178th Legislative Day 11/20/2008

HB0029	Recalled	3
HB0029	Third Reading	4
HB2047	Third Reading	5
HB2332	First Reading	3
HB2973	Recalled	89
HB2973	Third Reading	95
HB4119	Third Reading	6
HB4249	Recede	86
HB4613	Third Reading	38
HB4758	Third Reading	7
HB4845	Third Reading	20
HB4861	Third Reading	23
HB4890	Recalled	25
HB4890	Third Reading	27
HB5037	First Reading	121
HB5151	Recalled	28
HB5151	Third Reading	35
HB5730	Third Reading	36
SB0620	Concurrence	61
SB0934	Concurrence	52
SB1511	Concurrence	71
SB1529	Concurrence	75
SB1981	Concurrence	83
SB1987	Concurrence	96
SB2452	Concurrence	83
SB2520	Concurrence	113
SB2558	Concurrence	114
SB2558	Non-Concurrence	115
SB2562	Concurrence	85
SB2824	Concurrence	87
SB3078	First Reading	121
SR0923	Adopted	42
SR0930	Resolution Offered	1
SR0931	Resolution Offered	2
SR0932	Resolution Offered	2
SR0933	Resolution Offered	117
HJR0145	Adopted	118
HJR0145	Resolution Offered	118
SJR0109	Adopted	44

178th Legislative Day 11/20/2008 Senate to Order-Senator Martinez 1 Prayer-The Reverend Joe Eby 1 Pledge of Allegiance 1 Journal-Approved 1 Message from the House 21 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 21 Committee Reports 21 Executive Session 46 Committee Reports 47 Committee Reports 48 Executive Session Arises 49 Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes 51

Committee Reports

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Message from the House

Messages from the House

Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted

51

51

117

117

118

121

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The regular Session of the 95th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desk? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Reverend Joe Eby, Chatham Presbyterian Church, Chatham, Illinois.

THE REVEREND JOE EBY:

(Prayer by the Reverend Joe Eby)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please remain standing for the Pledge Allegiance. Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Maloney)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Journal of November 19th, 2008.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

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

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 930, offered by Senator Harmon and all

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Members.

And Senate Resolution 931, offered by Senator Jones and all Members.

They're both death resolutions, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

And Senate Resolution 932, offered by Senator Hendon.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

A point of personal privilege, Madam President. I would like the Senate to welcome -- I met two -- a wonderful couple last night after our meeting and they are here today to visit us, all the way from Australia, and are here today. This is Chris and Denise Knight from Australia. I'd like the Senate to welcome them to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Will our guests please rise? Will we give them a very warm Illinois welcome? Will all the Members at the sound of my voice please come down to Senate Chambers? We are going to continue for further final action. All Members, please come to the Senate Floor. Senator Risinger, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RISINGER:

Point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

State your point.

SENATOR RISINGER:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

I have on the Floor with me George Ryan from the Department of Transportation. He is the Regional Engineer in charge of District 2 and 3 out of Dixon and Ottawa. And I wish the Senate would all give him a hand and a welcome to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Can we please welcome this gentleman to the Senate Floor? Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 2332, offered by Senator Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Bethany Carson from the -- Statehouse Bureau Chief, Illinois Issues, seeks leave of the Body to take still photos. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. The Associated Press requests leave to take photos. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. We will now proceed to the Calendar - on page 2, top of the Order, House Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Forby. House Bill 29. Senator Forby seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 29 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 29. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Forby, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. Amendment No. 5 becomes the bill. And what

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

this is, is there's about an acre of ground that Central Management Services owns in Marion, Illinois, next to the Chamber of Commerce, and the Chamber's wanting to expand on their -- their building. They're going to spend about six hundred and -- so -- or, six hundred thousand dollars on this building and it's going to take one acre of property. There's nobody in opposition to this. So, if there's any questions, I'll try to answer your questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Forby moves the adoption of -- of Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 29. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 29. Senator Forby, do you wish to proceed? He indicates he will. Madam Secretary, read the bill, please.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 29.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. I just explained this bill. And one thing it does do, if it don't do -- go to public service, it goes back to

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

CMS. So I just ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 29 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 29, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Proceeding to House Bill 2047. Senator Link. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 2047.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. The -- this bill -- House Bill 2047 provides that, in event a firefighter began a new employment with new employer as a result of intergovernmental agreement -- eliminates the previous employer's fire department, the new firefighter shall not be required the seven-year credit with his last pension. And it combines with the last creditable years for any disability pensions received. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

A -- a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Does -- does this involve any increase in any way to an unfunded liability? Does it increase the unfunded liability in any way or at -- or an implicit tax increase to pay for this benefit?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 2047 pass. The question is, shall House Bill 2047 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 2047, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body -- with leave of the Body, we will return to 2973. Now moving on to House Bill 4119. Senator Frerichs, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 4119.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

One second while I fix my microphone. Thank you very much, Madam President. House Bill 4119 amends the Code of Civil Procedure by allowing an attorney admitted to practice in the State of Illinois, as an officer of the court, to issue subpoenas on behalf of the court for witnesses and to counties in a pending action. The proposed bill does not require an order of court to obtain an issuance by the clerk or by an attorney of a subpoena duces tecum. And I would -- it was passed unanimously in the House. Would ask a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4119 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4119, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will return to 4613. Senator Sullivan, on House Bill 4758. Do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 4758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Thank you, Madam President. Members of the Senate, House Bill 4758 is an extension of the sunset of the Horse Racing Equity Fund Act. It was created by legislation in 2006. It places a three percent impact fee on casinos with adjusted gross revenues over two hundred million dollars. The money is distributed from the Fund to be used for horsemen's purses and marketing and track improvements. This language -- the -- the language in this legislation would be -- would be eliminated if -- the impact fees would be eliminated if the State passes legislation to put slots at the tracks, if the casino taxes are raised, or when the tenth license becomes active. This -- legislation also has a three-year sunset date from the date that the legislation is -- is -- is -- it -- it goes into effect. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in strong support of this legislation. Would just like to remind the Body, coming from the county that still has more horses than people, we really look at this not as a racing bill, but as an agribusiness bill. This really puts money back into my county. We have a lot of horse farms that -- we have a lot of individuals that depend upon seed and farm businesses. So I rise in strong support and I commend Senator Sullivan for putting this legislation forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

To the bill, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

...bill.

SENATOR HOLMES:

This is really a major problem in so many of the communities that have casinos and we count on this. And you have to understand that the State, right off the top, gets fifty percent from the casinos. What we have done recently, within the past year, is we have caused such a massive hardship. passed a smoking ban, which has hurt the amount of revenue the casinos are bringing in. Casinos in Joliet - Harrah's has laid off or not replaced over two hundred and twenty people. Penn National, with casinos in Aurora and Joliet, have also faced significant layoffs of over two hundred people. And this is just going to continue to escalate as we keep hammering the casinos which bring in so much revenue to our State. We're now cutting those dollars. So this really does present a major hardship. Look at this. The casinos to Illinois have been sort of like this, you know, goose that lays the golden egg. And we keep hammering them with tax increases, subsidies to the tracks. And I, as a business owner, don't know any other business that subsidizes a competing business. What we're doing with this golden goose at this point is pretty much chopping off its head. And we're going to get to a point where we put our casinos out of business and we're no longer getting that revenue. So I am definitely opposed to this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Wilhelmi, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR WILHELMI:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: I -- I'd like to first state that I have great respect for the sponsor. He knows that. I think everyone in this room knows that. What I -- what I want to question is this - and I want you all to think about it: At what point are we going to stop taking one industry to subsidize another? At what point are we going to say, if we continue to do that, we're going to have that industry, the gaming industry, which we legalized in 1991, continue to do layoffs? I know for a fact that the two boats in Joliet will lay people off because of this bill. And what happens when they lay people off? What happens when they shorten the hours? happens when they see the revenues go down? The funds that go into our State coffers go down. So as we ramp up taxes for the casino industry, we are actually seeing a decline in revenue to the State of Illinois. This is not sound public policy. And also, it attacks four of the nine casinos. So if you do well in the State of Illinois and you operate a casino and you get -your revenue is over two hundred million dollars, we're going to penalize you and tax you. We're not going to tax all the casinos in the State - just the four successful -- most successful casinos. When you look at this from a policy perspective, when you look at it on the revenue side, and when you look at it in terms of the free market that we all subscribe to in this country and in this State, I ask you all to please give this great thought and consideration before we take this vote. Why now, when the revenues to the casinos are down 20.6 percent? Why now, when we're seeing a loss of market share to Indiana in large part because of the smoking ban? Should we be doing this now, Ladies and Gentlemen, or should we maybe take a

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

break, let the casinos continue to operate, let those revenues continue to go into the -- to the GRF and to the School Fund? Why now? A vote of No sends a message that we understand why this industry is so important to the State of Illinois, why two hundred plus employees being laid off by each of the boats that are going to be affected. We're talking about a thousand or more people that are going to lose their jobs because of this bill - not just because of the market in general, because of this specific piece of legislation. Please think about that before you cast your vote. Please consider those thousand employees. And please take a hard look at the policy message this is sending. It's not good policy on the revenue side and it's not good public policy in general. I ask you to vote Present or No. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Can we kind of quiet it down a little bit? Senator Haine. SENATOR HAINE:

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

Indicates he will.

SENATOR HAINE:

Senator Sullivan, what is the actual numbers that would indicate a decline in gross revenue on the present, existing gaming boats? Do you have those figures? I mean, I've heard them bandied about, but what are the -- what's the actual number in the last six months, we'll say, that show a decline, and what -- what is the amount of that money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Sullivan.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Senator Haine, are you talking about a decline from the -the casinos themselves? I -- here's how I'll answer the question. This -- and it's actually a -- I'd like to also respond to what Senator Wilhelmi stated. This fee has been in place for the last two years. The -- the casinos have been paying this impact fee -- fee for the last two years. profits have continued to rise. It has generated approximately - I don't know exactly, but around - thirty to thirty-five million dollars a year. That money is -- actually, right now, it's about seventy-five maybe eighty million dollars, is sitting in the Treasurer's Office in a fund there, has not been dispensed because this was challenged in court. The courts ruled on it. The Illinois Supreme Court ruled on it 7 to 0, said this is constitutional. And, again, I want to reiterate, there have not been any layoffs. This fee has been in place for the last two years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

So - right - the -- so we have seventy-five million at the present time sitting in an account that was from past collection, right? But in the past six months, it's been stated that the revenue, the gross revenue, has declined on the existing boats. That's what I'm -- I'm asking. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

I think, as some of the previous speakers have indicated, the casinos are indicating that the smoking ban has had a negative impact on their gross revenues, yes. I do not know those numbers, though, Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

So, would it be fair to say that it -- that the -- the phrase "negative impact" might be further fleshed out to be a significant negative impact? I'm being told that its revenues are dropping twenty-five percent on the existing licensed boats. Is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Again, I do not know what those numbers are. There has been a reduction and I know that some of the concern has been with regard to the smoking ban. You and I have talked about an amendment to this bill. And I assume that you are going to bring this up, so let's just have a discussion about it right now. As you all know, when the legislation -- the smoking ban, it was initially -- passed, I was one who was in support of giving an exception to the casinos. I know that -- and I would still be interested in doing that. I feel very strongly that we can address the concerns -- the health concerns on the -- on the riverboats and still allow smoking in parts of those casinos.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Thank you, Senator Sullivan. I appreciate that very much. My -- my point is this, and I'm addressing this I guess to the bill and to my colleagues here: We have an industry that, for a number of reasons, is in decline - is presently in decline because of competition from adjoining states - Wisconsin, Indiana, Iowa and Missouri - that have -- that allow smoking in their gaming facilities. Gamblers smoke - and that's -- that's a fact of life. I didn't create that. It -- that's just the way it is. I used to work bingo games at old St. Patrick's Church in Alton and come home and have to -- take two showers. Gamblers smoke. My -- my -- what I'm asking the Senate to consider is that -- is that we do not keep at the present time the three percent; that we delay this matter until next month and see how we can turn this industry around - it may be exempting smoking - because we are continuing a tax that is on a declining industry, which makes them more unwilling to invest, which creates a downward spiral as they face competition, as I say, from the adjoining states. We just look at this anew rather than keeping a -- this impact fee on what is now not a rising tide which carries all boats, but a declining tide which may sink and ground some of these boats. That's all I'm asking. This is a different vote that we're taking now than we took before. And there's seventy-five million dollars in this fund to be released. So it's not going to hurt the horsemen if we consider the board and consider the future of the industry which is generating the money for the horsemen. It seems to me that we would take a careful, cautious look while they're using the seventy-five million dollars. So a Present vote or a No vote would not diminish them because they have this fund. And that's

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

what I'm asking. And I thank you, Senator Sullivan, for your candor, your presentation of the bill. But this is an -- an industry which is in decline. Its decline will ultimately affect the very horsemen that are asking to continue this -- this impact fee. And what I'm saying is, let's look at the whole board and see how we can benefit both. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You know, every once in a while, we listen to a debate on the Senate Floor and there's always a trickle -- at least a trickle of hypocrisy, Madam President, but it is getting at least knee-deep in here and approaching the waist. The notion that because an industry is in decline that we should relieve them of a tax burden is revolutionary in this Chamber. This State's been losing businesses for the last six years. But I haven't heard anyone on that side of the aisle get up and say let's cut taxes, let's reduce the tax burden, let's try to create jobs. But now, suddenly, because the riverboat industry's maybe got some problems out there, because you voted for the smoking ban, you now want to go back and take it from the tracks. That's wrong. If you are worried about the decline of the industry, then maybe you should revisit your vote or your policy with regards to restrictions on the riverboat casino industry and not from the horsemen. I urge a Yes vote on House

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Bill 4758. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support this morning of House Bill 4758 Senator Sullivan is introducing this morning. I beg to differ with the gentleman from Alton, Illinois, my colleague Senator Haine. You know, if we took that approach in regards to maybe we should wait awhile and maybe we should wait thirty days, maybe we should wait sixty days, well, then, maybe we should wait out to bail out the banks in this country. we should wait to bail out the automobile industry, 'cause it's an industry in decline. Maybe we should wait to bail out the coal industry, because they haven't figured out how to -- how to create clean coal energy. Maybe we should wait for all these economic opportunities that exist in our backyard who need help. The horse racing industry is an industry that has provided a source of revenue for many, many social services, for many great programs that all our communities have benefited throughout the last fifty, sixty, a hundred years. And to today turn our backs on the horse racing industry would be a shame. Would be a shame that -- after all these years of producing revenues for many of our programs that have benefited all our people and all our communities, it would be a shame. The horse racing industry, for many of our communities, is an economic -- is -- is one of the last bastions of economic opportunities for our suburban municipalities. I know that in Cicero and Berwyn and Stickney, beyond that southwest corner, Hawthorne Race Track important part of the fabric of the economy of our community.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

We need to give them one last opportunity to regroup, restructure and provide opportunities. That industry cannot be left alone. We need to stand by it. It has been with us for many years. And I'd like everyone on both sides of the aisle to vote green in support of this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Any other discussion? If not, Senator Sullivan, to close.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I, first of all, want to thank my colleagues for a very lively discussion and debate on this issue. You brought up some very good concerns and questions. I do appreciate that. I -- I -- I just want folks in the Chamber here to know that the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Sullivan, hold on one second. Please, can we please quiet it down so we can hear Senator Sullivan give his closing.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Been a lot of discussion about the -- the profits of the casino industry and how they have dropped for whatever reasons - the smoking ban, the economy, whatever. But please keep in mind that the -- the casino industry has continued to make large profits, huge profits. Whereas, the horse racing industry, this agricultural-based industry, is struggling. There are nineteen other states that have racing and casinos. All those other states do something similar to what we're doing in -- here in Illinois. They either have slots at the tracks or they have impact fees. We are trying to put Illinois on a level playing

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

ground. I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 4758 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 37 voting Aye, 13 voting Nay, 5 voting Present. This bill, having received -- I'm sorry, House Bill 4758, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate President Emil Jones, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. Just a point of personal privilege. I'd like for the Chamber to welcome back the Minority Leader who was out for a brief stint. We are all glad to see him back, doing well. And I promised... And I -- I promised him this morning -- he said he didn't want to have a relapse. He said, "Please don't put Senator Hendon in the Chair."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please state your point.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I would like to introduce to the Senate my Page for a Day. His name is Austin Yattoni - Would you stand up, Austin? - and he is here today with his father, Bill Yattoni. They are from

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Rochester, Illinois. And they're also joined today by their pastor at the Chatham Presbyterian Church, Pastor Joe Eby. So, if you would welcome them to the Senate Chambers, I'd appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Welcome to the State Senate. Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

State your point.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

I have a guest with me - actually, he's been in -- with me for the last two days. He is a cousin of mine, Jesse Sullivan. He's from Petersburg - Senator Bomke's constituent. But he lives in Petersburg. He is a recent graduate of Oxford University and got a master's there in international politics. And he's -- wants to find out how we do it at the State level, so he's spent the last couple of days with us. I'd like everybody to welcome Jesse Sullivan to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please help us welcome this -- this gentleman to the Senate Chamber. Senator Bond, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BOND:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

State your point.

SENATOR BOND:

I -- I would just like to welcome here today some terrific

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

young men from Lake County. They are here with YouthBuild in North Chicago. I'd like to offer them a warm Springfield welcome. They're in the President's...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Will our guests please rise? Will the Senate please welcome them? Mike Brooks from WICS seeks leave of the Body to videotape. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Back to the order of business on page 2, House Bill -- House Bills 3rd Reading, towards the bottom. House Bill 4845. Senator Harmon. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 4845.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 4845 is a technical amendment to the Interior Design Title Act. We're simply changing the title from "interior designer" to "registered interior designer". The intent is to preclude a lawsuit. There is an organization that has been filing suit in other states on these sorts of title Acts. By making the change and including the word "registered", we believe we can eliminate that risk. I'm not aware of any opposition. I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4845 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4845, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, Messages.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

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

Senate Bill 1981 -- 1981

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

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1981

Passed the House, as amended, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Senate President's Anteroom. The Rules Committee will meet immediately.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Hendon, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Executive Committee - a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 934, Motions -- a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1511, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2452, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2824, a Motion to Concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1981, Senate Resolution 929 and Senate Bill 1861; refer to State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee - a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 620, a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529, a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2562, a Motion to Recede from Senate Amendment No. 2 and 3 to House Bill 4249; refer to Transportation Committee - House Joint Resolution 88 and 130; Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment No. 6 to House Bill 2973, Floor Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 5151 and Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 109.

Senator Rickey Hendon, Chairman. November 20th, 2008.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

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

Yes, purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please state your announcement.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, I'd like to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please listen up. Listen up, please.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I'd like to announce that State Government and Veterans Affairs will be meeting at 12:15 in Room 409.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Silverstein, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Purpose for announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please state your announcement.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

The Senate Executive meeting will meet promptly at 12:15 in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Cullerton, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Please state your point.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

I was -- I don't see the gentleman now, but I wanted to just welcome the Speaker of the House, who was just on the Floor of the Senate. Want to welcome the Speaker over here in the Senate. Speaker Mike Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Speaker Madigan, welcome to the Senate. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're returning now to the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bills, on page 2. We will proceed with Senator Maloney on House Bill 4861. Do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 4861.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Currently, in Illinois law, says that when an individual's agreed to have her name included in the -- his or her name in the First Person Consent organ and donor tissue {sic} (tissue donor) registry, the -- that can be -- and there's -- there is a death and -- that can be referred to by the hospitals. What this bill -- and we have one of the largest donor registry programs in the country. What this bill does is simply permits county coroners and medical examiners to check that First Person Consent organ and donor tissue {sic} registry to see if the accident victim who has died is on that list. Very often, the county coroner or medical examiner is at the scene of an accident, and this is a better way to facilitate checking the registry and would hopefully save some additional lives. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4861 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4861, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Garrett.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Garrett seeks leave of this Body to return House Bill 4890 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 4890. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Garrett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Garrett, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. We've actually passed this bill already, and because of the JCAR rule issues that we are involved in, this -- the bill that we passed out of the Senate has been attached to another bill. So here's what it is: It -- it simply requires that the State Board of Education work, in conjunction with the Department of Public Health, to develop and make available to school boards guidelines for the management of students with life-threatening food allergies by July 1, 2009. And then but -- by July 1, 2010, each local school board must implement its policy based on the State Board of Education's guidelines. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any discussion on the amendment? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. I -- question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

She indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator, I know that yesterday in committee we had some discussion on this and that the Illinois School Alliance had indicated some concerns. And have you had an opportunity to address those or would you, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, thank you. Yes, they do have concerns. These are the same concerns they had with the first version. They just want to make sure that they are at the table, that the local school boards do have input. And -- and I have pledged and promised that that will happen. The point of this - as you know, we're caught in this back and forth - is to keep this bill alive. As I said in committee, we all have constituents, parents of these children who have these food allergies at schools, who -- who want to have some sort of a -- a program at their local school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Burzynski. SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Senator. I do appreciate your response. I think some of the concern is -- and I think that you know this as well. This bill is probably going to go to the House. And I -- I understand yesterday you said you wanted to just keep this in the process, keep it moving. The reality is, we'll probably have to have a new bill introduced next year, I'm guessing, in the next General Assembly. And I think that it would probably be very good if you could bring the School Management Alliance and others in to that discussion and get it done right so that we don't have some of this. So, you know, I would appreciate

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

your comments on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion on the amendment? If not, Senator Garrett moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4890. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 4890. Senator Garrett, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 4890.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I think we have really covered the bill through the amendment. And, again, to those who have any concerns regarding the administrative organizations for schools, I have promised and pledged to work with them, make sure they have a seat at the table. And most likely, we will have a much more in-depth bill in the Session. But, again, I would like to keep this bill alive and show that we continue to have support until I can sit down with all the interested parties. And I appreciate your Aye vote.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4890 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4890, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Raoul, on House Bill 5032. Moving on to the top of page 3. Lightford, on House Bill 5141. Senator Lightford. Moving on to Senator Trotter, on House Bill 5151. Senator Trotter seeks... Senator Trotter seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 5032 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of -- of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill -- 5032. Madam Secretary, are there any -- I'm sorry... I'm sorry. No, there's -- a little technical error. On House Bill 5151. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved -- approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Trotter. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Raoul, on Amendment No. 2 -- Senator Trotter, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Madam President, Members of the Senate. It's a very simple amendment. What it does is it appropriates, in FY'09, 34.7 million dollars from other State funds. The legislation includes funding from the Department of Transportation for the expenditures for salt, road salt, as well

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

as cost-neutral fund transfers from the Capital Development Board. Again, this legislation does not contain any funding from GRF.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Madam President. Just to let the Members on this side know - that weren't in Appropriations yesterday - this -- the salt issue, while there may be some issues with respect to why it's so expensive, the Audit Commission is looking into that. But we really do need to appropriate some money to make sure that our roads are safe this winter. So I would urge a Yes yote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Senator Lauzen, on the amendment.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I could make the comment either now or when it goes to 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Whatever you want, Senator.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

The -- the concern for the Body is we have a tremendous mess on the procurement in this. In Audit Commission yesterday morning, then Appropriations Committee in the afternoon, it was described that the centralization of the procurement on this issue in CMS has created this problem. What we're going to be approving in this bill is three times the cost from last year for a commodity like salt for our roads. In my opinion, it's like an overly indulgent parent with a delinquent adolescent.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

When you vote for this kind of bailout, you'll be reinforcing bad behavior. And actually, I think that there's -- not only is the Audit Commission looking at it, but the Attorney General, Lisa Madigan, is now looking at it. I think that we're just reinforcing bad behavior. So I -- I would advise against supporting this because of the problems. Three times the cost of last year. If something doesn't stink in that procurement -- I'd give odds on that bet.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Thank you. Any further discussion on the amendment? Senator Trotter moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 5151. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President. Pardon me, Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Trotter, to explain your amendment. SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman and, once again, Members of the Senate. Senate Amendment No. 3 appropriates a total of forty million dollars from other State funds, specifically the Tobacco Settlement Recovery Fund, to the Department of Healthcare and Family Service -- Services for our catastrophic relief payment program. The program is intended to be administered by the Department and will be for hospitals which meet the following criteria: First, they have to be Illinois-based; it has to have a Medicaid inpatient utilization

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

rate of greater than the current Statewide mean; and they are not a publicly owned hospital; and are not part of a multiple hospital network.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

He indicate he'll yield.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

The money that we're sweeping out of is -- is the money that's usually used for the -- the prescription drug program. Is this the -- the Tobacco Settlement Recovery funds? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, no. The -- the yes part - yes, it is coming out of the Tobacco Settlement dollars. But, no, these are not dollars that have been earmarked for anything else. What we have in the ending balance from the tobacco funds is 79.6 million dollars. So these are not taking dollars from any other program. These are just dollars that have not been dedicated to anything else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

So we currently have a balance of seventy-nine million dollars that's sitting in the -- in this Tobacco Settlement Fund

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

right now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, that is the projection of the ending balance for '09. Last year, we had left an ending balance of 68.7 million dollars. So the projection is that, based on the interest accruals, it'll be -- 79.6.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

So the decision was -- I -- I guess, first of all, if -- if we have this money that's available -- it has been frustrating for the last few months as we have been trying to get funds to pay human service providers, to pay health care providers, to pay our bills, and now we're finding out that there is money there that could have been used to pay those individuals. But, I guess, who's decision was it that we have chosen these hospitals - which the majority of them are in Chicago - who's decision was it that we were going to pay mainly these Chicago hospitals money, but we're not going to use it to pay any of the human service providers that are struggling and laying off people and having to close their doors 'cause they're not getting paid?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

It's going to be our decision. That's why we're going to pass this legislation. We're not paying the bills. The current

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

payment cycle, we're behind - it's almost 1.7 billion dollars. This will constitute payment -- if we even put it towards the payment cycle for those providers that have been administering services, would not be more than just one day or maybe two days that we're paying down that cycle. This is a -- a -- a rational way to spend this -- these dollars that are here. Even though we talk about seventy-nine million and a hundred million, but in the scheme of things, it's not that much money. where it'd do the most good. You say the hospitals are in Well, that's where the hospitals are basically struggling the most. That's where the population is. where we have the largest population of uninsured and -- and -and underinsured individuals. These dollars will address that. The decision of which hospitals will be chosen will be given to the Department who will make the determination which is the most needy. So this is -- the twenty-three hospitals that have been listed are certainly not all the hospitals that are in need of these dollars, but those are the ones that have been at least looked at and recognized that are in dire need of -- of these dollars or some dollars before they close.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. I certainly agree that they need to be helped and they need to be paid, as we need to do that with all of our bills. But isn't it true that the majority of these Chicago hospitals that are on here, they are already under the Prompt Payment Act and they are all being paid within thirty days, where our human service providers are out four, five, six, seven

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

months from being paid. All these on here are being paid within thirty days, so they're caught up. And doesn't it make sense for us to at least make an attempt to help our human service providers and our mass transit organizations that are all struggling before we pay off hospitals that are already being paid promptly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Because of the economic crisis that we're in, there are a lot of things that we need to be doing, but we do not have the revenues to do them. Certainly, we need to be addressing our transportation needs, our infrastructure needs, our education dollars, where those dollars are going to come from. We don't have the money. This is barely enough money even to address the hospital problem. But where we do have money, we try to earmark it where it's going to do the best good. In this case, this is enough money, and -- and it's not -- it -- we've said it's forty million dollars, but in essence, really, it's only twenty million dollars because we're getting a twenty -- another twenty million dollars matched from the feds. So we are, again, trying to do what we can in this bad situation and make it better with the -- the limited resources that we have. The hospitals, again, it's -- it's not just Chicago. You know, there's -there's hospitals down here from -- from Carbondale, Centralia. It -- it goes throughout the State. So, to -- to look at it just as a -- a Chicago problem, it's not; it's a statewide issue. We have some resources - we'd like to utilize them in this regard.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

I'll just wrap it up with this. And I know it's -- you're in a tough situation, having to make a decision, but we're the ones that are getting calls every day because of the fiscal mismanagement of the last six years. We're the ones that have to tell our human service providers that haven't been paid for six months that the decision of this Body is that we're going to take a few available dollars that we have and we're going to give it to those hospitals that are already paid up to date. And that is a difficult decision to make, for us to have to go back home and say we've chosen to give this money to these Chicago hospitals who are already paid up. And so I would urge a No vote, and then I -- I hope we go back to the drawing board and we try to address the whole systemic problem, as opposed to just this piecemeal approach of helping a -- a few select hospitals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Trotter moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 5151. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, we have House Bill 5151. Senator Trotter, do you wish to proceed?

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 5151.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, again, Madam President. We've heard the discussion -- discussion. If there is no further discussion, I just ask for its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5151 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, we have -- there are 46 voting Aye, 7 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5151, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Noland, on House Bill 5730. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 5730.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Senator Noland.

SENATOR NOLAND:

Thank you, Madam President. House Bill 5730 merely takes

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

the -- the -- excuse me, rather amends the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act within our Municipal Code and allows the Village of Hoffman Estates to extend the life of its TIF district from twenty-three to thirty-five years to take advantage of the tax/financial incentives to help redevelopment -- redevelop a small parcel of land just above I-72. So that's all there is to it. We do have the approvals of all of the associated taxing bodies. Everybody is on board with this. This passed out of committee unanimously. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in strong support of this legislation. At a time when our State's economy, when our national economy is really struggling, the extension of this TIF is going to allow a community to continue its development process. It's providing jobs. It's stimulating the local economy. I think it's a real wise decision for everyone to consider supporting this legislation and extending the TIF. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MARTINEZ)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5730 pass. All those in favor will -- will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, there are 56 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5730, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

passed. Senator Link in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

With leave of the Body, we will go back to House Bill 4613.

Senator Martinez. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 4613.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez, to explain your bill.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you. House Bill 4613 provides that the county jail housing immigration-related detainees shall provide detainees with reasonable access to religious workers, consistent with the safety, security, and orderly operation of the jail. It also defines "reasonable access" and provides the sheriff with the right to screen and approve religious workers. As you know, at the accelerated pace that right now the deportation process going on of immigrants, right now there's several counties that do not have -- that some of these jails do not permit access to ministry. And all we're saying with this bill is that please work with the -- if we can work with the sheriff's office in those counties to provide access to religious ministry to these detainees who are right now separated from their families. And I just think that morally it is the right thing to do. I want to thank Senator Collins, who helped me tremendously with this bill also. And I'm -- I'm happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Martinez, first, I want to thank you for the exchange that we had yesterday -- yesterday in committee about this bill. One of the issues that was raised was the fact that we have in Illinois statute now a law called the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which says that without a compelling reason, a governmental body cannot unduly burden someone's ability to exercise their worship. That bill, it's my understanding -- that law, excuse me, applies to anyone who is incarcerated in the State of Illinois. Is that -- and would that -- do you know if that law currently covers individuals who are detained based on their immigration status? Does the Religious Freedom Restoration Act cover those people?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I don't think that we are doing anything to circumvent what's -- with the law. I think what we're trying to do here is make sure that there is a process at the other end, especially in one of the counties that doesn't -- doesn't even allow any type of religious ministry. And we just think this is wrong. All we're trying to do is, we want to work with -- with those counties to make sure that all the policies, all the safety policies, are being followed, that there is no new regulations

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

or no new schedules -- schedules being put in place at all. All we're saying is, please allow these people who are in these jails to -- to be allowed access -- access to ministry based on the fact that they are so separated from their family. And we know that even the worst criminal has access to ministry. These are not criminals. These are people that are waiting for immigration to -- for deportation. And we're asking these counties to work and make sure that they are allowed this -- this religious ministry in their -- in those jails.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Martinez, it seems to me there are two issues here. One is, whether or not, if this becomes law, that individuals who are incarcerated for reasons other than immigrant status and the individuals who are detained based on their immigrant status are going to be treated equally with regards to their access to clergy. That's the first issue. Now, this bill uses different language than the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and that's the issue I raised yesterday. This bill talks about not limiting someone's access to clergy except for quote, unquote "good cause". That's not the language that's used in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. I'll ask again what I asked yesterday in committee: haven't we simply either amended the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to include immigrant detainees or used in this bill the same language?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Senator Righter, I -- I -- I answer you one more time with the same answer, is that in some of these -- in these two particular counties, the -- the law is not being followed. That Act is not being followed. And all we're asking is to make sure that these detainees have access to religious... We're not trying to change the law. We're just making sure that it is enforced, and especially in these counties where that is not happening. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, Mr. President, please. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber, what's happened in this situation that Senator Martinez is trying to address is truly unfortunate. And that is that you have some -- two custodians of local jail facilities that have an agreement with the federal government with regards to immigrant detainees who are choosing, for one reason or another, not to allow the people detained appropriate access to clergy. The message that this bill will send is, rather than going to court and doing something to change that policy, we're simply going to pass another bill. Now, I'm going to vote in favor of this, Senator Martinez, because I think -- I think this is the right message to send, but I am very concerned it is not the most effective message you can send. sheriffs in these counties are interested in ignoring current statute, under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, I don't know that we can hold out reasonable hope that they're going to pay attention to this bill either. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 4613 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay -- Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 4613, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Gordon Graham of WAND-TV seeks permission to videotape proceedings. Seeing no objection, permission is granted. We will now be moving to page 7 on the Calendar -- is -- in the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. Senator Lightford, do you wish to -- your resolution to be considered? Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 923, offered by Senator Lightford.

No committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Resolution 923 urges President Bush, President-elect Obama and Congress as proposing -- they're proposing a large stimulus package to restart the economy. And what I believe they've done is not fully considered the youth across the country as it relates to employment. And I'm requesting that Congress include two billion dollars as a stimulus to our economy for our youth. What would happen is a package will be created to employ young people between the ages of thirteen and twenty-one - at least a million young people, I should say, here

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

in Illinois between the ages of thirteen and twenty-one. Just to give you a little information, back in 2000, the summer youth employment program was eliminated and the employment program was revamped, and nothing seriously has been done to encourage youth employment for the past eight years. So this resolution urges, again, President Bush, President-elect Obama and Congress to allocate two billion of the next proposed stimulus package that should be somewhere in the hundreds of billions - to create an employment program throughout the year, with a particular emphasis on the summer, for one million youth ages thirteen to twenty-one, which combines education and productive work in their neighborhoods. It would give teens an opportunity to earn money while they are producing meaningful work. exciting is that they'll turn right around and spend this money immediately back in the economy, providing direct economic stimulus. And I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Jacobs, for what purpose you rise? SENATOR JACOBS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates she will yield.

SENATOR JACOBS:

You know, I've been spending some recent time shopping in grocery stores and I happened to walk by the rack where they had the magazines and I notice that your name appeared in <u>US Weekly</u> magazine two weeks in a row - which is the hottest magazine in the country - and referring to Barack Obama. So I was wondering why we need to have a bill to -- to tell the President-elect

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

what to do when you have a personal relationship with him and can just call him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lightford, if you wish to respond to that question. SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Oh, I'm -- I'm happy to respond and I -- it's great to personally know our President-elect and I'm sure he's aware of this important initiative here to support youth. He was a big supporter of youth as he served here in the Illinois General Assembly. But now, Senator Jacobs, he's got fifty states; he's got the whole wide world in his hands. And it's important that we just send him a reminder, letting him know that I'm really particularly concerned about a million youth here in Illinois receiving employment opportunities for the summer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Lightford moves for the adoption of Resolution 923. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 109. Senator Lightford, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, have there been any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Joint Resolution 109, offered by Senator Lightford. Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lightford, to explain your amendment. SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee {sic}. This is our School Code mandate waiver denials

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

or requests that have been in place by all of our school districts across the State. There were a total number of seventy requests put forth. In December of 2007, the State Board of Ed voted to discontinue its practice of recommending to the General Assembly which applications to deny, accept, or only in exceptional circumstances. Therefore, no waivers were recommended for denial by ISBE in this report. We heard testimony in committee on yesterday and sometimes before and we've come up with some of our ideals of recommendations. And they're all set forth in Floor Amendment No. 1. And I'd be happy to answer any direct questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Lightford moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 109. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Joint Resolution 109, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lightford, to -- on the -- Senate Joint Resolution

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

109.

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, this is the school mandate waiver requests. There were seventy submitted across

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

the State. The one that I would highlight as a item of discussion was behind-the-wheel instruction. And the Secretary of State and those concerned about behind-the-wheel, including Senator Cullerton - passed a bill some time ago - and Senator Cronin, is willing to all come together and sit down and come up with how do we best address behind-the-wheel instruction. And so what we did here was, instead of extending deadlines -- I'm sorry, instead of approving the waivers for three-year requests and five-year requests, we did approve them for one year. Other than that, pretty much school districts that were reapplying, and -- and also, we kept a cap at driver's ed fees for two hundred and fifty dollars. I'd be happy to answer questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the school waivers - this resolution -- Senator Lightford moves the adoption of
joint -- Senate Joint Resolution 109. School waivers -- this
resolution -- requiring school waivers requires a record vote.
This -- those in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 109 will vote
Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take
the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, 1 Nay, none
voting Present. Senate Joint Resolution 109, having received
the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. To
fulfill our responsibilities under Article V, Section 9 of the
Constitution, we will now proceed to the Order of Advice {sic}
(Advise) and Consent. Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

appointments set forth in the Messages from the Governor dated November 12th and November 14th, 2008.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hendon moves that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the appointments set forth in the Messages from the Governor dated November 12th and November 14th, 2008. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Hendon, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, to which was referred the Governor's Message of November 12th, 2008, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Senate do advise and consent to the following appointment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of November 12th, 2008, I will read the non-salaried appointment of which the Committee on Executive Appointments recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Historic Preservation Agency Board of Trustees, for a term commencing October 22nd, 2008, and ending January 19th, 2009: Daniel Arnold.

Mr. President, having read the non-salaried appointment from the Governor's Message of November 12th, 2008, I now seek leave to consider the appointment on a roll call. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is,

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

does the Senate advise and consent to the appointments just read from the Governor's Message of November 12th. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The majority of Senators elected concurring by a -- a record vote, the Senate does advise and consent with -- to the appointments just read. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Hendon, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, to which was referred the Governor's Message of November 14th, 2008, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Senate do advise and consent to the following appointment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of November 14th, 2008, I will read the non-salaried appointment of which the Committee on Executive Appointments recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be members of the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, for a term commencing January 13, 2009, and ending January 12th, 2015: Niranjan Shah.

Mr. President, having read the non-salaried appointment from the Governor's Message of November 14th, 2008, I will now seek leave to consider the appointment on a roll call. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the appointments just read from the Governor's Message of November 14. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of Senators elected concurring by a record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the appointments just read. Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I want to thank all the members of the Executive Appointments Committee who have worked with me over the course of my leadership on that committee. Thank you, Leader Watson, Senator Luechtefeld, Judge Petka, and all the members of the committee. This is probably my last Executive Appointments report. I thank my staff, especially Brother Dodge here, who did a great job. And if this is indeed my last one, it's been great and I appreciate you. And I move that we arise from Executive Session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hendon moves the Senate arise from Executive Session. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion is carried. The Senate has arisen from Executive Session. Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise for a purpose of announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

State your announcement.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Senator Link. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senator "Hollywood West Side" Hendon is having his twentieth thousand seventy-fifth birthday. He will be celebrating while we're out during Christmas break and I was hoping that we could all attend -- holiday break -- holiday not Christmas, because we'll offend religion. But I am for the moment of silence. But for his -- during holiday break, on December 6th at 6 p.m. until the police come. The rules are no squares, no haters, no teetot, and only people that are over thirty thousand years old with a AARP card. So you're all welcome to celebrate Senator Hendon's birthday party on Saturday, December 6th, in Chicago at Blu 47 on 47 and King Drive. Just in case you can't make it, if you could just join me in wishing him a happy birthday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Happy pre-birthday, Senator Hendon. Senator Risinger, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Senate Republicans would request a thirty-minute caucus in Leader Watson's Office prior to us going to committees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Upon recess, that will be in order. Just a quick reminder: Senate Executive Committee will be meeting in 212. Senate -- State Government Committee will be meeting in 409. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committees, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

The Senate stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The Senate will come to order. Will all Members at the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? We will be conducting business immediately. All Members at the sound of my voice, please come to the Senate Floor. We will be conducting business immediately. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Motions to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 934, House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1511, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1981, House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2452, and House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2824 recommend Do Adopt.

And Senator Demuzio, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs, reports a Motions -- Motions to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 620, House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529, and House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2562; and a Motion to Recede from Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4249 recommend Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

There will be a Rules Committee meeting in the President's Anteroom immediately. Rules Committee in the President's Anteroom immediately. Senator Martinez in the Chair. (Senate stands at ease) Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senator Hendon, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment No. 7 to House Bill 2973.

Rickey Hendon -- Senator Rickey Hendon, Chairman. November 20th, 2008.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Will all Senators at the sound of my voice please come to the Floor immediately for final action. All Senators at the sound of my voice, please come to the Senate Floor for final action. The Supplemental Calendar has been printed and distributed to all Members at their desk. We will be starting on Senate Bill 620. Senator Haine. Senator Haine. With the leave of the Body, we'll come back to Senate Bill 620. Senate Bill 934. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, please read the bill -- or, motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 934.

Filed by Senator James DeLeo.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo, to explain your motion.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 on Senate Bill 934. For those of you that weren't in committee earlier today, for those of you who have been out of this planet or out of the touch of reality, this is the language for the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

autism bill. As I said, I -- I don't want this to go unnoticed, but the substance of this bill has been before this General Assembly five times this Session. I was the sponsor of Senate Bill 1900, House Bill 415, House Bill 2070, and all which were doomed by the House, amending the bill to add language for an unrelated purpose, for a lawsuit. This is -- I reluctantly -- reluctantly accept the rulemaking JCAR language in this bill. I want to thank everyone that was involved in the effort to provide treatment for those with autism - the many, many, many, many legislators and families that worked on this legislation. It took all of our efforts to get here today. I would -- I'd ask to concur in -- in -- in Amendment No. 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 934, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

He indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator DeLeo, last night I had a conversation with a supporter of this bill who impressed upon me his view, based on actuarial studies, that this particular mandate will only slightly increase group health insurance premiums for employers who will fall under this mandate. Are you familiar with what that number is - what the increase would be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, Senator Righter. We've been told that the average cost to a premium would be point -- .03 percent to .06 percent. And what they're saying, overall will be - on an annual basis - be less than one percent - less than one percent cost to a premium.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator DeLeo, when I was continuing my discussion with this individual, one of the issues that we explored was the -- the numbers that were used to calculate this average increase, specifically the increase in the number of diagnoses of individuals with autism. Currently, it's my understanding that number stands at around one for every one hundred and fifty individuals, which is a dramatic increase from what it was a few short years ago. Do you know what the study that -- that you are quoting assumes that number will be in two or three or four years?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

You know... Thank you, Senator Righter. I don't have the numbers here today. Actually, I don't have my file, the original autism file, but I know there was -- when you talk about the number of -- of -- of people -- children diagnosed with autism and you talked about the next ten years, I remember that they were talking about, if we don't start with this early intervention in the next ten years, the annual cost could exceed two to four hundred billion. So, I don't know what that

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

breakdown -- break -- that -- that -- how it breaks down to individuals who are diagnosed with autism, but it's a significant increase.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And -- and I suppose, Senator DeLeo, just to walk through this, that's one of my concerns, because one of the pitches being made on behalf of this bill - and you've made it here today and you've made it before, and -- as have other proponents - is that the average increase in the premium for employers who fall under this mandate will be so marginal that they almost literally won't even notice it. But that assumes that the diagnoses rate of one per every one hundred and fifty individuals in our society will not increase, which is a wildly -- wildly unrealistic assumption to make. That number has increased dramatically over the last five years. And so it looks like, in order to achieve a low number in terms of the average increase, what we've done is suddenly assume that when this bill becomes law that magically the rate of diagnoses of autism will flatten out and will not increase anymore. Do you think that's a reasonable assumption to make, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

No, and I'll tell you the reason why. You said about one in -- one in one fifty, and I'm -- I'm finding out, as I'm reading my notes here, it's probably affecting one in -- one in a hundred and sixty-six. One out of one -- one hundred and

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

sixty-six. We need early intervention. And -- and the studies have showed -- showed that we will save - save - save hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars by enacting this law. What -- what we need, we need services that are accessible to these children, these children with neurological conditions, and -- so we don't have identical services. And this will -- for a long term, this would be a cost-saving effect, not a growing cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, please, Mr. President. Thank you. DeLeo, thank you for those forthright and honest responses. before I go any further, I want to congratulate and thank you. I mean, you and I have talked about this legislation at length. And I can feel it in your voice that you believe in -- in this cause and you believe it to your very core. And you're committed to it, otherwise you wouldn't be running this bill yet again in this Chamber trying to get over this hurdle - five times. But the concern that I have, and I think a number of us have, is the figures that are being given to Members in this Senate and promoted to the business community, that this will -provoke only a marginal increase in group health insurance rates, is based on the assumption that the diagnoses rates will suddenly stop increasing, which, again, is fantasy if nothing else. I am not willing to place at risk a much larger group of people who might lose their health insurance through their employers in order to deal with this issue in this manner. need to deal with this issue, but I do not believe the broadbased manner in which Senate Bill 934 calls for is

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

appropriate way to go forward on this. For that reason, I urge a No vote. Thank you, Senator, again. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

I know we've been through this legislation a number of times, but I just want to make sure we haven't seen any changes in it. Does this currently -- this legislation exclude all partially self-funded or self-funded health plans in the State? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

It still does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

So the majority of children in this State, then, who are covered under self-funded, which is the largest portion of coverage in this State, are excluded from this. This only covers, then, those small employers in the State. So anyone that has a child that may fall under this -- needing this coverage, if they work for a -- an employer that has basically more than fifty employees, they would be excluded from this coverage and they would not have that coverage. Am I -- is that

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

And then, for local governments, does this mandate this onto local governments, municipalities or counties, other taxing districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

No, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Would that include if that smaller local government is a -- has a fully insured health plan? So, if a smaller municipality had a fully insured health plan, would they be mandated under this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

No, that -- that's correct. It's not covered.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

And then, how about KidCare -- or ALL KIDS, I should say? I think ALL KIDS is the largest coverage -- has the largest coverage of children. Are we including this coverage under -- under ALL KIDS in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

No. Actually, with ALL KIDS, it's -- it's currently not covered. We have a Medicaid and Medicare waiver in place to help -- to help people. It's not covered under -- under ALL KIDS.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

I think what -- what we're going to see is the problem that we're already seeing in Illinois, where employers -- because the cost of health care is rising so much, employers are terminating their coverage and individuals are having to go onto Medicaid or going on to ALL KIDS. And now, here we have a situation where we are putting this mandate onto small employers only. Large employers are excluded. Government's excluded. ALL KIDS are excluded. The overwhelming majority of children in this State are excluded from this plan and we're putting it on the small employer who is suffering more than anyone in this State. And the end result is, it's going to drive the cost up for care, small employers are going to terminate their coverage, and we're going to move more -- more kids onto the ALL KIDS plan where they're not going to get coverage. I guess I would urge that we do not support this and that we go back and come up with a plan

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

that would address the whole systemic issue of autism and not try to put it on the small percentage of -- of small employers here, which exclude -- the majority of children in this State are excluded from this legislation. Let's get something that's going to cover all the children in this State, as opposed to just putting it on the small employers. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator DeLeo, to close.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. As I said before in the opening comments, I want to thank everybody for -- in this effort to provide better treatment for those with autism. Let me just remind you, the last five times, it came out of here 47 to 6, 48 to nothing, 49 -- it's been -- it just passed out of the House 109 to nothing. Most of the cost providing services and care to loved ones with -- with autism are borne by the -by the family. Some of these families indicated in the committee room they're mortgaging their homes. They're living with relatives. They're accumulating a lot of debt. People have filed for bankruptcy in order to finance the medical services for the -- essential for the children with autism. purpose of this is to -- actually to lower the costs for those caring of children with autism. I ask for your support. I ask to concur in Floor Amendment No. 1, 2 and 3, Mr. President, to Senate Bill 934. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 934. All those -- favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 45 Ayes, 6 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill 934 -- concurs with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 934; having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave -- with leave of the Body, we'll go back to Senate Bill 620. Senator Haine. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 620.

Filed by Senator William Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine, to explain your motion.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment by the House is -- is -- has the same language as we passed in House Bill 5159. It passed the Senate with 35 votes some time ago in the spring. However, it had the rulemaking language and therefore it got caught up in that controversy. It's -- this comes back from the House with a smaller and kindler {sic} and more gentler rules language. And so, therefore, we are voting on it. The bill -- the gist of the bill, if you recall, was a bill that brings under a more formal review the police powers of railroads. Railroads have police departments which are sanctioned and authorized by the State of Illinois. This bill mandates that their policies be approved and comply with the Act by the police training and standards board. It also provides an appeal mechanism, for the use of the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

police department, a rail carrier's decision on an internal investigation. Provides an appeal to the Illinois State Police, which is novel. It's unprecedented, but it is also customary in -- in other situations involving other State sanctioned and authorized police departments. I have personally dealt with the railroad police in my county over the years when I was State's attorney in Madison County. They are an excellent police department. They work well with our local authorities. I recall they had the best Christmas party of any police department, which brought a great deal of joy at that time of year. However, they are also management. They are considered management. And therefore, there has to be a check and balance, some review if they're authorized by the State. And I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I wonder if the sponsor will yield, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Haine, in your closing right there, on behalf of the bill, you said that there needs to be some check and balance. And I wonder if you believe that the contracts that are negotiated between management and unions and, on top of that, a federal mediation board is not -- I mean, there's two layers of checks and balances right there for -- for labor. Is that insufficient in your mind?

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Senator Righter, I appreciate very much your question, but I'm not willing to -- I don't know what the actual procedure is. And I'm not here to say that it is either fair or unfair. Obviously, the UTU, which is a proponent of the bill, believes that there is not a sufficient method of appeal of a person aggrieved by a decision of the railroad in its orders to its police officer. That's all they are saying. The railroads' response is this is part of a grievance procedure. The UTU, the union, says to me that it is not part of a grievance procedure. They wish to have another objective entity look at it, and that would be the State Police. The State Police is not mandated to do anything, except if they believe there's sufficiency, they can inform the ICC. So to answer your question, the employees, through their union, believe it's insufficient. And this is not an onerous burden on the railroads, for the simple reason that the State authorizes the police power that they are granted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I mean, Senator Haine, with all due respect, but if management says it's sufficient and you've got a couple of instances where labor union reps were kicked off property -- and -- and to our knowledge, that's -- that's what started this. There's not a widespread rash of railroad police acting out of line, abusing other individuals. There's none of that. And if you have some of that, we -- we

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

should hear it. But given the fact that the management says it's okay and labor says it isn't, and you're here as a sponsor of the bill saying you really don't know if there's a fair system or not -- I mean, can you help us anymore with why we ought to have this in place, other than because labor says that's what we need?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Senator, it isn't that I don't know. It's that there seems to be something amiss when the employee, the bargaining unit, indicates that they do not have a remedy. And this remedy that is proposed is two-fold and it's not unreasonable. It just says that the trainings board shall review the policies and quidelines of the railroad and approve them if they comply with the Act; secondly, that a person aggrieved by the decision can take it to the State Police for their review. If they find that there's been something untoward done by the railroad police on orders of management, they can be cited in the ICC. That is not an onerous burden on behalf of a corporation whose police department is sanctioned by the State of Illinois. We have sanctioned them and given them wider powers. And we want them to have police powers. But this is a review that's customary in other law enforcement situations. If a municipal department has a major issue, a complaint, the State's attorney will usually go to the State Police for an objective, outside review of the case so that people can have confidence in an objective review. the -- the -- in this one instance -- one instance was the union leader being escorted from the property on a safety inspection.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

That seems to me to be completely unreasonable conduct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

...please, Mr. President. Thank you. Thank you, Senator Haine. Ladies and Gentlemen, with all due respect again to the sponsor, the analogy that since the State Police can come in and review a local law enforcement procedure or action and therefore should be able to do that here is really not a very good analogy. Because when it comes to local law enforcement, there is no negotiated contract between management and labor, and when it comes to local law enforcement actions, there is no federal mediation board. There are already two checks and balances in place and those are the two that they need. All the evidence -all the evidences there is, is that two representatives of a labor union were removed from railroad property, and that is why this bill is before us. Absent some actual evidence that there has been misconduct and that that misconduct cannot be handled by the current two layers - two layers - of checks and balances in the system, we do not need to add another. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Dahl.

SENATOR DAHL:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR DAHL:

Senator Haine, in -- in committee, just a very short time

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

ago, we -- we heard this and I was under the impression that the railroad people are thoroughly convinced that they are under federal law. And I also heard them say that they were willing to spend up to a million dollars in court to fight this. So if -- if we vote this in, are we going to be in a court of law and have another issue for the State of Illinois where we're going to spend a lot of money fighting a bill that we've made law that's going to be shot down in court and -- and all this is going to do is create more expense for us and -- and it's going to be the way it was?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Senator Dahl, that's a very good question. I appreciate your sincerity in that, and I don't know. It seems to me I was a bit taken aback at that comment, because I don't believe these regulations are that onerous. And I -- the -- lawyers have issued procedure -- has issued opinions, citing federal regulations allowing the State to regulate railroad police. And I -- I -- and I -- that's number one. I don't know whether they have a strong case, but if they want to spend a million dollars to their law firms, I guess their lawyers will have a nice year. They'll being doing the opposite as we all are doing here. But secondly, I don't believe it would make sense for them to -- to do -- do that, based upon the division of legal opinion and the fact that, when cooler heads look at this, these are not unreasonable regulations. They're not burdensome. Providing for review. And in their own -- in their own statements, they indicate these are rare occurrences. So, I -- I don't know what

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

the burden is that would cause them to spend a million dollars to avoid somebody filing a complaint with the -- the Illinois State Police.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Dahl.

SENATOR DAHL:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: If -- if, indeed, these -- these instances are that rare, why -- why do we need this bill? There's no other state in the country that -- that has this. The railroads feel that they are under federal law. And I -- I think we're barking up the wrong tree on this thing and -- and I encourage a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Unless I don't understand the bill, I -- we're giving oversight to -- of the railroad police by the State Police. Is that correct? If the sponsor would yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Sponsor indicates he will. Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Senator, for that question. No, we are not. We are giving a -- a review process on a complaint to the State Police. If someone is aggrieved by a decision, they may appeal the decision to the State Police. The State Police has -- have unfettered discretion whether to review the depth, completeness, objectivity of the rail carrier's investigation; may conduct its own investigation, or may not do anything. They -- they can

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

file a report with the Illinois Commerce Commission. But they're not overseeing the railroad police. This is only a complaint process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, this sounds to me like a slippery slope. So then, pretty soon, the next step will be municipal police, sheriff's police, now that the State will have oversight on some of the things that we're doing within our own organizations. I mean, and then, I know that -- I was told that Senate bill -- this particular Senate bill, no other state has it, nor is any other state considering this. And from the law enforcement perspective, I certainly worry that now we're going to give this to the State Police for the railroad police, then will come the other municipal agencies and -- and county agencies. And then, frankly, for that, I ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Haine, to close.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you. And -- and to answer those very heartfelt questions and -- and comments, I wish to conclude by pointing out to the Body the differences between a municipal department or a sheriff's department and the railroad police. The municipal departments are charged with the faithful execution of the laws and they are governed by those procedures. They have internal review that are public bodies. They have -- they have a State's attorney that may further review. The -- the railroad police, however, are an entirely different entity. They are

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

clothed with -- with police power, but they are a corporate and management-owned and -operated system. This bill onerous. But this operation calls for a minimal review, and that's what this is. To answer Senator Millner's sincere problems with -- with it, and I would have those problems too if this would be any way part of this bill, but they're not, and they never will be because of the key differences between a municipal and sheriff's department and the railroad police. These are minimal standards, minimal reviews by the State Police. It is to keep the railroads cognizant of the fact that, although they run a private corporate police department, they are going to be reviewed by some public entity, because they are clothed by the State of Illinois with tremendous police power, which we want to encourage. And I would ask for an Aye vote for the second time around. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendments 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 620. 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 33 Ayes, 16 Nays, 2 present. Senate -- the Senate concurs on House Amendments 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 620; having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have a -- some young -- some students here from Monmouth College, up in the gallery over to my right. They are -- their class is -- they are students from the parties and elections class from Monmouth College in Monmouth, Illinois. And they -- their instructor, Robin Johnson, is with them. They're actually students from all across the State and even in some other countries. But we're pleased to have 'em here. I'd just like everybody to welcome 'em. Also, I do want to mention that Mattie Hunter is also a Monmouth College grad. And so on behalf of both of us, we -- we welcome them to Springfield today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Will our guests in the gallery please stand and be welcomed to the Illinois Senate? Leader Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you very much. Point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, first of all, I want to thank everybody for welcoming me back. It's overwhelming. Both Members, staff, lobbyists, everybody that said so many nice things about me. I'd have done this a long time ago if I'd known -- get this much attention. But... So I really appreciate that. I -- I do. But I want to just rise. Today is the last day for our Chief of Staff, Brian McFadden, who will be taking a job with Sangamon County. And we're going to miss him, obviously. I'm going to miss him. I --

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

- the guy made my job a lot easier over the last six years. He was a fantastic Chief of Staff and -- and did a great job for us. So, he's well respected among our Members and I think among your Members also, and certainly in the House. So, I -- I just want to wish him well as he goes to -- to a better job and more opportunity. And -- and I'd like for you to join me in thanking him for his service for us here in the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Good luck, Brian, on your new adventure. Senator Raoul, on Senate Bill 1511. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1511.

Filed by Senator Kwame Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul, to explain your motion.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I move to concur with House Amendment 1 and 3 of Senate Bill 1511. House Amendment 3 deletes all and becomes the bill. House Amendment 3 increases the general obligation bond amount by thirty-five million dollars and specifies that this amount as -- as an increase for use by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity for clean coal/energy development purposes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

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

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Senator, I understand this is a bond authorization for thirty-five million, but the project that's going to come before us, as I understand, only eighteen million maximum can be used. Do we have a use for or can there be a use for the other seventeen million?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I imagine it'd be used for other potential clean coal projects within the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

So this bond authorization frees up that money to be used for other clean coal projects?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

It specifies -- it -- the amendment specifically requires the thirty-five million is for the purposes of facility cost reports prepared pursuant to the Illinois Power Agency Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

And I'll bring this to a close, Mr. President. But I just wanted to make sure that -- you know, as I understand the bill

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

that's going to come -- the Tenaska bill that's going to come before us, there's an eighteen-million-dollar cap on that and -- and I wanted to make sure that there was nothing in the wind to use this other seventeen million. Does it free it up, or is it just hanging out there?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. May I ask the question -- the same question a little bit more directly? If we need eighteen million dollars for a study, why are we increasing the borrowing capacity by thirty-five million?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Again, it -- it is for the purposes of facility cost reports for the Illinois Power Agency Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

So, are there additional projects beside the one that we're asking to vote on in this bill, and perhaps a series? I think it's 1987. Are we being asked -- why give twice as much borrowing capacity than what we're being asked to on the Tenaska project?

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

The -- the -- the clean coal development board has indicated that they are currently tapped out and they would need this for other potential projects. But there has been nothing approved. Obviously other projects would have to go -- would have to be approved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul, to close.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, for recognizing me late. A inquiry of the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your inquiry.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Is it the Chair's understanding that this particular measure requires a three-fifths majority in order to be approved?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

You are correct.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

concur on House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1511. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 47 Ayes, 2 Nays, 2 voting Present. The Senate concurs on House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1511. The bill, having received the required constitutional three-fifths majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1529. Senator Forby. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529.

Filed by Senator Gary Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby, to explain your motion.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Amendment No. 3 becomes the bill. Employees of Macon-Piatt correction special ed district provides educational service in the State Corrections facilities. House Amendment No. 3 finalizes an agent {sic} between the employees of the Macon-Piatt correction special ed district, AFSCME 31, CMS, Illinois Department of Corrections and the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice, making them State employees. This will have no -- no impact on the State. This went through the House 108 to 1. And there was no issues in the committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator, it's my understanding - and I wasn't in the committee, but just looking at our analysis - that the Regional Office of Education of Macon-Piatt counties is opposed to the bill. Can you tell me why they might be opposed? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

They -- no, I can't tell you. They wasn't there today in committee and nobody put any slips up. So, there was no opposition. So I have no idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, you know, one of the reasons they might not have been in committee is that they didn't know this bill was coming up today. And that's part of the problem when we try and move these things so fast. What is the purpose or why is it necessary that these employees -- that we void their contracts and that they become State employees? What's the impetus for that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Well, they stay employees and they don't lose no benefits

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

or nothing. They're still working, but they're just going to be working under AFSCME Union 31 instead of an IMRF or -- or some other -- TRS -- teachers or whatever. And since they're working under Corrections, they ought to be State workers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, to the bill: Then I --what I'm suggesting to you all is that there seemed to be a process in place that was working in these two counties for these various employees. The Regional Office of Education did not have the opportunity, obviously, to be here on such short notice today to talk to this issue, but it seems to me that --that we've got a situation where people were employed, they had contractual agreements. Now those are going to be overthrown. These people are going to become State employees now for some reason - not exactly sure why that's necessary, but obviously someone thinks it's necessary they become State employees. So, just -- I would urge you to be very cautious as you vote for this bill. We might be setting a precedent, a very slippery slope. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. A brief question for the sponsor, if I may, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Thank you. Senator Forby, will there be any fiscal cost addition to the State would this bill become law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Senator Forby, am I correct that these funds that are already paying for these people really are already State monies, but it's just being flowed through the regional office, and what you're simply doing is rather than have it be a flow-through for the regional office, that have it be done directly through the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Yes, that's true.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I stand in support of Senator Forby's piece of legislation. I think what he's doing is somewhat streamlining a process and having direct responsibility for these people through the State. And I stand in support of the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Forby, I represent Piatt County. Senator Watson represents Macon County. I think - I don't know about Senator Watson - a day or two ago I was visited by officials from AFSCME asking me to vote for this. No one -- no one who works for the Regional Office of Education, constituents of mine, have said they want this. And so I'm kind of curious about how it landed in your lap.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Well, AFSCME just came and asked me if I'd run this bill and it came out of the House 108 to 1. Nobody over there and Education, nobody was against this bill. And as far as I'm concerned and AFSCME thought, they didn't think there was any opposition to this. They thought everybody was on board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, I -- I can't speak to what AFSCME thinks, Senator Forby. There are people who are opposed to this, though - the people who are actually there, who are affected by this legislation. Senator Forby, it's my understanding that if this bill becomes law, that the contract -- that it is retroactive back to January 1st, 2007. If that's accurate, then what are

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

the fiscal implications both to the employees and to either the Regional Office of Education or the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

I don't think there's -- as far as education, I can't answer that. But as far as the employees, I don't think there's none at all. They don't lose nothing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm sorry, Senator Forby. I -- I didn't understand everything that you said. If -- what is the effect of the -- of the effectiveness of this -- the retroactivity to January 1st, 2007? Because -- I mean, that's -- that's -- that's almost two years ago, Senator Forby. I mean, you're going to say that if nothing's going to change, then why are we moving the bill in the first place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

The contract stays the same. The employees don't lose any -- none. They don't lose any benefits they have. So, I don't see any impact on none of the employees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To -- to close, please, Mr. President. Thank you. And thank you for your indulgence. Senator Forby, thank you for

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

that. As a Senator who represents Piatt County and on behalf of another Senator who represents Macon County, I know that Dick Shelby, who's the Regional Superintendent of Schools, is not in support of this. And I appreciate AFSCME bringing it to you, Senator Forby, and some of the good work they do. But I think until the people who are in charge of those employees and delivering the education in those areas are comfortable with this, I'm not sure why the fifty-nine of us would be signing off on this, except for that AFSCME wants it. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. Just a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

You -- Senator, you had mentioned that there was -- there's no cost to this. Are the employees that are being -- that are converting now over to AFSCME -- are the salaries and benefits, pensions, are they identical to what they had before, so there's no -- no change in -- in that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

What they're telling me, there will be no change to that. Everything will be the same - their pension, every -- their salary and everything.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Then I -- I guess I couldn't quite understand the explanation of why it's -- why we're going back two years for the -- for the effective date. Is there -- what's the reasoning for going back?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

I don't have that reason for you -- for why they're going back two years or not. I mean, I run this -- I had this bill once before and ran it over and they put this amendment on this bill in the House and it came back, and when they -- told me there was no opposition, nobody was losing any money, everybody's benefits was the same and everybody was on board. So, that's where I'm at with this bill today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Forby, to close.

SENATOR FORBY:

I just ask everybody for an Aye vote. You know, I don't think there's any impact on this thing and it will -- it won't hurt anybody. None of the employees will lose any benefits or any salary. And -- only thing, they're just going from the State or IMRF to AFSCME's contract. They're an AFSCME -- State worker now. I'll ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529. All those in favor will vote. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Ayes, 11 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate concurs with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1529; having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Matt Fortin of WCIA-TV requests permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission is granted. Senate Bill 1981. Senator Hendon. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1981.

Filed by Senator Rickey Hendon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hendon, to explain your motion.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. This is an extension of the movie tax credit so we can keep and get the film business back -- going here in Illinois. I appreciate Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1981. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate concurs with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1981. The bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2452. Senator Cullerton. Madam Secretary, please read the bill -- or,

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2452.

Filed by Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cullerton, on the motion.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The House added an amendment to my underlying bill which deleted the underlying bill and created the criminal law that creates the offense of interfering with a judicial officer, making it illegal to bribe or attempt to bribe a judge, a court employee, or the spouse of a judge - that being an addition. That's a Class 2 felony. The second part of the bill is to make it a crime to -- file a false lien or encumbrance against the property of a judge, and that's not limited even to realty, could be any property of the judge. That would be if it's done in retaliation for the performance of the official duties. This is an initiative of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. I don't know of any opposition and would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2452. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Present. The Senate concurs with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2452; having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2562. Senator John Jones. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2562.

Filed by Senator John O. Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the --Senate Bill 2562 is a bill that we've been of the Senate. working on about all -- all year for the pheasant hunters of the State of Illinois. In concurring with -- with House Amendment 1 and 3, House Amendment No. 3 deletes everything and becomes the bill and it's -- has the rulemaking in it, the new rulemaking that the -- that the House has come up with, and -- and hopefully we -- we can get it through with that. But it also is a -- is an increase in -- in hunting fees for pheasant hunters only if they want to hunt on -- on public ground. It -- the price will be twenty-five dollars for residents -- Illinois residents, thirty-five dollars for nonresidents in 2008. And it increases by five dollars for each of the next three consecutive years until the maximum daily access fee is fifty dollars for residents -- Illinois residents and sixty dollars nonresidents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Senator Sullivan.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you. Just to the bill: I just wanted to let our colleagues know that this is supported by the -- all the sportsmen's organizations. It's a way to address a funding issue with -- with -- within the pheasants program and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2562. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 48 Ayes, 1 Nay, 1 Present. The Senate concurs on House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2562; having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hendon in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

With leave of the Body, we will return to 2824. We will now be going to page 2 on the Supplemental Calendar, on the Secretary's Desk, Non-concur. Senator Link, on House Bill 4249. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to recede from the Senate -- from Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4249.

Filed by Senator Terry Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link, on 4249.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Just a little

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

confused looking at the board there. Basically, what we're doing on here is, in House Bill 4249, extends the Environmental Health Protection {sic} (Practitioner Licensing) Act, which expires this year, to 2019. The amendment that I am seceding from deals with how to keep the license active and restoration of the license that has lapsed. It also puts together a new board in depth to oversee the Act. It was felt that the amendments need more work, and so while discussing the --discussing continuing on these items, the bill must extend the Environmental Health Protection {sic} Act, which expired this year on December 31st, to next -- to a year -- December 31st, 2019. I would ask that everybody would vote Aye on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link moves that the Senate recede from Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4249. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate recede from Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4249. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, none voting Nay, 1 voting Present. The Senate recedes from Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4249. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Link in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

With leave of the Body, we will return back to Senate Bill 2824. Senator Demuzio. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2824.

Filed by Senator John Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Demuzio, on the motion.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2824, House Amendment No. 2 amends the Boundary Change Article of the School Code, and it -- what it does is that when a school district is annexed into another school district, and the district that is being absorbed into the new district is dissolved, upon resolution of the school board, the county clerk must extend taxes to pay the principal and interest on any bonds issued to refund -- refund bonded indebtedness of the annexing school district. House Amendment 2 only applies to districts that were dissolved and annexed by another district pursuant to a referendum that was held in April of 2003. What happened is that - Pana School District and Tower Grove {sic} School District - in 2003, a referendum was passed in Tower Hill to dissolve the school district and to be annexed by Pana. Pana's school district had an outstanding long-term debt at that time, and the desolation {sic} of the annexation agreement would have required the debt to be paid by the residents of the old district and not by the new district and the new area annexed. So -- however, Pana wants to restructure the debt now, and the bill will ensure that the old residents of the district will have -- will continue to pay for the debt, rather than the residents of the newly annexed area. I ask for a favorable

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I was the original sponsor of this bill that the House added an amendment to that was relevant to Senator Demuzio's district. And so I asked her to be the -- take over the sponsorship of -- of the -- of the bill. And, therefore, I support her motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

And, therefore, I move to concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2824.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2824. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 52 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate concurs with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2824. The bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go back to the regular Calendar. Page 2. House Bill 2973. Senator Collins. Senator Collins seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2973 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2973. Madam Secretary, are

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

there any amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

We're going to table No. 6. We're going to table No. 6. Withdraw Amendment No. 6.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins withdraws Floor Amendment No. 6. Madam Secretary, are there any other amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Floor Amendment No. 7, offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 7 to House Bill 2973 deletes all and becomes the bill. It amends the Code of Civil Procedure to allow borrowers who are delinquent on their home loans up to a ninety-day grace period to avoid foreclosure if they seek HUD-approved credit counseling services. As we've seen the economic downturn, we now know that more and more homes are facing foreclosure. Illinois now ranks in the top ten states facing foreclosure, and in the first half of 2008, Cook County saw a forty-eight-percent increase in foreclosures. And by the end of the year, foreclosures are expected to top forty-eight thousand. Surprisingly, however, the greatest increases have been in

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

DuPage - eighty-five-percent increase; Kane - seventy-three-percent increase; and McHenry County's fifty-eight-percent increase in foreclosures. I'm open to any questions that my colleagues might have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford, on the amendment.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. The sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Sponsor indicates she will.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Senator Collins, we had some extensive discussions - which I'll accolade the parties here in just a moment - but could you help us with regards to the grace period, both the total number of days and then the cycles that we're talking about, which was finally concurred to in this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank -- thank you, Senator, for the question and for explanation. We asked for a ninety-day grace period and it's segmented out to thirty days - thirty, thirty, thirty. After the borrower is delinquent for thirty days, a notice goes out indicating that if the borrower seeks counseling, he has -- he or she has thirty days to seek counseling to agree to a counseling intervention with the lender to work out some plan -- some remodification plan. And once they agree, if the borrower agrees, he gets an additional -- he or she gets an additional thirty days for -- to work out the plan. So, that gives us the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

combination of ninety.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Collins, the -- one of the issues that was discussed with the industry on this notice period of the thirty, thirty, thirty was the ability to consolidate the notices for both this and the -- and the federal HUD. Could you perhaps clarify that for us?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you. That language has -- is in Amendment No. 7. We have taken care of that concern, where the notice is -- the required language -- or, the language substantially is similar to that in the federal language notice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. So, in simple terms, they are able to consolidate the notices. Am I correct? Okay. Thank you on that. The reason that we changed and moved this language under the Code of Civil Procedures {sic} (Procedure), am I correct to assume that in part we're now able to capture in the federal charters, and we're also able to capture in State charters with reciprocal agreements, so it would not put our State charters at an unfair disadvantage to those others. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. That is correct. Last year I passed the Illinois foreclosure law that captured both the federally chartered and the State chartered. And in the discussions with the banking and the small banks, and as well as the Illinois Bankers Association and the credit unions, they wanted a level playing field and that is what is in Floor Amendment No. 7.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Mr. President, thank you for the indulgence. I have two more questions, then will bring it to closure here. Senator Collins, is the Attorney General supportive of this legislation and is the Secretary Martinez's department in -- in favor of this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, Senator Rutherford. And I want to thank them for -- everyone at the table for their diligence in working into the wee hours last night to see that we had agreed-upon language.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Mr. President, thank you. I -- I stand in support of Senator Collins' both amendment and the underlying -- and then to become the bill. I -- I want to accolade Secretary Martinez. He has been outstanding. He has been extremely cooperative,

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

outreach, calling the cell phone late at night, early in the morning, work through this. I also want to commend the Attorney General's Office and their participation. But I also want to stand in -- in high accolade for the Illinois Bankers Association, the Community Bankers Association, the credit unions, the financial institutions, Chase Bank, and the others in the industry that have worked so -- truthfully, I think in an open spirit - again, as we talked about late into last night, even as early as this morning - to make sure that we had a piece of legislation that we stand here either in total support of or at least neutrality towards, and no one stands in opposition to this amendment. So, Senator Collins, I think the process has worked the way that it should, that we have continued and enjoyed in the Committee on Senate Financial Institutions. I stand in support of your legislation. Look forward to seeing this become law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I just have a issue with the notice. How are we sending that out - that regular, certified mail? Cause I can see the problems developing, whether I got notice or didn't get notice. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

EDING OFFICER: (DEMITOR ETIME)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

I don't have the language in front of me, but as I recall it's certified mail.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins moves for the adoption of Amendment 7 to House Bill 2973. All those in favor will 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)

...Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 2973. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 2973.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Is this a close? Or do I go through the discussions again? Are there any more questions on the bill? If not, I will close. Thank you, Mr. President. We know -- we know that during the rising tide of the housing bubble, many individuals took risks - the borrower, the broker, the banker and the investor. However, it was not the borrower who created those -- created those credit default swaps and many of the other high-risk loan products. And I believe that if the federal government can bail out the banking industry with a seven hundred billion price tag that the taxpayer is paying for, or give AIG now over a hundred

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

billion dollars, I feel that it's a privilege for us to stand here as an opportunity and an obligation to ensure that homeowners, those working -- hardworking families, men and women, have the opportunity to retain a portion, just a little portion of the American dream and their dignity. So I would ask for my colleagues to stand with me to speak to the citizens of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 2973 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 2973, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. WAND-TV requests permission to videotape recording. Seeing no objection, permission is granted. We will now proceed to page 7 of the Calendar to Secretary's -- Concurrences. Senate Bill 1415. Senator Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1511. Senator Raoul. A little bit of confusion. Senate Bill 1987. Senator Trotter. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1987.

Filed by Senator Donne Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter, to explain your motion.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much. Well, actually you have -- we're

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

going to do all the amendments at once? Is that the deal? Okay. I can either explain it now, or if we adopt these, explain it on the merits of the bill? Go for it? Okay. Good This -- the Amendments 2, 4 and 5 amends the Illinois Power Agency Act, the Public Utilities Act and the Illinois Vehicle Code, regarding clean air and clean coal. It authorizes a process to study and construct an initial -- clean coal facility that generates electricity and sequesters fifty percent of its carbon emissions. The General Assembly must approve the cost design study before the facility can be built, and if approved, the General Assembly must set the price of which electricity can be sold from -- from the facility. authorizes coal to natural gas facility to -- to sequester its carbon emissions. It amends the Illinois Power Act to specify that the first facility that the agency builds, finance, or operates must be a clean coal facility that uses Illinois coal and sequesters the carbon dioxide. It amends the Illinois Power Agency Act to allow owners of coal-fired facilities previously owned by the Illinois utilities to propose long-term cost plans, provided that the facilities retrofit or repower to sequester carbon emissions. It requires the ARES and utilities that sell outside of their service territories to comply with the renewable portfolio standards. It requires ComEd and Ameren's annual procurement plans to include demand-response whenever it costs less than purchasing capacity. And it also requires IPA and ICC to use a benchmark when evaluating in-State renewable energy bids to eliminate bids that exploit the in-State preference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Senator Trotter, it's my understanding the location of this project will be in Taylorville, Illinois. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

That is correct, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

And as I understand it, this will be the first commercially sized clean coal power plant in the United States and -- and possibly in the world.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

That is correct, as well, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Senator Trotter, you indicated that this will use Illinois coal. As I read the -- as I read the bill itself, I don't see where it says Illinois coal. What it says is "high volatility

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

{sic} (volatile) bituminous rank and greater than 1.7 pounds of sulfur per million Btu content". Is that the -- the -- is Illinois the only State that has that coal?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

I do not know the answer to that, sir. But that is the definition of Illinois coal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

But it is the intent that this facility will burn Illinois coal?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

In the sequestering of the carbon, in the bill it says that you'll sequester the carbon up to fifty percent if the -- if the plant starts construction by 2015, and then it jumps to seventy percent at 2015 to 2016 {sic} (2016 to 2017) and then it jumps up to ninety percent. Is that in there so that this project will move forward? Is that an incentive to get it going faster? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Yes and no. It -- it is so it'd move faster, but it is our goal -- it's the national goal that by 2025 that we'll have this number of ninety percent for the clean air green initiatives that the President has recommended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Well, thank you, Senator Trotter. And thank you, Mr. President. This is a -- a very major project and it is -- this is a -- a phase one study, if you will. And it's my understanding that the State's investment will be eighteen million dollars to do this study. It will move us to the point to where we move forward and -- and can move with the construction plans if the General Assembly approves the study after it's done. It's a direction that we need to go. We need to provide the alternative fuel and we need to -- the alternative energy, and we need to use Illinois coal and move forward in that direction. So I stand in support of this project, Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, I -- I have just two questions, and the first is -- is really to -- to confirm that much of what we heard in committee, as I state it on the Floor,

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

is correct for purposes of the -- of the Senate Journal. So, if you'll indulge me, there's a little bit of a setup here. But the -- we learned in committee -- we heard in committee that there is a -- a technical issue with the bill that could easily be cured going forward. The -- the core of the bill, as you said, is to lay the groundwork for the construction of a clean coal plant in Taylorville, which folks agree. But that will happen only after the study is completed and the General Assembly acts again. The one piece that goes into effect immediately is the extension of the renewable portfolio standard from the current participants in the utility market to all of the players, including the competitive alternative retail energy suppliers, the ARES. And that's a good thing, I -- I think. And that's what we heard in committee. The -- the problem is that there is a slightly different mechanism applied to the incumbent utilities than would be applied to the ARES. a cap on the utilities that will -- would protect ratepayers if the cost of the renewable energy is too high that does not apply to the ARES. It is -- it's my understanding, from our -- our testimony, that that exists. It could have a differential impact, but that it is the intention of no one to create an unequal playing field. The intent of the bill is to maintain competitive neutrality. Is that a fair statement of what we heard in committee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, it is, Senator Harmon. These benchmarks that you're talking about is -- is how we define 'em.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you. My -- my second question, Senator, is just this. I've been talking to the Attorney General's Office and some of the other participants. There is some interest in correcting this -- this small issue in subsequent legislation. I just wanted to ask if you'd be a willing collaborator in that effort.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, Senator Harmon, I will. It is -- if it is the will of the Body, there will be a trailer bill that will be put forth.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in support of the legislation. Unfortunately it's taken us almost three years to move this from its infancy stages to where it's at today. This is one of the rare opportunities where we have to match an environmentally conscious public policy with the ability to use one of Illinois' most greatest resources, as well as put thousands of people to work. It's been a long time coming. There's been some obstructors in the process. And frankly, I don't think it's improved during that time. But we need to act on this today to put Illinois at the forefront and move our economy forward and provide an alternative source of resources for our businesses and others. I urge an Aye vote.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Senator Trotter, in our troubled economy, none of us likes to -- like to pay more for electricity, and especially employers, because, you know, the trickle-down effect. So, does your bill increase the cost of electricity secured by competitive suppliers, requiring them to purchase high-cost electricity from renewable resources?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Sir, as you're aware, this legislation does create a study; it does pay for some technical licensing and licenses and some other engineering costs. What you're asking is really speculative. Some of this information will be bore out from this facility's cost report that we'll be receiving back in the General Assembly in the next two years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Millner. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Assembly. This legislation started back in June of 2004. And it started with the announcement of the Taylorville Energy Center. This passing of the bill, 1987, really brings this to -- to the part

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

where we have an opportunity today to pass legislation that is going to set some standards here for not only Illinois, Taylorville, but for the country. And this legislation is to enact our -- our first clean coal-fired power plant in the world. We in central Illinois sit on the largest bed of coal supply in the nation. And this legislation provides us here today an opportunity to vote on the -- an integrated gasification combined cycle project with carbon capture and sequestration. This environmentally acceptable way pressurizes coal, rather than burning it, to produce clean gas. The project would have the capacity of between five hundred and twenty-five to five hundred and fifty megawatts and would generate enough electricity to power more than five hundred thousand -- five hundred thousand homes. This project would also create over two thousand jobs and would generate millions of dollars of revenue not only here through central Illinois, but across the State. We have the opportunity here today as an assembly to bring jobs to our State - jobs that are needed as we look at our unemployment rate today and across -- not only here in Illinois, central Illinois, but across the country. So, I'm asking my colleagues today to support Senator Trotter's sponsorship of 1987 and bring to us here in Illinois our first coal gasification plant for Illinois. And I appreciate -- and I ask for your support. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

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

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Indicates he will.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Trotter, just to -- just for a clarification really on the legislation. The legislation describes -- excuse me, describes that the initial clean coal facility as a -- as a facility that has a final air permit. Can this facility still amend its air permit if needed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Jones, the answer -- the simple answer is yes. It is expected that the Taylorville Energy Center will be the initial clean coal facility and it already has a final air permit. However, because of significant improvements in the plant's design to improve its environmental and economic performance, this facility would need to amend its air permit and that would be permitted under this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Excuse me. Thank you, Senator Trotter, for -- for answering that. Just a couple of things to the bill. You know, there's also a provision in this bill that -- that affects my district. It's not only just Taylorville here. Power Holdings in -- that's going to build a facility in the Mt. Vernon area - this would -- would -- contains a provision that natural gas companies may enter into contracts with them. So, this is a -- an extremely important piece of legislation. But the other myth out there that -- you know, the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

-- the word that's going around is this is going to drive up costs to the consumers on electricity. Folks, we're going to drive up costs to -- to the consumers of this State - not only individuals, but businesses - if we don't start building some plants and -- and taking care of the need of the consumers in this State and the citizens of this State. So, this is a great piece of legislation. It's time for a Yes vote on this, and -- and send it to the Governor's desk. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I stand in strong support of this legislation. I feel a little bit of repetition here, but the State of Illinois has -- is in a unique opportunity to -- to invest in the future because we have the coal reserves to do it. Not every state has that opportunity, but there are other states who are competing for this -- this technology and this process. I think that needs to be pointed out. This State and our country and even globally is demanding that we invest in clean air technology. It's been talked about, the number of jobs. I've heard two thousand. I've heard three thousand construction jobs over the course of the construction of this plant, as well as the jobs that will -- the full-time jobs that will be in place once the plant is operating, which is in the hundreds. This is a tremendous opportunity to entice businesses to our -- to entice business to our State, and I certainly ask for and encourage a Yes vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lauzen.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman -- or, Mr. President. A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much. Naturally, I -- I think that all of us in this Chamber are in favor of clean sustainable sources of domestic energy, and as one of the previous speakers said, we got to start developing it now. I personally believe that the great majority of my constituents back home are in favor of incentivizing research and development in, you know, the next generation of energy generation. How would you go about explaining to, you know, our typical group of forty to sixty constituents in a senior center back home when we look at - and you know our budget better than most in this Chamber - our bills -- many of our bills aren't being paid for five to six months? When we wanted to keep the State parks open, I think that that was about a two/2.2-million-dollar bill. And yet, this is nine times as much and it's -- it's going to the benefit of a private company that's going to be placing a three and a -- three-and-ahalf-billion-dollar investment. Eighteen million dollars to them is one half of one percent of their development costs. And my constituents are probably going to ask the same question your constituents, why is the State taxpayer being asked to put in eighteen million when we're closing parks and when we're not paying our bills on time? How would you respond to your constituents at home?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

That it's all of our responsibility to save the world. We know that we have right now the -- the -- the hot air effect, the -- the -- and the green air, and whatever else they call it, the thermal effect that's going on. There will be no parks for us to go to, there will be no waters for us to swim in, if we do not start addressing this and going green. So, this is an investment in our future. So, it's important that we do put this eighteen million dollars there for it so we can get to that place, that sustainability level by 2025.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Just one other question. What this does, basically, is it provides funding for a study and then it sets in motion a process to guarantee demand for the energy that's produced at this plant. My -- my only other really major concern is that I understand that the cost - just the construction cost of this facility - the construction cost is fifteen cents per kilowatt hour versus -- I know in northern Illinois in our district, generally speaking, people pay about twelve cents per kilowatt hour. So, we'd be putting into place fifteen-cent purchase where we're buying it right now at twelve cents. We'd be -- we'd be guaranteeing demand from this facility at twenty-five percent higher than the current price of gas -- or, current price of electricity. Do you feel that that's going in the right direction?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

That's -- that's a difficult question, in -- in that I don't have the direct answer because I have not reviewed the contract. So, in the absence of doing that, I don't think I can answer your -- your question outright at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I speak this afternoon as a former official at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. I also speak as a Senator whose district is home to the second oldest coal-burning -- coal-burning generating plant in the Midwest. The oldest coal-burning generating plant lies in Senator Munoz's district, the Fisk Station. I have the Crawford Station. So, I can give personal testimony as it relates to Senate Bill 1987. You know, central issue and debate in this country has been the failure of -- and lack of a national energy policy. It has been on the forefront of our lives day in and day out for the last eighteen months. Every time we go to the pump and fill our tanks and every time we been receiving our electric bills and every time we paid our gas bills, it's -- the discussion at the -- at the kitchen table has been our failed energy policy here in Illinois, here in America. And there's no doubt that our President-elect Barack Obama has got it right. I believe that his vision in putting forth a national policy, a federal investment in alternative energy policy is where this country wants to go and it's where Americans want to go. And that's why we elected somebody like Barack Obama.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

important -- it's important also -- as I've traveled southern Illinois and I've -- as the adopted Senator for Franklin County, I've spent the last four years visiting downstate communities. Been in Benton. Been in Franklin County. I know the trials and tribulations of the people in southern Illinois, the lack of opportunities, the lack of jobs. We must today, on the final day of the legislature, keep hope alive for the people in southern Illinois, especially in Taylorville. We need to support and be -- continue to be at the forefront in this country here in Illinois, in the fifth-largest economy, in supporting this project. It is -- it is the vanguard of energy policy initiatives that are going on in this country. We are pushing the envelope. We pushed the envelope on November 4th in electing President Barack Obama. We need today -- continue to be at the forefront of the energy policy in voting Yes for Senate Bill 1987. Keep hope alive. Let's bring -- opportunity must return to Taylorville. Vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Leader Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I -- I want to applaud the previous speaker. I -- I appreciate his support. I don't know what to say. Is that a kiss of death? Anyway, first of all, I -- I just -- I want to thank Deanna Demuzio. She's worked hard on this legislation for four or five years. And Taylorville, of course, is in her district. But this is important to all of central Illinois, not just Christian County. There's going to be a lot of ripple effect. It's going to help the -- the economic opportunities in -- in our area and that's a big thing. It's all -- it's about

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

jobs. And I understand some of the opposition, but we're -we're hurting in our area of the State. There isn't any doubt about that. We've got a real concern about employment and anything we can do to enhance that would be beneficial, obviously, to the people of our area. And I -- I don't share the -- necessarily the concerns that some have about what the -the rising costs. I mean, we're all relatively conservative about the way we think about electricity rates, but they're going to go up. That's just the basic facts of life. And we -we've always talked about wait till we get the technology, wait till the technology's here and Illinois coal is going to expand and we're going to see all this booming markets out there. Well, the technology is here. That's what this is. technology that's available to -- to enhance the -- Illinois coal throughout the State, and then we have enough coal reserves here - more than Saudi Arabia. So, we ought to be taking advantage of this. This is good for the industry, good for the -- for, certainly, central Illinois and Taylorville, Decatur, Macon County. There's a lot of people who are going to benefit from that, so I urge everyone's support. And thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Trotter, to close.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I, too, want to thank Senator Demuzio. I want to thank Vince Demuzio. I mean, this has been one of those protracted fights that's been out here for a long time. And -- and -- and all of the -- the people who sat at the table. Thank the Attorney General's

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Office, ComEd, all the good people who came to the table to get us this piece of legislation. They talk about the ripple There will be a ripple effect according to NIU, Northern Illinois University, that there'll be jobs not only in the coal industry, but it'll be in the health care industry also, the retail, hospitality. It says that they're looking it can generate up to a billion -- billions of dollars through the Total employee compensation will be over three-hundredand-thirty-four-million-dollar total. Annual compensation for -- from the plan itself will be 24.3 million That's four hundred and sixteen direct and indirect jobs. The economic growth on an annual basis is 78.5 million This is about jobs. It is about the environment. It's about doing the right thing for the future. And I ask for its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendments 2, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1987. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate concurs with House Amendments 2, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1987. The bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Rise on a point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

State your point.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber, as we're growing toward the end of the day, I would like to recognize another longtime member of the Senate Republican staff who'll be departing. Greg Cox is standing here with me. Greg has been a member of our staff for almost a decade, although the beard that he has grown recently makes it look like it's something closer to twenty or twenty-five. Greg's worked hard, not just for our side of the aisle. He's worked hard for everybody. And I hope the Senate would join me now in congratulating him and extending our best wishes for a great future.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senate Bill 2520. Senator Raoul. Madam Secretary, please read the motion

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2520.

Filed by Senator Kwame Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Raoul, to explain your motion.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I move to concur with House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 of Senate Bill 2520. This is an -- omnibus pension bill that makes changes to numerous articles of the Pension Code. As amended, the bill contains provisions of -- for purchase of past service credit, trustee terms, eligibility for disability benefits, transfers --

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

transfer for credit between funds, felony language, and military service credits. COGFA stated that any fiscal impact to any pension fund would be minimal. Every portability provision requires the employee to contribute the difference in costs between the two funds, plus interest at an actuarially assumed rate. All provisions to establish optional service credit require the employee to pay employee or -- and employer -- contributions plus interest. I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Meeks, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR MEEKS:

Yes. Mr. President, I'd like to welcome to the Floor the esteemed Attorney General of the State of Illinois - the Attorney General Lisa Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome, Attorney General Madigan. This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2520. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate concurs with House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2520; having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2558. Senator Sullivan. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2558. Filed by Senator John Sullivan.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sullivan, to explain your motion.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Senate here, this identical bill passed this Chamber back on April the 3rd, 58 Yes votes, no No votes. It went over to the House. They put an amendment on it. It came back here. It failed. This has been -- that amendment has been stripped out. This is the original bill and it simply allows a -- a contractual employee of an Illinois veterans home to purchase their past service. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2558. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the question -- take the vote. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Bill -- or, the -- the Senate concurs on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2558. The motion... Madam Secretary, do we have any other motions on file?

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Yes. I have a motion to nonconcur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

I move to nonconcur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2558.

Filed by Senator John Sullivan.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Sullivan, to explain your motion.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. My wish is to nonconcur with this amendment -- motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Sullivan moves to nonconcur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2558. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. The Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Kotowski, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Mr. President, point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate and members of the gallery, I'm pleased today to be joined by Mark Walker, the next State Representative of the 66th District. Mark is a terrific person, a military veteran, successful businessman. He's going to be a tremendous asset to the Illinois General Assembly. Please give him a great Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Welcome to your visit to the Senate. President Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Most of our business has been concluded for this time of Session, so I just wish to wish everyone a -- some happy holidays, Happy Thanksgiving, all the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

great things. We have concluded our major business for today, except for reading in Messages. And wish everyone have an enjoyable time. Look forward to seeing you at Christmas or New Year. God bless you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Resolution 933, offered by Senator Garrett.

It is substantive, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With leave of the Body, all 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 LINK)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries. The resolution is adopted. Madam Secretary, Resolutions. Madam Secretary, Messages.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to -- 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:

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

House Joint Resolution 145.

Sponsored by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads HJR No. 145)

Adopted by the House, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Martinez moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of immediate consideration and the adoption of House Joint Resolution 145. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Senator Martinez now moves the adoption of House Joint Resolution 145. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. And the House Joint Resolution 145 is adopted.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 4622

Which amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4622 -- I'm sorry, Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4622 and Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 4622.

Nonconcurred in by the House, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 719

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

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 719

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 801, with House Amendment No. 4; Senate Bill 1174, with House Amendment No. 1; and Senate Bill 2085, with House Amendment No. 1.

All passed the House, as amended, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

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

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

Senate Bill 826

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

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 826

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 2179, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 2348, with House Amendments 1 and 6 {sic} (1, 2 & 6); and Senate Bill 2603, with House Amendments 1 and 3.

All passed the House, as amended, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed a bill of the

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 5037.

Passed the House, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

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

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

Senate Bill 100

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

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 100.

We've received like Messages on Senate Bill 113, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 874, with House Amendment No. 1; Senate Bill 1013, with House Amendment No. 1.

All passed the House, as amended, 11-20 -- on 11-20, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

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

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

Senate Bill 101

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

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 101 and House Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 101.

178th Legislative Day

11/20/2008

Passed the House, as amended, November 20th, 2008. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

...Secretary, Introduction of Bills.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

Senate Bill 3078, offered by Senator Crotty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY SHIPLEY:

House Bill 5037, offered by Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Pursuant to Senate -- to House Joint Resolution 145, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, January 12th, 2009, at 12 o'clock noon. The Senate stands adjourned.