wants to come out like, you know, looking like Jesus. You know We should take advantage of that and we should promote a higher ethical standard in the State of Illinois. And I'm quite surprised that great leader from the west side, Rickey Hendon, who's had a great career in the Illinois Senate, who inspires me on occasion on the Floor of the Senate, yesterday in committee when he -- he was right. I am surprised that even the good government people, even those -- those do-gooders, those good government people, were opposed to this legislation. For God's sakes, what has the world come to when even the do-gooders, the good government people, are opposed to being ethical. I stand in support of Senate Bill 780 and I think Jimmy DeLeo's got a great bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Brady.

### SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in support of this initiative, along with my colleagues Senator Dillard and Senator Murphy. God knows it takes forever for us to move on ethical reform. In fact, oftentimes it takes the courts. This may be one place in which we can preempt the

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

courts. So I ask you to help join all of us in supporting this. But I do have one question for Senator Harmon. Senator Harmon, is it the same Senator Obama who asked us to come back for yesterday's bill to vote against the Governor's AV that asked you to vote Present on this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Maloney.

### SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just to the bill: A couple of things in my own experience came to mind, as I was looking at this legislation this morning. And -- and that is -- most of you know, my background has been in high school education. no longer affiliated with any high school, but I often thought it'd be a nice opportunity at some point to teach a community college class in -- in -- in government. And I think many of us could make that contribution based on your experiences here. This bill precludes us from doing anything like that. Also, over the years, I was involved in coaching. Representative is a football coach. This bill would preclude him from doing anything like that. My past experience as a basketball official - because I would get a check from a local high school, I would not be able to do that. So, I point these out simply as illustrations that -- that this bill does need more work. And I would -- I -- I would hope that we could put something together that is more complete, has less holes on it, before we send it over to the House and I would feel much more comfortable in that regard. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jacobs.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Question of my esteemed colleague.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, how does the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, the chief ethics self-watchdog group in Illinois, feel about your bill? Are they for it or against it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Interesting question. Cynthia Canary appeared at the Executive Committee last night. She filed a slip that they were opposed to this bill. She got up for oral testimony and she testified that she was opposed to it in its current form, and she liked the idea that this was going to be a work in progress. And she wanted to be - as she was with Senator Harmon's bill - she wanted to be part of -- of the strengthening or the changing of this legislation. So, the answer to your question is, she filed an opposition slip, but in her oral testimony, she wanted to work with us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

I know you're like I and you've read that we've had some corruption problems in Illinois. Specifically, Levine was convicted for coercing -- or -- or charged with coercing kickbacks from a Hollywood producer. Would this bill stop Stuart Levine from trying to get a kickback from a Hollywood

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

producer?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

I -- I don't -- I don't think so, Senator. But the fact that I believe Mr. Levine was on a board and commission and this strengthens the -- the people on boards -- the lobbying, the outside contact with boards and commissions. So, I -- I -- I can't answer that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Tony Rezko was convicted on twenty -- sixteen -- I think, sixteen counts of twenty-four. His crimes were mail fraud, wire fraud, bribery, money laundering. Would this bill stop any of that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator Jacobs, this bill is not going to stop drug dealing or bank robbery. This is a bill focused at ethics in government. I -- I don't -- I -- this is not going to change somebody's corrupt, under-the-table, backroom deals. This is to get sunshine - sunshine, what everybody says in this building all the time - transparency in government. And I think this would help it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

So when Ali Ata testified in court that he took twenty-five thousand dollars to the Governor and gave it to him in exchange for a job, would this prohibit that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

The testimony that came out in the federal court was testimony of illegal activity. This is an ethics bill, Senator. This is apples and oranges, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

I don't want to belabor the point, but I just would say that this is a problem looking for a solution. The problem is not on this Chamber. I'm -- I'm not aware of any legislator for many, many years that has been charged with anything. problem in Illinois, the cancer in Illinois, is the Governor. And I find it ironic that the Governor is proposing ethics bills when he has his own ethic problems. Now yesterday we made some good legislation. Wasn't perfect, but it was okay. just a tit for tat. It's wrong. It's the kind of thing we need to move away from in Illinois. Look, I think the Governor's a good person. I think he's trying to do the right thing, but fighting with Speaker Madigan and just trying to bully people to get his way is not going to work. I -- I wish you would take a message back to the Governor. Let him know that this legislator, and I believe many more legislators in this Chamber, are done, that we're fed up. We are absolutely tired. You know, he needs to come clean of what he knows, when he knew it,

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

and he needs to tell us exactly what went on with Ala Ata, and he needs to tell us why he didn't return the sixty-five thousand dollars that he gave to his campaign. Then, the Governor can come lecture me on -- on ethical issues.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Radogno.

### SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Obviously, we're debating ethics, once again, which I think is a good thing because I think we all realize that it's very important to our constituents, as well as to the future functioning of Illinois government. The one thing that puzzles me, though, and this was a comment made by Senator Harmon, is that we need to keep the bill here in order to negotiate it. I don't understand why we think the Senate has the monopoly on being able to negotiate a good bill. In fact, I think that we would be better off sending it out of here with a strong message that we need to accomplish something. I think that's how, the last time, the whole issue picked up steam is when both Chambers were passing bills across. It showed that there really was an interest in getting something done. I do agree there's some problems with this bill, but -and I'm willing to continue to work on them, but I think we send a stronger message by passing it out of here and challenging the other side of the Rotunda to work with us to come up with a compromise that we can all support. So I would urge a Yes vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I know, like many others, I inspired by the conscience of Cicero, the gentleman, and that moved me to share a couple of observations with my -- with my colleagues. You know, someone else made reference to the need to engage the courts. It's something that I personally am familiar with. About ten years ago, I sued the State in order to block a sweetheart - more than ten years ago, closer to twelve years ago - sued the State in order to block a sweetheart deal for construction of a office -- of an office building that the State didn't really need. And we ended up settling. We took it right to the brink. Half a dozen of us who were House Members thought that the Constitution was being violated and circumventing our approval for the expenditures on this. So, we sued. And as part of that settlement agreement, we, for the first time, had formal competitive bidding on contracts in Illinois. Before, we used to have a competitive selection process where someone in government had a cup of coffee with two separate individuals. That formally constituted a bidding process and we got past that. I certainly know what it's like to be patient. It took me fifteen years - fifteen years. I'm not -- Representative Laurino - I remember, prior bill, Senator DeLeo talking about Representative Laurino from the 39th Ward on mandatory automobile insurance. Took fifteen years to put the Toll Highway Authority - which then was the poster child for everything that could be wrong and was wrong in Illinois government - to put them into the Procurement Code to have the same bidding laws, procedures and restrictions applied to the Toll Highway Authority and reform them the way that they would apply to other State agencies. That opposition came from

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Democrats in power. It came from Republicans in power. It -the opposition for those who wanted to maintain the status quo knows no partisan identification. And that's why we need - with all due respect to Senator Harmon, who has done an extraordinary job moving a major boulder off the road for our ascent up the mountain - why we need to seize the momentum and continue I -- I want to make a couple of other quick observations. As long as we are forming a menu of what else needs to be incorporated in these discussions, which I hope will take place among all four caucuses and the -- and the Governor's office, we need far greater restrictions and far accountability for decisions which involve billions of dollars involving pension funds and other major investment decisions. When there's a lot of cheese out there, we have to build bigger and better mousetraps. And some of the greatest offenses which have occurred, or which have the potential to occur, involve billions of dollars in pension and investment funds. We have previously passed greater accountability measures, in Senate Bill 1305, out of this Chamber on more than one occasion. need to make sure that those are ingredients in the next recipe. We also need to better delineate how private individuals represent the public interest when they're called to do so. All too often we've seen, regardless of which party -- all too often we've seen - over the years, over the decades - how private individuals have engaged themselves on behalf of the public and the State's interests. And, yet, weaving themselves in and out of those respective roles, the lines get blurred and it's hard to differentiate when someone is representing the public interest and when they're representing their own

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

interest. We need to provide greater clarity for that as well, as private individuals seek to advance a public agenda. So, in closing, what I would say is we all recognize that there are imperfections to this particular bill. We can do more. We need to do more and I hope you'll join me in voting for this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, in the words of my esteemed colleague, Senator Christine Radogno, yesterday, "Hallelujah!" This is what the framers of the Illinois Constitution envisioned - Republicans supporting a Democrat bill, Democrat's opposing a Democratic bill, do-gooders against the ethics bill. And if you listen and read the Capitol Fix --I mean, Capitol Fax today, people like Senator DeLeo, who is serious about this, and Senator Hendon being disparaged as not being for ethics, and the publisher going on to say, now he can roll over and die 'cause he's seen everything, because the dogooders, people for campaign reform and ethics, testified against the bill in committee yesterday. This is bipartisan here. This is what we really need, where people just really say what they think. The only thing Rich Miller left out of the story - I wish he was here - was die and go to hell. But I guess, after this pass, he can add that to his Capitol Fax, because he didn't believe we would do it. But Senator DeLeo is about to pass this today with bipartisan support. Now, let's get down to the real deal. If the Governor's name was anything but Blagojevich - and I'm going to say it again, Blagojevich,

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Blagojevich -- it's his idea - that's why some of you are against it, because it's his idea. Now I was told by some friends that I need to be kinder and gentler and not even speak on this bill, 'cause I'm going to lose the two or three votes that I do have to be Senate President. But I guess that's just the way it's going to be, 'cause I got to be me. Why should we allow people to give money to the political parties, which is a pass-through, and then the heads of the political parties, if they don't like you, which has been the history of Rickey Ricardo Hendon's life, they spend millions of dollars against They spent so much money against me they finally said forget about it. They can't beat me, because I have the people, as Senator Sandoval talked about. We supposed to have the people. But, oh, no, Senator Harmon's bill's a good bill. Guess what? That's the law now. Why not go the next step? Why not end the abuses that allow the money to be spent and be given to people who are just as political, even more political, than many of us in this Chamber? This is a great day. wonderful moment. I couldn't have -- I had to speak, Mr. President, because to see the reformers saying they're against this and talking about all the reasons why, and -- and I want to be able to double dip and I want to be able to get my money in my law firm. And everybody knows that many of the law firms are working for these big companies that have matters before this Senate, but they don't want to disclose that. They don't want to end that gravy train. They just want to hurt Blagojevich. Has he made some mistakes? Sure, he's made some mistakes, but he won't be Governor forever. Be careful of the rules you make today, 'cause you're going to have to live by 'em tomorrow.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

I urge my good friends, who I still like here, don't vote Present. And all of you want to run for higher office. I have no plans. But voting Present is a -- a issue right now. Republican running for President, running on ethics reform. Democrat running for President, running on ethics reform. Don't vote this down just because Blagojevich thought of it. This is a good bill. Let's send Rich Miller where he needs to be and vote for it.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

We're going to have Senator Harmon, because his name was mentioned in debate, and then the last speaker will be President Jones. Senator Harmon.

#### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I appreciate being recognized a second time. My name has been used in debate several times. I will not respond to the more inconsequential mentions, but I do want to -- to respond to Senator Radogno's point and to ratify her point. She made a good one, and I want to correct a misperception that may be there. I don't believe we should keep the bill in the Senate because we have a monopoly on good ideas. I think it's, in fact, just the opposite. acting today and unilaterally sending over something to the House, we are saying that we have a monopoly on good ideas. should we act without coordinating with the House? Why can't we come together and negotiate before we take action? What's going to happen if we send this over there? My prediction is that the House has no incentive then to negotiate with us if we've declined to negotiate with them. They'll come up with their own proposal and send it back to us as an amendment to this bill,

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

and we will have had no input and we'll be looking at a bill that we have a take-or-leave proposition and have had no input into. We should be rational about this. Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. Let's negotiate this bill before we start throwing bombs across the building.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

President Jones.

### SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Listening to the debate in the Executive Committee yesterday and listening to the debate today, I just want to point out a few facts. I want to commend the sponsor of House Bill 824, Senator Harmon, for his work that he I want to commend Senator DeLeo for the work that he's doing. House Bill 824 was vastly different than House Bill 1, because House Bill 1 that folks was clamoring about - this is it, this is a great thing - was a terribly flawed bill. were made. I wanted more changes in the bill. Some of the provisions in Senate Bill 780, I wanted those provisions included in 824. But I was told that if we include the provisions that will close the back door as relate to campaign finances and contributions from those individuals doing business with the State that that would kill the bill. And I said, "Well, why would that kill the bill?" "Well, the House wouldn't like that." It was not aimed at any particular political party, but it is a true fact. I've heard Members on this Floor saying, "We got to tell the people the truth." Well, you -- you've been telling the people the untruth. You haven't told them the truth about the bill that passed yesterday. The bill yesterday just closed the front door. They still can go through the back door

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

and give the contributions. Tell the truth. This bill, 780, is designed to close the back door. If you want true ethics reform, if you don't want influence in government, be it the Republican Party, or the Democrat Party, if you going down the slippery slope, let's do it right. Let's close the door and not play the game. We play the game - all the hype and so forth. And at least - I give the sponsor of 824, Senator Harmon, credit, 'cause at least he told the truth. "Senator Jones wanted to do it in Veto Session 'cause he wanted to kill the bill" - that was a lie and they still lie about that. The rules are the rules. But the Constitution is the Constitution. bill would die. The bill is not alive now; it does not take effect until January 1. If we did it in November or we did -did it, as we did yesterday, it doesn't change anything. But one thing I do know is this, the back door is wide open. You want true ethics reform, close the back door. You don't want it, leave it open. Now they jumped on me because I said I needed a pay raise. I'm for the pay raise. And I had a lot of Members in this Chamber and in the other -- other Chamber who voted against the pay raise. Said, "Please don't do what we did, 'cause I need the money." You want the money? this bill. You going to vote for it. You're going to vote for And I have to disagree with my colleague, my esteemed Chairman of the Exec Committee, for doing such a marvelous job yesterday. This is not a Present vote, if you are genuinely sincere. How can you tell me during those negotiations that you were opposed to the provisions I wanted in that bill -- bill to close the back door on contributions? And since the bill passed yesterday, if you were for the back door being closed, you would

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

have came in that committee and said, I support that. But you are still against it, then you must be representing someone else other than who you claim you supposed to be representing. You're trying to protect someone else. We know you got the Comptroller of the State, you got the Secretary of State, you got the Attorney General, you got the -- the Governor's Office. All contracts come out of those entities. They come out of those entities. But those entities -- and here's a strange thing, some contracts given by the Governor's Office, Secretary of State Office, those contracts go beyond the term limit of the officeholder. For example, a person could have a massive contract with the State of -- Secretary of State. That massive contract extends beyond his term of office. That contractor cannot give any money to him or her, but that same contractor can give to the candidate running to succeed him. 'Cause when that new person come in, they may want to have that contract extended for another five or ten years. See, and that's a flaw in the bill of 824 that one did not want to address. It is a fact, 'cause I know some of the big major contractors with the State of Illinois and they -- and those contractors were there before the current Governor got there. And that -- and if -they give campaign contributions to someone that is not the Governor who may be aspiring to be the Governor, because when they become the Governor they will want that contract renewed. So let's stop playing these silly games and talking about "Oh, this great -- this great law that was passed." I haven't practiced law in many, many years. But it -- what it gets down to, who ox is gored. Issues that come before us, it could be condominium laws, individual practicing condominium law.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

got a piece of legislation here making all this money off the law, and so forth. Let's tell the truth and let quit -- and stop playing games. 'Cause there has been gamesmanship on the legislation that we passed. Let's be sincere about it. Who has the conflict of interest on a particular issue. So, 780 is -is -- is growing a few oxes, I know that. We -- you can tell by the way they vote and what they say. They're not going to tell you, but I know - and most of the Members here know. This piece of legislation should receive a unanimous vote. No, it's not perfect, just as House Bill 1 is not perfect - the bill that passed out of here that everybody said it was agreed to. not perfect. It left the back door wide open. 780 will close the back door if you really want ethics reform. This bill will close the back door and you wouldn't have to worry about the political parties, be it Republican -- one day you guys may have a Constitutional office. That's why you're voting for this bill. And the Democrats on this side who want to retain should vote for it as well. I urge a Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo, to close.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I want to thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle for the very spirited debate. And I think it's - as Senator Hendon mentioned - it's - it's good when it's not a partisan issue; we can really get a lot of input and feeling on a piece of legislation. I just want to close with a couple quick points. I have here in my hand, it's the restrictions for outside employment for members of the United States Congress. And it was the Ethics Reform Act of

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

And as a congressman, you can't do anything. As a congressman, Senator Halvorson, the only thing that you can do is teach. As a congressman, you can't have your name -- you can't be employed by a firm. You can't live -- you can't let -use your name to any firm or partnership or corporation. You can't have any compensation for practicing a profession. and even if you teach, Senator Halvorson, your -- your only earned income -- your outside earned -- earned income for a calendar year can only be fifteen percent of your salary. Congress did it. Congress did it. They wanted ethics. Congress did it. Double dipping, let's talk about double dipping. Let's talk about double dipping, Senator. Let's talk about double dipping. Who are we responsible for? The person that pays you - your county, your city or municipal job. You have a eighty/ninety thousand dollar job. Or the constituents who sent you down here? Just think about that. Who -- paycheck or your constituents? We should stop the practice. You want to be a legislator, be a legislator. You want to be a county employee, be a county employee. You want to be a lawyer, go do your lawyering. If you want to be a legislator, come down -let's stop the conflicts. You know, and we talk about contributions, expands the contribution ban. I have a list here of the four -- the four constitutional officers and the four leaders of our four Chambers. You know what the contributions were from vendors with State contracts last year? This isn't the Governor's Office. This is our four constitutional officers and our four leaders - over two million dollars in contributions by people that do contracts with the State of Illinois. You know what? If we pass this legislation, this -- we could stop

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

this nonsense. Greater disclosure - greater disclosure for General Assembly Members - out disclosing our -- all the other little things that go on. Oh, this is original. Seventeen states passed that. Seventeen states passed that in the last two years. Oh, that's original. We're real original here in Illinois. We're always the last one. This is the piece of legislation. As I mentioned, it came out in debate. I heard the message. It's a bill in progress at work. Let's pass this bill, Mr. President. Let's get this into law. Let's stop the conflicts. Let's ban the contributions. Let's make everybody on an even playing field. As the President mentioned, this even -- candidates, declared candidates -- I don't want to be in a disadvantage. I want to be on an even playing field if I'm running for re-election. So let's -- let's adopt this language. Everybody will be on the same playing field. All constitutionals will be on the same playing field. The four Leaders will be on the same playing field, Mr. President. And with having said that, sir, I ask for an affirmative roll call, affirmative vote on Senate Bill 780, sir. Thank you.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 780 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 Ayes, 1 Nay, 5 voting Present. Senate Bill 780, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Clayborne in -- back in the Chair. We're going to

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

stand at ease for a moment. Don't leave the Chamber. We will - proceeding to further action. Senator Risinger -- I mean, Senator Righter, I'm sorry. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Yes.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, our side of the aisle received a notice for a Rules Committee meeting. So I was -- just wanted to ask you if you had any idea what time the 10:30 Rules Committee meeting might be meeting? You know, I take that back, Mr. President. I'm not sure whether it said a.m. or p.m. Is that going to be your come back?

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

We're still working that through. We'll get back with you. Please stay in the Chamber. We are going to proceed to -- for further action. We're going to take up additional action. Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Mr. President, as Chairman of Rules, I just wanted to ask - answer a member of Rules Committee. We're working -- waiting for a little paperwork and then we'll have Rules and I guess we can finish up for the day. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

The Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes.

### (SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

We're going to recess to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

The Senate will now come to order. There is a -- a Rules meeting immediately in the President's Anteroom. Again, a Rules meeting immediately in the President's Anteroom.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Committee Reports, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Hendon, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 5 and 9 to Senate Bill 790 and a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1103.

Senator Rickey Hendon, Chairman. September 23rd, 2008.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

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

Thank you, Mr. President. For a -- announcement. We would like a Democratic Caucus in the President's Office immediately, for approximately twenty minutes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

A Democratic Caucus immediately in the President's Office -

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

twenty minutes. Senator Risinger, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR RISINGER:

Senate Republicans would like to have a caucus immediately in the Minority Leader's Office for twenty minutes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

So in order. Immediately after the caucuses, we will be coming back to the Floor for final action. Be prompt. The Senate stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

The Senate will come to order. We will now go to Senate Supplemental Calendar No. 1. It has been printed and distributed. All Senators to the -- within the sound of my voice, please come to the Floor. This is final action. Come to the Floor. On the Order of Concurrence, Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Senate Bill 790. Senator Schoenberg, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 5 and 9 to Senate Bill 790.

Filed by Senator Jeff Schoenberg.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

One minute, Senator Schoenberg. Point of personal privilege. WAND-TV wishes to videotape -- seeking leave to videotape. Seeing no objection, leave has been granted. Senator Schoenberg, to explain your motion.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the Jenny Craiq version of a fund transfer bill that we had considered earlier. I'm going to move that we concur with Amendments 1, 5 and 9 to Senate Bill 790 and the net result of this Jenny Craiq version will mean that we will transfer 221.3 million dollars from various funds into a newly created Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Relief Fund. The bill includes several dates certain by which the Treasurer and the Comptroller transfer balances from these funds -- from these dedicated funds to the Budget Relief Fund and it also includes protections for these dedicated funds if, in fact, there are insufficient balances. All of which is important so as to ensure that there are no unintended consequences of reductions in services as a result of these fund transfers. The bill spells out a number of dedicated funds and the specific amounts and line items -- fund numbers for -- which would be transferred into this pooled fund that in turn would also enable us to access between twelve and sixteen million dollars in additional federal funding. Senator Trotter will explain in subsequent legislation what -this is the revenue side of restoration funding in a number of essential service areas, particularly in alcohol and substance abuse, for community-based services, for the developmentally disabled, for Lou Gehriq's disease, Alzheimer's, displaced homemakers, several of the programs from some of constitutionals, and, as I said, other essential services. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none -- Senator Righter.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator -- Senator Schoenberg, how many funds are subject to the sweeps in this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

According to my math - thank you for your patience - there are -- there are a hundred and forty-seven of the roughly seven hundred dedicated funds which are tapped. I think you'll notice that there are some conspicuous absences that -- that are important to all of us. Like the earlier version, we've left those out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Schoenberg, can you describe for the Chamber the methodology that was used to pick the funds that are subject to the sweeps and how much is being taken out of them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I think the best way to characterize how those decisions were made is, first, we separated out funds like the motor fuel -- like the gas tax, the Motor Fuel Fund, which many of us realize is -- is something that not -- should not be drawn down

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

from. And then, in looking at available -- at the most current available fund balances, the decision -- in -- in these hundreds of specially dedicated funds, determination was then made as to which funds could absorb a reduction in their current balances. Now one of the advantages that we have now versus the earlier one is that we actually have fresher and more recent data from the Comptroller on what those fund balances were. You may recall, several months ago we considered something that set a ceiling of five hundred and thirty million dollars. The data that we're working from for this bill is far more current and that's -- that's pretty much how we determined which funds were going to be drawn from.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Schoenberg, I understood you to just say that you're pleased with the -- relatively recent information you have about how much the balances are. Can you tell me how much information you have about the planned purchases out of the fund? In other words, was a concerted effort made by either the Democrats here in this Chamber or the Democrats over in the House, who wrote the bill, to reach out to the people who are connected with this fund and say, "We see that you have a balance of XYZ million; can you tell us what your plans are for the expenditures out of this fund in the next six months or year?"

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

On the expenditure side, I'll defer to Senator Trotter in the next bill, unless he wants to address this now. But what I will say is that in -- in calculating this, we -- the most recent data was used on the amount of revenues the funds brought in, what the projected costs would be to administer the programs that those funds were supposed to pay for, and then with those surplus balances, a decision was made as to how much could indeed be drawn from them in order to make it possible for us to -- to fund some essential core services, like those I just described.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm -- I'm sorry, Senator. Did -- was that, yes? I mean, was -- did someone reach out to the people who are connected with each of these funds and ask them about their planned expenditures?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Yeah, on that one, I'm going to defer to Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter.

### SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. If -- if I could, I'm going to try to answer your question. The -- the answer to the first question - did we work in tandem with the House as they put together the methodology in which they have used to -- to select these funds - the answer is no. This was a bill that

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

came from there. However, what they did use, and -- and from conversations that I had with them, was the historical methodology that we had used in the past; one, that these funds have been transferred in the past, using the caveat that, of those funds that we transfer, at no time will they ever be diminished to the point to where as there will be no dollars there. So as long as there was operating dollars to do whatever mission that they had asked these dollars to be for, we will continue to use these dollars. As you know, over the past -since 2003, we have transferred over 900.8 million dollars with very few problems. What we have learned was that there were some, because of their federal grants or because they did get federal dollars, that we had to shy away from those. So from experience, we've learned that we will not use those. Some are presently in litigation. Certainly, we did not tap those funds again. But your initial question - did we work with them and did they contact individuals - the answer is we did not, and I cannot answer if they did.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Please.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber, Senate Bill 790 may pass or it may not pass. But, I sincerely hope that if it does pass and the subsequent supplemental appropriation that it's designed to fund passes, that no one

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

walks out of this Chamber or this building proud of the way this has been done. Because there isn't -- there shouldn't be any pride in the way this is done. This is truly, truly the lesser of two evils, even if you can support this solution. You are, in passing this legislation, pitting -- asking the Members to pit babies who have yet to be born, who would benefit from the funding of the newborn screening, against the middle-income and low-middle-income families who enjoy our State parks and our State historic sites. You are pitting the senior who would benefit from the money that you're taking out of the Drug Rebate Fund against the person who desperately needs the drug and alcohol counseling that is now not available to them because the Governor cut the deficit budget that you sent them. This is not a good solution. Perhaps it's one that this Chamber and this General Assembly can live with, but it's not a good solution. Let's not take pride in what we're doing here today. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Dillard.

### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. If the sponsor would yield for a couple of questions, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. Senator Schoenberg, we're early in the fiscal year and the Governor has two percent transferability among a whole litany of line items. Why do we need to do a sweeps bill? Why don't we just let the Governor, early in the fiscal year -

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

it's not late, it's early - manage State government, as opposed to us sitting here and picking out a quarter of a billion dollars in fund sweeps?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I couldn't think of a better person on the other side of the aisle to raise that question with me, because I think you know from personal experience, Senator Dillard, when former Governor Edgar inherited what was then the largest budget deficit in the history of the State from his predecessor, that there were many difficult decisions that needed to be made, not all of which the Governor's Office relied upon the Legislature And, as I recall, those difficult decisions and to make. choices, many of them which resulted in very painful reductions in services to the most vulnerable people in our communities, that many of those decisions could have been averted had it been for a restoration of funding through another means. have a recession, Senator Dillard. Won't go into how we got here. We have very challenging economic times. I don't think anybody's going to take any pride in anything. I think we all understand the enormity of the task ahead of us. And as there's economic uncertainty in households communities in our State, we need to step forward and draw from existing resources in order to ensure that those most vulnerable in our communities and those most essential services that the government provides, that they can continue at some relative pace to what we need them to. As we all know, the irony is that people rely on us the most when the economy is the worst. We're

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

already realizing, as we've heard from the most recent projections on the State's revenues, as a result of the current economic conditions, sales taxes are down. That's not a function of any policy decision that's been made here in this State. It's a much larger reality that we all have to confront, and in confronting that, what we're saying is that there may be some difficult choices. I won't go so far as to say that they're cynical choices. But that we need to ensure that the revenues are there to make certain that these essential services can continue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Dillard.

### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. The hour is late. I just have one other question, Mr. President, and then I'll speak to the -- to the gentleman's bill for -- just very shortly. Senator Schoenberg, federal prohibitions on the spending or the ability of us to sweep these moneys, have we gone through this three-page list of funds and do we know if there are federal prohibitions? I mean, we may have a couple million here, couple million there, but the feds may not let us sweep those. How certain are you that we legally under federal law can sweep some of these funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

As -- as I understand it, Senator Dillard, there -- all the due diligence was done so as to ensure that there would not be some unintended consequences. There may be some dispute on some of that, but the belief is that that due diligence was done.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Dillard, to the bill.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. And I appreciate Jeff's attempt here and Donne Trotter's attempt to let us manage State government. quickly, there are a couple of groups - hunters, number one -- I know that some police officers believe there are some funds in here that we do not have the ability to sweep under federal law, but that'll have to work its way out. I quess I'm opposed to the sweeping of these funds. I believe the Governor - it's early in the fiscal year - has the ability -- and even though he's a guy that many of us don't necessarily trust and he's not the best manager in the State's history, it's early in the year and he's got the ability to do this. And I don't want to sit here and pick these funds again. But I quess my big point on this is we are in year seven of now this particular administration - year seven. And, yes, I worked for Governor Edgar and we swept funds in a recession our first year as Governor. We hated it. Many of those funds we actually had to pay back. So we just didn't raid 'em, we had to pay 'em back sometimes, like the Road Fund. But we're in year seven and obviously we have a major structural imbalance and a budget issue in this State when we year after year, Session after Session, have to come back and sweep a quarter of a billion dollar funds. And this is a red flag that we got major budget problems in this State we can't manage. And I'm not going to sit here in year seven and try to sweep a quarter of a billion dollars of funds again, especially when the Governor, if he wants to manage his agencies, can do it without these particular

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

fund sweeps. So, I would urge a No vote on this particular bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator Schoenberg, what -- what is your intention that these moneys will go to after they go to the fund?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Senator Brady, immediately following our action on this bill, I anticipate that Senator Trotter will be presenting House Amendment No. 7 to Senate Bill 1103, which will go -- which will be the appropriation portion of -- of this package and which will, in detail, outline where those restorations will be. As I indicated, they are predominantly in core services - many of them human services, whether it's alcohol and substance abuse, whether it's averting layoffs in agencies like the Department of Children and Family Services or for foster care, whether it's for psychiatric screenings, whether it's for community service grants for individuals with mental illness. We're simply trying to keep pace with expanding needs at a very difficult economic time. But I'll defer to Senator Trotter at the next bill to outline in greater detail what all the spending will be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Senator Brady.

#### SENATOR BRADY:

Senator Schoenberg, what happens to these resources if the Governor vetoes that legislation, as he did in his first budget reduction veto?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

So, if the question is what happens if the Governor vetoes or makes some changes to the spending -- to the spending bill on 1103, the money would sit in -- the money would sit in the fund. Remember, the -- the -- it's written in the bill that there are transfers made on October 1st of '08, January 1 of '09, on April 1 of '09, and -- that pool the money and make it possible to then pay for the expenditures which will be coming -- the restoration, I should say, of services which will be coming in the next bill. If there are lines that are amendatorily vetoed out or if the bill's vetoed entirely, if this bill becomes law, then those moneys are still going to be collected, pooled and held in that fund pending the need to disburse them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Brady.

### SENATOR BRADY:

So, Senator, they wouldn't go back into the funds which they were taken from if the Governor vetoes this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

No, they would stay in the Budget Relief Fund. And for

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

practical purposes, I think if you look at the next bill and you see where the restorations are and you realize what the spending pressures are from the increase of people who need services, then I think you'll see that those funds will be very desperately needed in a following bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Brady.

### SENATOR BRADY:

To this bill and to the next one: Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a sad, sad day in Illinois' history. Over the last six years or so, we have increased State spending by billions and billions of dollars. And yet, over the last several months, this administration and the Democratic leadership we find in this State have held our parks, have held our historical sites, have held our alcohol and chemical dependency organizations, have held the Department of Children and Family Services and others hostage to our - I shouldn't say our - frankly, to the Governor's inept ability to manage State resources. It's a sad day when we sit here after we've seen billions of dollars of increases over the last several years and we've threatened the very livelihood of our fellow citizens and neighbors throughout this State. I hope that when we come to next year's budget, you will remember this day and you will look seriously at what we need to do as a State in setting our priorities. Let's not let this happen again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

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

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, if you don't have the votes to pass this bill, these sweeps, will you call the next bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I -- I don't control the next bill. That's Senator Trotter's prerogative.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Do you think there's anyway that he could -- that you could get an answer for him? Are you going to call the other bill, too?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

...I said, I -- I'm not -- I'm not that bill sponsor, so I can't -- I -- I would leave it to him at the appropriate -- as I understand now from Senator Trotter, my third base coach, it's his intention to move forward regardless of the outcome of this concurrence motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

I understand that there's going to be a restoration of some eight million dollars for parks in -- in the bill that Senator

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Trotter has. But is it also true that we're sweeping nineteen billion {sic} from DNR to pay eight million back for the parks? That's what I've been told. Or, the parks is actually less than -- than -- 2.1 and we're going to sweep nineteen million from DNR?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I believe that if you look at where some of the -- I don't know what the source of your figure is. There are -- the largest fund that's being swept is the Fund for Illinois' Future The Fish and Wildlife Endowment Fund is also being transferred. The first one is ten million. That one is two million. I guess if you want to add up every fund that touches DNR, you could do so, but, you know, I -- I think implicit, Senator, in all of this is an acknowledgement that those of us who feel strongly about conservation, about our State parks, and -- and the critical role that they play, not just in -- in being destinations in our State, but also for providing employment for many people in downstate communities, that -- that those needs come -- press up right against some very critical human needs throughout the State as well - in southern Illinois, central Illinois and in the larger metropolitan areas further upstate. It's not a perfect balance. But as I indicated earlier, the demand on services goes up, especially for human services, when there's a recession or at difficult economic times. more substance abuse. There's more alcohol abuse. There's more difficulty with mental illness. More people suffer from depression. There's a greater demand for community-based mental

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

health services. There's a greater demand for those government agencies like DCFS, who intervene with troubled families. There's a greater demand on their services. I'm sympathetic, but I also recognize that people are hurt and bleeding in communities throughout the State and we have to provide some immediate relief, as imperfect as it might be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, DNR has stated in the past that funds cannot be swept due to moneys being license revenue and is against federal regulations to sweep these funds. That came from DNR. And -and -- and I -- and if you add up the -- the amount being swept from DNR, it comes to right at nineteen million dollars. To reopen the parks, I'm told, is about 1.2 million dollars. It -it -- and -- and -- and many of the funds that are being swept you know, the Park/Conservation Fund, the State Boating Act Fund, the State Parks Fund, Underground Resources Conservation Enforcement Trust, the Abandoned Mined Land Reclamation, DNR Special Projects Fund, Land Reclamation Fund - nineteen billion {sic} from them to restore 1.2. You know, I -- there's -there's something wrong here. We've had close to seven years in this administration and -- and every budget that he has finally proposed was passed as if it were balanced. And I can remember the Governor saying after a year or two, we finally have a balanced budget. Well, everyone in this Legislature knew that we've had six or -- six budgets now that have been passed, none of them balanced. And we just keep moving the payment cycle back. We keep borrowing more money. And now -- now we've --

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

we've come to -- it's finally come to a head. And this is -you know, this is just a poor job over the last six years, not
only by the Governor, but anybody who supports the Governor.
This is a -- this is a mess. I think you know it. We know it.
It's truly a mess and -- and it's going to take years to dig out
of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Jacobs.

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Just quickly. There's enough bologna to go around for all of us. And if we could print that bologna, we could probably run the State. But the fact is that we need these parks filled and we need to put the money where our mouth is. DCFS children are on the front lines and they aren't -- cases aren't going to be able to go forward because DCF workers won't be there to testify in court. Child abusers could get off. myriad of reasons to pass this bill, but the simple best reason is, is nobody else has an option. I am looking very forward to working with my friends across the aisle to find out exactly what you want to cut, to find out exactly how you want to grow the government, how you want to move Illinois forward. But year after year, we come to this Chamber; we do the same thing. We never talk about the future. But we better start talking about the future in Illinois, because our past is too rich with history for us not to move forward. I would just urge everyone to vote on this and save the bologna for the kids at home.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I looked forward to coming to Springfield these past couple days simply because -and I don't want to play into the lore that many of -- many of us do at times - I listen to some of my colleagues say, "Well, we get all these phone calls. We get all these messages and we get all this e-mail." Well, you know, for the first time, I can actually -- actually confirm that since May 31st, there hasn't been a day, there hasn't been a week, there hasn't been a month that I haven't received a phone call, an e-mail or a visit or gone to some public event where some social service agency, family, child, woman has not been affected by these cuts made by Governor Rod Blagojevich. I remind everyone that on May 31st, we provided a budget in that he cut two billion dollars - two billion dollars - and affected working families and real people, kids, women, children. And since, for two and a half months, those working families and -- and mothers and families that Rod Blagojevich pretends to protect -- I think the guy on the fifth floor of city hall has got it right. The man has gone cuckoo cuckoo - if not schizophrenic, because he has put in harm's way real people. These are children. These are mothers who face domestic violence. These are real people, DCFS, historic sites. The man has gone mad, by putting the most vulnerable people in society in harm's way. I know this is not the best public policy. But, you know, there's a saying in the Bible that goes: He who has no sin, cast the first stone. And we've been sweeping funds for Republican and Democratic administrations for as long as we can remember. So, what's wrong with it now? You know, we need, once again, to put the people ahead -- the people first and put Illinois first and restore these cuts to substance

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

abuse, historic sites, to our parks, and to working families in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Lauzen.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: You know, the summer season is now over. We're into fall. Kids are back in school. But this is an unhappy carnival shell game. To one of the previous speakers, my esteemed colleague from the Quad Cities area, you're talking about the State parks, and yet what Senator Luechtefeld pointed out is they're going to get 2.1 million dollars, yet on the shell game at the carnival, they're going to be taking 18.9 million away from the Department of Natural Resources. Got to look at what it is that you're actually proposing on this when you use that as an argument in favor of voting for the thing. It is an argument against it. They're going to be taking practically ten times as much away from those people as they're going to be restoring in the next bill. So, the Governor runs the wheels off this car. He's doubled the long-term debt, the mortgage debt, under the general obligation bonds. Runs the accounts payable to a level that's twice what it was before his administration, and that was bad enough. Now has the worst unfunded liability in the country and it's only bound to get worse with what's been going on in the financial markets. And he's tried to sell some of the most valuable assets of the State -- of our State taxpayers, that belong to the State taxpayers. It is such a misperception back home when people tell me, "Oh, but, you know, money is tight for the State government." That is such nonsense. Over the last

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

six years, the revenue of the State of Illinois has increased by That's sixty-five hundred millions of 6.5 billion dollars. dollars more today than he had six years ago and yet he still can't get by. Are our children better educated? The answer is, no, according to the performance statistics. Are the roads in better condition? They're obviously in worse condition. the streets safer? No, crime is going up. The delicate balance has been destroyed among the university system, the social service agencies. The money basically has gone to seven hundred thousand more people on Medicaid. One out of two babies born in Illinois now is covered under Medicaid, supplemented by the taxpayers, and no improvement in the number -- or the percentage of Illinois citizens who are covered by insurance. It was 13.8 percent at the beginning of his term. It's still 13.7 percent. So, all of this wealth has been squandered. And now you want to use one of the last things that's possibly at your disposal to make it through a year. And as Senator Dillard pointed out so appropriately, you're at the beginning of the budget year. And frankly, you're at the beginning of a recession. The worst impact on the State of a recession, and you're pulling out one of the last plugs that you can use to save when it gets a lot worse from here. This is just bad public policy that has been put forward by years of bad decisions. So, when the sponsor says that this -- we're in a recession because of no problems that we've created or no decisions that have been created by the current administration, I believe that the unemployment level being higher in Illinois and Chicago than it is across the country demonstrates that we -- that the current administration has had a lot to do with the mess that the budget finances are

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

in. This is a bad idea to pull out one of the last lifeboats you got.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

We are looking to restore some funding, which will be the - the follow-up bill that's coming up. My question is, did you
look at any other alternatives as a way to come up with the
revenue that's necessary to backfill the two hundred and twentyone million? Was anything else looked at besides sweeping the
funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The answer to that -- the answer to that question, Senator, is, yes. One of the alternatives that was considered and rejected was the Budget Stabilization Fund, which I think would have been a far less suitable alternative to draw down from. And -- and, you know, let me add one other thing. For -- one of the reasons why we're still here as the hour is approaching five o'clock is because there was, throughout much of the day, a greater bipartisan appetite to draw a larger net amount of money from these hundreds of dedicated funds. What -- so, to refocus everyone's thinking, what we've really done is take an incremental approach towards something that we all know that

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

we're going to need to revisit in the weeks or months ahead by virtue of the sheer pressures that are being put upon us as a result of the current economic conditions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Were any other issues -- were any other line items on the budget looked at when the decision was to only use the sweeps? For example, did we look at the Member initiative moneys that were in the budget? Did we look at the new programs that were - that were started in the budget? Did we look at, in fact, legislation that was introduced yesterday? Have we looked at selling some of the State planes? Can you tell me why the State of Illinois needs four planes for the Governor? If we sold one plane, we could keep all the parks open for a year. If we sold two planes, we could keep the parks and all historic sites open for an entire year. There are other options to look at. Were any of those looked at? Were any other cuts looked at, as opposed to just looking at raiding funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Those are -- those are matters really for another bill. This bill is seeking to maximize the amount of revenue-generating activity from hundreds of specially dedicated funds, which have historically represented an off-budget budget in this State. We've had this off-budget budget in Republican administrations and Democratic administrations. We heard earlier about how during the Edgar administration they sought to

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

confront very severe -- budgetary pressures during a bad economic crisis by using the same -- by using the same tools. And -- and I just want to add one other matter, and that is, this bill passed with ninety-seven votes in the House. there was obviously strong bipartisan support, not rushing with enthusiasm, but an acknowledgement that people are hurt and bleeding in our communities. Providers have had to shut down programs or lay people off entirely. Those who need services the most, whether they're -- a family who has a loved one with methamphetamine addiction in southern Illinois or someone with an alcohol or substance abuse problem in the Quad Cities or -or a -- a -- or a family that needs interventions that are provided from the Department of Children and Family Services in the southern suburbs. There's an interdependence in all of These tools are not new inventions. They're hardly our preferred options, but we're in a recession and we can't turn our backs on people. And when we start turning our backs on people, that's when we have to rethink why it is we're doing what we're doing here in the first place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. I'll try to ask a question. Maybe we can get a little shorter answer than the -- than that one. When we -- if you remember, when we passed the budget months ago, before this financial times have happened, when we passed the budget, we knew it wasn't balanced. In fact, the comments were made that the Governor will manage the budget. So, we passed it knowing that he was going to make -- knowing that you were going to have

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

the Governor manage the budget. Just like a -- you don't have a alcoholic working at a liquor store, the idea of you saying, "Governor, you manage the budget", we should have known better that this is how it would have been managed. Bottom line is, we did not look at any other alternatives. A sixty billion dollar budget, they can't come up with a -- a quarter of one percent in other areas to cut the budget than just going after dependency programs and going after our parks. That doesn't make sense. I think we could do a lot better job if you would work with our side of the aisle in actually crafting a budget that would be balanced, as opposed to just raiding funds, which is going to be a quick fix and not address the real problems. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Thank you. Just to remind everybody, we've had a lot of debate, a lot of questions. Please make your -- your comments brief right now. Senator Hendon.

### SENATOR HENDON:

...President, if I was in Washington right now, a Congressman or U.S. Senator, I would be supporting President Bush in his move right now to get this country back on economic ground with the fiasco on Wall Street. This is not time to be partisan. There is not time in Washington to be partisan. America is in a recession, not just Illinois. The alternative to this is further layoffs. They've already talked about the drug and alcohol abuse people. Right now in my neighborhood, they're selling two dollar heroin, two dollars a bag, and it's more powerful and more potent than ever, heroin, white heroin, from Afghanistan. We must put this money back in. You'll get your shot at Rod Blagojevich in a couple years and you can deal with

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

him then.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Radogno.

#### SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to express my frustration that we are here at five o'clock on Tuesday doing what we could have done at five o'clock on Wednesday. We all invested a whole day here. There was a lot of work put on on trying to make this a better bill. The fact of the matter is there is no -- there's no excuse for being in the position we're in right now, having to do these fund sweeps to -- to fund very important programs. That's just not a good situation. But we don't have very many good choices at all. But there was a real coming together today in an effort to make this a better fund sweep bill, to tighten up and use funds that are primarily bureaucratic and administrative and leave funds alone that our constituents care about. And that could have been done. also could have tapped into the twenty-five million dollars in pork that's still left in the budget. And we were almost there. There was a lot of compromise. Not all of those things would have happened, but we had a good shot at making this far, far better. And then, all of a sudden, after a full day's work and we sat waiting for an hour for the Senate Democrats to come over and, you know, give their final input, we find out, wow, the Governor got involved and you guys blinked. And now we're back to what the House passed, which is not a good bill. But, again, we have very little choice, at this point, but to try to fund those services. I'm going to vote No, because I know there's a better alternative out there. And so do all of you or you

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

wouldn't have been with us all day and yesterday afternoon working on that better alternative. So, we still have a shot. We could still make this a better bill and fund the services we need to fund. So I'm voting No on this, but I do think we will -- that we need to support the services that will be contained in the next bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Haine, briefly.

#### SENATOR HAINE:

Briefly, to the bill, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I believe that -- that a valiant effort was made by Senator Schoenberg and the -- and the leaders to craft a better bill, which means actually more funds to be susceptible to the so-called sweeps. We didn't get across the goal line. So here we are at this hour and rather than shooting the -coming upon the scene of this great battle and shooting the survivors, we should be focusing on the need to fund what's coming next, Senator Trotter's bill. And as referred to earlier by Senator Schoenberg, this is it. If we want to have a better bill, certainly we have November to take up another effort. But now we have many people watching this, on the edge of their seats. They're watching this. The House sent us their bill. They crafted their bill with Republican support. And if it goes back, we don't know what'll happen if -- if we change it. The people that are watching this -- the people that depend on the Alzheimer's funding, the people that depend on the mental health programs are watching this, the people that depend on the programs that deal with substance abuse, which are really public safety programs, the many, many other things that Senator

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Trotter will outline. Just as Senator -- the previous speaker indicated, yes, there could be a better bill. But this is what we have now and let's get it done. And certainly the criticism is warranted. And the criticism is good to remember in the budget process in the future, I agree. But now is the time to tell these people back home that there is not going to be a disaster and there's not going to be injury and harm as a result of our inaction and our concentration on other mistakes. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Last one's Leader Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I guess a quick question for the sponsor. Are there any guarantees that the historic sites, that the State parks, that the funding that's going to be provided by this, that those will open? Have you had any conversation with the administration and is there any quarantees that that will happen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I have not. I'm dealing with the revenue side of this, not the spending side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

I appreciate your candor and I think, obviously, we know the answer to this, that -- that there is no guarantee. I mean, this goes back to the capital bill and all the problems that we

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

had with that and the assurances and the guarantees that things were going to be spent in the manner in which we intended, we being the Legislature. And -- and we know how that -- that can turn out and I think that's a huge problem with what we're doing here. And I would say that - and some speakers have mentioned this - that if we were drafting this budget or if we would have been the ones to deal with the -- the vetoes, I think we would have done it differently. We have different priorities. Certainly, the twenty-five million dollars that's still in this budget that is contained for pork, primarily for your side of the aisle, for the Democrat side of the aisle - twenty-five million dollars would have gone a long way to solving the issues that are before us. But, no, we couldn't touch that. That's an issue that we would have had a priority. I think three caucuses in this -- on this -- in this -- in the Capitol here, the three caucuses would have agreed - take the twenty-five million out. One caucus did not, yours. There's a -- this is another onetime revenue source. This goes right back to the problems that we have of State government today. This isn't just this fiscal This has been going on for six fiscal years - total fiscal irresponsibility. Now we're solving that problem with one-time revenue sources that go away and the problem gets greater next year. I agree with Senator Radogno. We -- we were working hard. We -- we -- we were at the table. You were at the table. All of us were at the table. Things were working Things were going in the right direction. Unfortunately, enter the second floor, enter the administration and that -- and it came crumbling down. The agreement just dissolved. why I'm -- I'm -- I'm frustrated. I'm -- I'm upset. I haven't

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

-- the Members on this side of the aisle know that I am, because we had a solution at hand that would have been good. What are we impacting here? We're impacting tourism to the tune of fifteen million dollars. Tourism is the number two economic engine that drives this State. And we're taking money out of funds who promote tourism and market tourism for Illinois. Agriculture, the number one industry that drives this State, county fairs - all being swept to the tune of four and a half million dollars. It's been said by Senator Luechtefeld, we're taking -- sweeping eighteen million dollars out of funds that are appropriated for DNR purposes and putting that back 2.1. Now, that to me is not -- not a good trade. As Senator Lauzen talked about, it is truly, truly a shell game. And these dedicated funds, what are they for, especially in professions? I happen to be a pharmacist. I think you all know that. Pharmacists, dentists, doctors, Realtors, optometrists these professions are regulated and have a disciplinary fund established by the license that people pay in when we -- we -we get our license - by the way, of which were raised, almost doubled, three years ago, and it creates this excess in this --They lay people off that aren't out there inspecting funds. pharmacies, dentists' office, legal institutions, doctors' office, optometrists. They have -- optometrists have a guy working half-time. And you raise the fees on the license, so you end up having more money in the fund that you can ultimately sweep out, and it's a double taxation to those people in the professions. It truly isn't good public policy and that was said. This is terrible public policy. But this has been going on for six years - six years. There has to be a political price

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

to pay for the fiscal irresponsibility that has been put right at the feet of the people of this State, primarily by those in control. And who's in control? The Democrat Party and the Democrat President of the Senate, the Democrat Speaker of the House and the Governor of this State. That's where the responsibility lies and that's why we're here today to talk about legislation like this that's going to ultimately sweep some two hundred and thirty million dollars out of dedicated This is not good public policy. It's terrible public policy. We're all for keeping our parks open. How can we close the Vandalia old State House when next year - next year -Lincoln's bicentennial? There'll be people all over the country, all over the world, coming to the United States to follow the pilgrimage of -- of Lincoln. And we're talking about closing it. It's a matter of priorities, Ladies and Gentlemen. This would not have been our priority on this side of the aisle. You would have seen a different budget and a whole different This is a bad idea, terrible idea. And I encourage our Members, and you on your side of the aisle, be responsible for a change and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Garrett, briefly.

#### SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to speak. I usually don't stand up and speak to these types of issues, but I feel very strongly, and I encourage my friends on -- on the other side of the aisle to really think very seriously about voting No. When Senator Watson says that there's a political price to pay, I think that's really dangerous when we're talking

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

about closing disabled communities and making sure that they don't have another place to go, that there are no other recourses for the most vulnerable people in this State. This isn't about politics. It might be right here today in this Chamber, but we have to think about what our role is here. We're here as a safety net. These people need us. This is not something that we can pretend is going to go away, because it's not. It's up to us, right now, today, to do the right thing, to vote Yes to make sure that these people are going to get the funds that they need. Otherwise it's going to be a disaster. We're kidding ourselves if we think that we can just parlay this off to politics as usual in Illinois. This is different. We may have gotten here because of politics, but now we have to find a way to get out of it. And these people need us and we need to vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Schoenberg, to close.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think we've had a very healthy and extensive discussion on the imperfections of this bill, but there are simply too many people in this State who are hurt and bleeding and who need us. My friends, the world is so different than what it was just two weeks ago, when we have watched major financial institutions in this country either teeter on the verge of collapse or fail entirely. We have seen an economy which has forced more people to lose their homes which has turned them to alcohol and substance abuse, which has turned them -- increased the amount of -- the amount of people who

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

require mental health services in our communities. We cannot turn our backs on people. No matter whether we're Democrats or Republicans, we can't turn our backs on people. And we all like to go to our local community service providers for human services or mental health or the developmental disabilities and we all like to go every year and get an award and get our plaque and take a picture and look at it and -- and see how good it all looks in the newspaper, but how many bodies do we have to step over now to do that? We have to restore these essential services. We need to have a way to pay for it. This is not the first time we're going to need to take a -- a step like this. But we have to move forward, because we cannot leave people behind. Thank you.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

This is final action and requires three-fifths vote. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1, 5 and 9 to Senate Bill 790. 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 the question, there are 40 voting Yea, 15 voting Nay, none voting Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendments No. 1, 5 and 9 to Senate Bill 790. And the bill, having received the required constitutional three-fifths majority, is declared passed. Point of personal privilege. WCIA-TV requests permission to videotape. With leave of the Body, seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Sandoval, do you have a point of personal privilege? Senator Sandoval. Moving on to Senate Bill 1103. Madam Secretary, please read... Oh, Senator Trotter, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary,

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

please read the motion.

### SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 7 to Senate Bill -- 1103.

Filed by Senator Donne Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter, please explain your motion.

### SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. If I can just get your attention, please. I -- I do concur with the House on 1103. This is the appropriation bill that will restore funding to the various agencies that were impacted by the Governor's vetoes. But before I -- begin, I just want to say thank you for those who did speak on the last bill. I did write up my speech to which I was going to put this on Postponed Consideration, 'cause I -- 'cause as you know, there's no need having an appropriations bill if you don't have moneys to spend, which would automatically allow the Governor to veto the bill. So, for those who did vote for it, thank you very much, 'cause this is a step forward and forward is where we need to be going. This is not the saddest day, and as some said, this is -- this is a day that we have to look at. If I can get your attention, please. So, with that, there -- there has been sadder days. was sad when we did not have a budget, or we, as the Senate, passed out a budget here back in May with a revenue stream and that would have been passed in the House subsequently signed by the Governor, we wouldn't be here today. But it was because the President called for a Session day to fix this, we are looking at that. Thank you very much...

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter, could you hold off for a second? Can we - can we hold the noise down so that Senator Trotter can proceed? Thank you.

#### SENATOR TROTTER:

I'm -- I'm starting off unusually from -- from the back end to the front end, but I just to thank those individuals that did get us to this point 'cause this is a very serious issue that needs to be addressed. Thank you very much, Senator Radogno, because you're absolutely correct, for the past day and a half a -- a very conscientious, concerted effort was to put together a bill, two bills to be exact, which would certainly resolve, not totally resolve, but certainly dealt with these impending layoffs, these -- these imminent cuts on people who were not getting their dollars and closures, in some cases, to individuals. However, it -- that did fall apart and we are here today with this bill, 1130 {sic}. This bill, and if I could -again, Mr. President -- Mr. President, if -- if you can, just get a little -- little more... 'cause I'm not going to read the whole thing, 'cause we're -- we're talking about what we have here. This provides a...

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Please, please can we hold it down? Can we please hold it down? Thank you.

#### SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you. 1103 provides for the fund transfers for the amount of 219.1 million dollars, with a total of 11.9 million dollars will paid from OSF funds. In this bill, we see 1.6 million dollars will go the State Appellate Defender's Office.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

This will restore seventy percent of -- of those vetoes to the personal services and operational lines of the budget. of 2.3 billion was voted -- voted {sic} out of that. Again, this restores seventy percent. We see dollars which will go one hundred percent to the Attorney General, bringing them up to their level, which will give them the authorization to do their work. It also funds the other constitutional officers up to one hundred percent as well. Department of Aging will receive one million dollars for the Elder Abuse and Neglect program. Services will get an additional 55.1 million dollars for alcohol and addiction treatment services. This funding will fully restore the program to its F'09 level, which was passed by the General Assembly. More dollars of -- one million dollars will go to the -- to Department of Human Services for funeral and burial expenses. A -- two million six hundred thousand will go for Community Service Grant Programs for people with mental illness. Is -- more dollars will go to -- 1.9 will go for the programs in the CILA services and the DCFS children. We see 2.1 million dollars to the Department of Natural Resources. Board of Elections -- the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board was not taken up to the level which we would like to see, that would have been done in the other board, but we -- it goes up for another hundred thousand dollars to them. The -- another million dollars to Healthcare and Family Services, Historical Preservation. And I believe all of us have had an opportunity over the past two days to look at this list. But, more importantly, it restores those cuts. It will forestall those layoffs to our workers that are out there and it also provides 36.6 {sic} million dollars to the RTA subsidy. If there's any

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

questions, I'll answer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

We -- we -- on the previous bill -- bill, we had extensive discussion. Senator Trotter also was -- was in a position to ask -- answer questions and he did, so we would request that you be brief. Senator Watson. Any discussion? Senator Watson. SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I guess I'll ask the -Senator Trotter the same question I asked Senator Schoenberg.
The fact that forty good people just voted for the -- the
sweeps, seven on this side of the aisle, with the good intention
that this money will actually go for what it's intended and
that's what you just read off - the State parks, historic sites,
all the human service cuts - do you -- is there any guarantee
that the money that was just allocated from the sweeps will go
to fund Senate Bill 1103?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter.

### SENATOR TROTTER:

There is no guarantee, in -- in that we cannot -- the Governor has the spending authority; however, what we did guarantee with the passage of Senator Schoenberg's bill is that we have what -- we now have, the Budget Relief Fund. So, the dollars that will be transferred will go specifically into this fund, so they cannot be used for any other thing. And as pointed out by the Senator, that if those dollars are not expended in this fiscal year, they will revert back to the fund. So, at -- at no time will these dollars be transferred into the General Revenue Fund which will give the Governor ultimate

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

discretion on they're -- how they're spent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. And I guess the -- the obvious answer is, there is no quarantee. And I quess we just hope that the Governor will do the right thing. It's a matter of priorities. That's what I was talking about in the last presentation, in the last bill. We would have done things differently. I think you would have done things differently, Senator, and -- and it's sad that we're here now looking at another one-time revenue source to limp along as we get through another fiscal year. And come back next year and -- and probably have another irresponsible -fiscally irresponsible budget brought before us. And I just -you just cannot go along this way. And I -- and I -- for the life of me, I don't understand why these particular projects were picked. I -- I actually talked to the -- the Governor about this and I just -- I said, "What are you -- what is this about? Why is this that you're being so punitive to people, whether it's the tourism people with historic sites? think of the money that that brings into this State when people stop by to our various little historic sites all over the State. Our State parks." I said, "I don't understand why you would do this. I don't get it." I -- for the miniscule dollars that were involved here and he created all of this problem for him. I said, "You know, your -- your polling numbers are bad now, and after this is over, it's going to be worse." And I think the Post Dispatch, St. Louis Post Dispatch, proved that to be accurate. It -- it just doesn't make any sense. It's an

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

unbelievable way to govern. And you've got to work with people. You've got to work with all of us and a new day will start on the second Wednesday of January and I hope that that will be a different attitude on your side of the aisle about how you approach us on this side. I think it will be. I think it will be. And I look forward to that, because we can solve the problems of this State by working together. You don't do it by being a total dysfunctional State government, where nobody gets along and they won't even sit in the same room together. It doesn't work. So let's get together, limp along, get through this fiscal year, come back next year and let's do the right thing by getting together and solving the problems. And there are a lot of problems in this State and we'll be willing to be there with you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. A question of the sponsor. The...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

The sponsor indicates he will yield.

### SENATOR SYVERSON:

The special fund that's being set up that we're going to -that this two hundred and twenty million will go into and be
used to pay for these supplemental projects, will that -- will
those payments be sped up? Is that money going to be paid
quicker than other agencies that are not part of the supplement
that are now, you know, ninety/hundred and twenty days out?
Will there be -- will this change the payment cycle for any of
these groups?

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter.

### SENATOR TROTTER:

Excuse me, I did not -- I haven't red the specific language on -- on that, as that was in Senator Schoenberg's bill. Senator, I -- I'm being told that there is no specific language in there that would expedite the payments in -- in Senate Bill 790.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

So, we're going to set up this fund. We don't know when it's going to be funded, though, to pay these organizations? They'll be paid at the -- at the same rate that the current vendors are being paid at?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter.

### SENATOR TROTTER:

Again, to my knowledge, there's no specific language to do otherwise; however, it would seem, I believe, the unwritten intent is to ensure that these dollars are taken out of this fund very expeditiously to pay these individuals and to pay these workers. So, assumingly - was it fifty-five million dollars is needed for treatment - I'll make an assumption that transfer can happen as soon as the Comptroller allows that to happen and those dollars can go straight to start going -- being paid to the various providers that are out there. And the same with the -- the closures of the historical sites as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

But these aren't going to be expedited payments. We're not going to move these payments above all those now that are in line that have been waiting four/five/some six months from getting paid. This is not going to -- this doesn't change that and move this -- they get in line with everybody else. Is that correct? Or is that -- they're going to be on a different payment cycle?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter.

#### SENATOR TROTTER:

Since these are -- now become dedicated funds, dedicated to these various agencies, then I would make the assumption - again, there's no language there - that they will be jumped ahead of the line and receive the dollars, 'cause these dollars have already been taken out of these funds, not commingled with the general revenue or with the other billing practices that the other groups have been subjected to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Okay. I'll wrap it up with this. Well, I think that's going to be awfully unfair. We're going to be hearing from a lot of providers that have been waiting for months, and now we're going to sweep these funds and use that to pay other people in front of them. I think that's going to be a problem. We're currently sweeping two hundred and twenty million to backfill two hundred and twenty million, but earlier Senator

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Schoenberg talked about the fact that our numbers are way off and our hole is much bigger. Are we going to wait until the end of the year, the end of the fiscal year, to start addressing that or is there going to be some movement to try to address the magnitude of this debt now, so we don't have to wait until next June to implement that? Is there a reason why -- if we know the debt is this big, why we're not working to find other areas to cut so we won't have this financial problem?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter.

#### SENATOR TROTTER:

Arquably, you could say that there's nothing here that needs to be cut, 'cause there is really no fat. Mostly what we're talking about here are essential services that haven't been paid. And as a consequence of there being not enough dollars to go forward, they're going to cut themselves, 'cause they're going to be eliminated. So, the -- the urgency is that we do that so we do not have these total layoffs, so we do not have these reductions in staff, and certainly for those providers. And they're essentially not jumping in front of the line 'cause they've been in line. They haven't been paid. this is also just bringing them up to speed before they get to that closure level of -- of existence. So this -- things are being done, as -- as pointed out by Senator Schoenberg. We did talk about some options, as -- as mentioned Senator Radogno. Think we've had some -- some very fruitful conversations. We're going to be looking forward of -- of how we're going to address this deficit that we have at this point in time, even if it includes looking at the Budget Stabilization Act. Because when

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

-- when do we officially say, today is that rainy day that we need to be looking into this rainy day fund, if we have to go there? I don't think we have to have Hurricane Jezebel for us to really get to a point of that devastation for us to be looking at these other options.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Jones, to wrap up. Senator Hendon, your light went off.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I had turned it on - turned it off - turned it on. But very briefly, I just want to thank those on the other side of the aisle who voted for this -- the previous bill -- along bipartisan lines, and I will personally call the Governor and ask him to make sure that he spends the money the way that we indicated to him for the parks, for the substance abuse. I did want to point out that it was not -this bill is not necessarily something that the Governor wanted. It was the other side of the aisle -- I mean, the other side of the Chamber -- the Rotunda who wanted to put in some language in there, this bill, that just totally wouldn't have allowed the Governor to change one word without killing everything. And we simply don't want that. If there's something -- one little thing here or there that the Governor doesn't want, we don't want him to destroy the whole thing. So I just want to thank all of our Members on this side and that side who voted for this and I hope that we can do the same -- the last bill. I hope we can do the same on this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator -- President Emil Jones, to wrap up.

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

#### SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Now I rise in strong Yeah. support of Senate Bill 1103 and I encourage all Members to vote for this bill. The easiest thing is -- for Members to do is to jump up and complain about what has been cut. If you are facing a budget deficit and you'd like those programs restored to those persons in this State that need those programs to take care of themselves, then you should vote for it. But don't just vote for -- for the appropriation when you are not willing to vote for the revenue stream. This is not the President, I mean, of the United States. George Bush just goes somewhere and finds the money and spend it. We cannot print money in the State of Illinois. And one of the speakers talked about Vandalia. What's going to happen to Vandalia, historic site down there? If you are not willing to vote for money to keep that facility going, then don't stand on the Senate Floor talking about working together. We were working together today. It was not the second floor who intervened with that crazy language. came from the other side of the Rotunda. So let's get your facts straight. But let's -- let's stop playing games on this issue. In January, Mr. Minority Leader, I won't be here, but I trust that the great majority on this side will treat you same as I treated you, and I thought I treated you pretty well as the Minority Leader. Only thing I'm going to miss is all those papers you constantly threw up in the air. I was hoping that I saw some paper today. So, the circus itself, I won't miss that, but I may miss a few of the clowns that run around this place now and then. And I -- and you heard those -- those statements from your previous Leader. But we should vote for this bill,

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

take care of those persons who need the help. If you're not willing to fight for revenue for programs, then don't jump on this Floor with all this hypocrisy about how the budget is being managed. It's not going to change in January. The dollar amount that it takes to run State government is costly. If you don't want to take care of the elderly, you don't want to take care of the poor, or you don't want to take care of those who need treatment for substance abuse, you don't want to fund education, then I don't know why in the hell most of us are even here if that's the game that we constantly play. You should vote for his bill because it's good for the people of the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Trotter, to close.

#### SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The bottom line is, could there have been a better bill? Could we have found a better way to fund this? Certainly, if we would have had the time to do so. Certainly, we could have done it if there were other people, who unfortunately felt that they had to load this tree up to a point to whereas it was bending by its own weight. But what this bill does, it does take care of those essential services. Those things that are very important to all of us, things that we always talk about doing, and that is taking care of the folks back in our communities. This is going to keep those historical sites open. It's going to still be --the dollars are going to be there and the people are going to be there to encourage tourism, so we can, again, get those revenues, those revenue streams back in here. This is going to

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

ensure that those individuals that -- that work hard and work very diligently to serve those people who are at many times at risk, those individuals at DCFS, those -- those frontline workers, ensures that they have their jobs so they can continue to do the work to make people, other people who are less fortunate, more whole. It's going to make sure that DHS has their dollars. There's more dollars in here for the mentally -- for the DD individuals, for the -- the group homes, and also for the community homes. So, it doesn't do everything, but it certainly is going to keep this State alive until something better comes along. And I ask for an Aye vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

This is final action. It requires three-fifths vote or 36 Members voting for it. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1103. 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. 55 voting Yea, none Nay, none Present. The Senate concurs in House Amendments 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1103. And the bill, having received the required constitutional three-fifths majority, is declared passed. Senator Sandoval, for what -- what -- what point do you seek recognition?

#### SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purpose of announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Please state your announcement.

#### SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Just to announce for the record that Senator Antonio Munoz

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

is on medical emergency leave today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Thank you. Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 873, offered by Senator Demuzio and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

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

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No objections filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

There any discussion? If not, the question shall -- is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and the resolutions are adopted. Senator Watson. SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to make a motion to table Senate Bill 3061 due to a technical drafting error. Table Senate Bill 3061.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CLAYBORNE)

Senator Watson moves that Senate Bill 3061 be tabled. The motion is always in order. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and Senate Bill 3061 is tabled. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the

172nd Legislative Day

9/23/2008

Senate stands adjourned until such time as the Senate assembles in regular, Veto or other Session pursuant to the schedule established and published by the Senate President and in accordance with Senate Joint Resolution 105, as adopted on May 31st, -- May 31st, 2008. The Senate stands adjourned.