58th Legislative Day 5/31/2011

117.1 0.1 0	D	1.00
HB1717	Recalled	178
HB1717	Third Reading	180
HB1719	Third Reading	181
HB1723	Recalled	149
HB1723	Third Reading	150
HB1723	Vote Intention	152
SB0042	Concurrence	190
SB0063	Concurrence	191
SB0107	Concurrence	152
SB0109	Concurrence	6
SB0122	Concurrence	11
SB0122	Vote Intention	25
SB0123	Concurrence	9
SB0145	Concurrence	12
SB0270	Concurrence	153
SB0335	Concurrence	192
SB0539	Concurrence	54
SB0620	Concurrence	204
SB0620	Concurrence	208
SB0620	Out Of Record	205
SB0675	Concurrence	155
SB0744	Concurrence	68
SB0745	Concurrence	156
SB1122	Concurrence	139
SB1178	Concurrence	25
SB1179	Concurrence	50
SB1228	Concurrence	156
SB1394	Concurrence	53
SB1533	Concurrence	159
SB1652	Concurrence	57
SB1652	Concurrence	119
SB1652	Out Of Record	57
SB1672	Concurrence	166
SB1799	Concurrence	57
SB1802	Concurrence	167
SB1831	Concurrence	169
SB1835	Concurrence	64
SB1852	Concurrence	171
SB1914	Concurrence	186
SB1918	Concurrence	172
SB1943	Concurrence	66

5/31/2011 58th Legislative Day SB1968 205 Concurrence SB2062 Concurrence 173 SB2133 Concurrence 67 SB2168 Concurrence 176 SB2169 Concurrence 206 SB2169 Vote Intention 210 SB2172 Concurrence 198 SB2288 Concurrence 177 SB2293 Concurrence 186 200 SB2405 Concurrence SR0262 Resolution Offered 211 HJR0032 Adopted 143 HJR0034 Resolution Offered 211 Adopted 212 HJR0039 Resolution Offered HJR0039 212 Senate to Order-Senator Sullivan 1 Prayer-Pastor John Smith 1 Pledge of Allegiance 1 Journal-Postponed 1 Committee Reports 1 Messages from the House 3 Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes 52 Messages from the House 52 Messages from the House 116 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 117 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 117 Committee Reports 117 Messages from the House 146 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 147 Committee Reports 147 Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes 148 Committee Reports 148 Committee Reports 151 Messages from the House 182 Messages from the House 183 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 184 Committee Reports 184 Messages from the House 185 Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes 188 Messages from the House 188

58th Legislative Day Committee Reports Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes Committee Reports Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted Messages from the House Adjournment 5/31/2011 189 204 204 204 211 212

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The regular Session of the 97th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor John Smith, United Methodist Church, here in Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Smith. PASTOR JOHN SMITH:

(Prayer by Pastor John Smith)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Maloney and crew to lead us in the Pledge.

SENATOR MALONEY:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Maloney and grandson, Eddie Maloney)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senate Journal of Monday, May 30th, 2011.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and -- and approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Delgado, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Health, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 145 and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 on Senate Bill 1943 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Hunter, Chairperson of the Committee on Human Services, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 123 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Maloney, Chairperson of the Committee on Higher Education, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 122 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2133 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Meeks, Chairperson of the Committee on Education, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1799 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Koehler, Chairperson of the Committee on Local Government, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 539 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Environment, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2288 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Garrett, Chairperson of the Committee on Commerce, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1394 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Forby, Chairperson of the Committee on Labor, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1122 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and 7 to Senate Bill 744 and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1835 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Hutchinson, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 109 recommended Do Adopt. Excuse me.

Senator Jacobs, Chairperson of the Committee on Energy, reports House Bill 815 Do Pass and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1652 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Raoul, Chairperson of the Committee on Pensions and Investments, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1613 recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 107.

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

House Amendment 1.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 266, with House Amendments 2 and 3; Senate Bill 270, with House Amendments 2 and 3; Senate Bill 540, with House Amendments 3, 4 and 5; Senate Bill 675, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 745, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1228, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1672, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1831, with

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

House Amendments 1 and 3; Senate Bill 1852, with House Amendment 3; Senate Bill 1918, with House Amendment 2; Senate Bill 2168, with House Amendment 2. They all passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

James Carder with Blue stream -- blueroomstream.com, WGN, requests permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, leave is Gordon Graham, WAND-TV, also seeks -- requests permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, leave is granted on both requests. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention, will all Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? We're about to go to Floor action. Will all Members -- and will all LAs please contact their Members and have them come to the Floor immediately? We're about to go to Floor action. Andrew Hansen, WICS-TV, requests permission to videotape the Senate -- on the Senate Floor. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, will all Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? We are ready to begin Floor action. Justin Fowler, of The State Journal-Register, requests permission to photograph the proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Jacqueline Collins, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR J. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly -- of the Senate...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Excuse me just a second, Senator Collins. Excuse me just one second. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could hold the visiting

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

down, please. I have a Member speaking here. Senator Collins.
SENATOR J. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise for a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point.

SENATOR J. COLLINS:

Since this is our last - I'm an optimist - since this is our last day before adjournment, we have a colleague who will be celebrating a birthday tomorrow. Now, I'm not sure of the age in which she's celebrating, but she doesn't look a day over twenty-nine. So I'd like all of us to wish Senator Mattie Hunter a very happy twenty-ninth birthday on June 1st.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter, happy birthday. Happy birthday. Senator Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR E. JONES:

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point.

SENATOR E. JONES:

We also have another colleague celebrating a birthday tomorrow, June 1st. Hopefully, we will not be here tomorrow. But Senator Kirk Dillard's birthday is tomorrow. So could you please join me in giving him a round of applause? I think he turned thirty-five today -- or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard, happy birthday to you tomorrow. Melissa Lee {sic} (Leu), Illinois Statehouse News, requests permission

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

to videotape the proceedings. Seeing no objection, so granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, Supplemental Calendar No. 1 has been distributed. We will be going to that order very shortly. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

Well, I -- Mr. President, I thought you were going to the -- I was getting ready for the next order of business.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Absolutely. I think we're ready to go to that order. Ladies and Gentlemen, Supplemental Calendar No. 1, on the Order of Concurrence, Senate Bills, is Senate Bill 109. Senator Haine. Indicates he'd like to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 109.

Offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, to present your concurrence.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a very interesting bill. It was filed in the House in January. I want to let everyone know this is not one of these midnight surprises. This was filed in the House and it was held during the entire Session in the House Revenue Committee. The Majority Leader is Chairman of that Committee and they worked out a number of agreements with the Department of Revenue. That's why it's late coming over here. It's been thoroughly vetted in the House. The -- what this bill does,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

quite simply, is allow a manufacturer representative, a tobacco manufacturer, to purchase a limited number of their product line, cigarettes, from a distributor who's licensed in Illinois and to market them - they're limited to fifty cartons - and to market them throughout the highways and byways of the State. And when they market them, they have to pay the tax; they got to pay the tax at the distributor level. The retailer has to pay the tax when they buy from them. They have to do reports to the Department of Revenue. This merely allows the traveling salesmen to market lines of cigarettes, and these are primarily made in our sister state of Kentucky. And they're new brands, new lines, not the old usual lines that we see. It allows them to break into the market. And it has no...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Go ahead. Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. President. It doesn't have any opposition. Retail Merchants are okay. The other tobacco companies are okay, 'cause they can do the same thing, although they wouldn't do it because they have the vast market share through past advertising. They also -- it has no opposition from the Department of Revenue. In fact, the Department of Revenue is the one who basically orchestrated this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Cultra, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CULTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Would the sponsor yield for a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine indicates he will yield. Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

I think we need to make it clear to the Body, these representatives, they'll be selling this product at retail, not to the consumer. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you so much, Senator Cultra. That's absolutely correct. This is only to the retailer, not to anyone -- any Tom, Dick or Harry on the street.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

To the bill: This is...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

This is not anything unordinary. It's done in many other states. It just allows manufacturers to promote their product to areas where distributors don't have good market penetration. So I would rise in support of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Any other discussion? Senator Haine, to close.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr...(microphone cutoff)... This is a -- this is a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

bill which is a reasonable bill. It's a -- it's with the approval of the Department of Revenue. It's part of the historic American free enterprise system of traveling salespeople. It also markets tobacco from Kentucky. I would remind the Body that in the old United States Capitol and the Doric columns, the top of the columns are adorned with tobacco leaves, showing the historic connection of tobacco in the American system itself. So I -- consistent with that, and we heard this in Room 400, which has, on the left side of the room, a picture of General Grant, who we all know was a chain-smoking cigar smoker. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. The question is, shall Senate Bill 109 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 109, having -- the question -- the Senate bill -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 109, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 122. Senator Sandoval. Senator Sandoval. Out of the record. Senate Bill 123. Senator Steans. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 123.

Filed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Steans, before you read your motion, Michael Tercha, with Chicago Tribune, requests permission to take still photographs. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Steans, on your motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 123, as -- as amended in the House, creates the Public Health Standing Orders Act. We need to do this. This is really codifying current practice, where in our public health clinics, physicians can issue standing orders that allow nurses to issue -- give vaccinations, immunizations, other kinds of preventative health care under those standing orders. This was required because the Department of -- IDFPR had sort of changed the way they were interpreting some things. This is current practice. We're now codifying it. It's an agreed-to bill and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Steans. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 123. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. The Senate having concurred -- having received the required constitutional majority -- Senate Bill 123 -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 123, and the bill is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will -- we will

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

return -- we're on the Supplemental Calendar No. 1. We will return to Senate Bill 122. Senator Sandoval. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 122.

Filed by Senator Sandoval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 122 requires the Board of Higher Ed require all public institutions of higher ed to track the status of those students who are first in their family to attend an institution of higher education. In addition, the Board is required to include the status of those students in their annual report sent to the General Assembly and the Governor. I'd ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 122. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 47 voting Aye, 11 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 122, and the bill is declared passed. Continuing on the Calendar, Supplemental

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Calendar No. 1, on the Order of Concurrence, is Senate Bill 145. Senator Steans. Madam Secretary, please read the motion. SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 145.

Filed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Bill 145, as amended in the House, creates the Specialized Mental Health Rehabilitation Act. It's doing two things. - the first big piece of this bill is really a follow-up to the nursing home reform legislation we passed. When we passed that legislation, it did not apply to facilities that take care of folks with developmental disabilities. There's been a long sixmonth negotiation process with all the advocates, owners of these facilities that treat people with DDs, and the Governor's -- led by the Governor's Office, that came to this agreed-to bill for follow-up for these facilities on the nursing home -really raising the standards of care in those facilities as well. The second piece of this bill was a later addition to the bill and it is pulling out five of the facilities, the institutes for mental disease, Subpart T facilities, from the Nursing Home Care Act. It continues to regulate them under the same regulatory structure as they are right now. But pulling them out enables us to have the bed tax that we passed as part of the Nursing Home Reform Act, you know, in follow up to that, get that through federal compliance. I would urge an Aye vote.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Pankau, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PANKAU:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

It -- Senator, is -- is this the granny tax that we passed in the wee hours of -- I'm sorry, that you passed in the wee hours of January yet this year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

First of all, I voted No on that bill. I don't appreciate implications on -- innuendos like that. This is not a granny tax in this bill. That was already passed, as you indicated, in January. This bill simply pulls out five facilities so they can be regulated separately and apart from the Nursing Home Care Act, under Subpart T classification. They're more therapeutic versions of the institutes for mental disease, which is a subset of the nursing homes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

So, Senator, if we vote No to this, what happens?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR STEANS:

There is a risk that the federal government does not approve the bed tax that we already passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

So, if we vote No on this, even though the amendments have nothing to do with the granny tax, we could kill the granny tax by voting No on this. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

That is a possibility. We don't know for sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

To the bill, Mr. President. I urge a No vote on this. This is the granny tax. I don't care how you want to call it. Yes, the sponsor has made some efforts to improve it with the disability community, but this is a tax on all of our nursing homes on the elderly. This should never have been in place in the first place. And I welcome the opportunity to get rid of it now once and for all. I urge a strong No vote on this. Let's send the message - let's send the message loud and strong - no granny tax. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a couple questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, if -- in -- in the way the current finances is set up right now, if -- if this -- if this proposal -- if this did not pass and the plan that was in place went away, how much of federal dollars would be -- would be lost to Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

About a hundred and forty-seven million dollars. I also want to note that twenty million of the dollars is used for community-based care.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

So that hundred and eighty million would come out of the nursing home line that is in place right now. That would result in a reduction of funding for every facility in Illinois that takes -- that has State dollars. Is that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yeah. Yes, you raise a very excellent point. And one of the things that we have done in the Nursing Home Care Act is raise standards of staffing requirements. And this was one of the elements that is needed to help the nursing homes actually

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

implement those raised standards. And without the funding, they're very much at risk of being able to -- to do that - increase the quality of care in these facilities. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

I think you also mentioned that some of the reforms that were included for the developmental disabled community, those facilities, those reforms are in this legislation as well. If that doesn't pass, then those reforms for now are not going to be -- would not be -- or, safeguards would not be put into place. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

You know, again, I guess to the bill: While I wasn't a big proponent of this way of funding this plan, unfortunately it was the only -- it's the only option that's out there and failure to pass this not only potentially puts our developmentally disabled facilities, the families and loved ones in those -- in those facilities, at risk, but also with the loss of those federal dollars, it means that all of our homes would be taking a hit financially. And until we can come up with a better plan where the State can fully fund its obligation, this is probably the lesser of two evils as a way to protect the -- our disabled

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

community, as well as make sure we don't lose those federal dollars. So, we appreciate your effort on -- on this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

I -- I found it interesting, in committee today, the -- this bill is supposed to reform and the disability community actually came out in strong opposition to this bill. Could you comment on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

One organization, Equip for Equality, who indicated they very much support the MR/DD changes that are in follow-up to it, they just don't like the five facilities that are getting pulled out, which I might add are not -- that are focused on folks with mental illnesses. Other groups like Access Living remain neutral on the bill and are not in opposition to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

They were not only opposed, but they also said that they weren't even invited to the table. And they said this bill is

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

affecting them and they were very unhappy that they didn't -they weren't even be -- able to voice their opinion or be at the
table to comment on what you were doing. Do -- do you have a
response to that? Why weren't they invited to the table?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

They were at the table for the entire negotiations on the MR/DD follow-up nursing home trailer bill. There was a second amendment that was added that pulls out these five facilities. This was done in the House. I was not aware of that either, until very late into it, so I had not been able to include them in the discussions around that. Once we found out that amendment was -- getting put on this bill, which had not been my original understanding, we did then invite them to the table and, in fact, had a conversation where they were invited. were not able to make it. Many of the other folks were, who had been against, who are now neutral because we did sit down at the table. Further, I have committed -- what we were trying to do here, we need a long-term care vision of how we take care of folks with mental illness in Illinois, sorely lacking. Michael Gelder, in the Governor's Office, is a strong proponent of this as well. He and I, along with the Chair of the Public Health Committee, Senator Delgado, are very committed to pulling together all the mental health advocates and determining what role these five institutes for mental disease should play in the continuum of care for folks with mental illnesses in the State moving forward. All parties will be included conversations. Currently, we're not changing the regulatory

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

structure at all for those five. Before we do, all parties will be included.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

To the bill: I was amazed in committee that we're doing something that affects the disability community and they were very much opposed; felt like they hadn't been included in the discussions. In addition to that, if this bill doesn't pass, the granny tax, which was passed at a very late hour in the veto -- or, in the overtime Session, would go away. And by voting No, we prevent the bed tax from being implemented and allow the opportunity to start over from scratch to have an open process. This tax effectively cuts rates for forty percent of the nursing homes and uses that money to increase rates for sixty percent. Should good public policy promote the cannibalization of one part of an industry by the other? I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Crotty, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CROTTY:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

The previous speaker, Senator Cultra, really had taken a few of the remarks that I also feel very strongly for persons with mental illness. And a matter of fact, I had gotten a note that the Mental Health Association and the Mental Health Summit,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

which is fifty-four organizations, are strongly opposed to this. For decades, Illinois has wasted, in my opinion, General Revenue funds and provided inadequate, inappropriate, and illegal care of persons with serious mental illnesses by placing more than forty-three hundred of them in nursing homes, known Institutes of Mental Disease {sic} (Institutions for Mental Diseases), or IMDs. Under federal law, the State is ineligible for federal financial participation under the Medicaid program for residents of IMDs; however, if these same persons receive treatment in the community, State funds expended for their care are matched by federal Medicaid funds. Specialized -- mental heath rehabilitation facility will still provide the inadequate, inappropriate, and what I feel is illegal care, and a waste of our tax dollars. There's no justification for creating this new category of nursing home, particularly without careful review and consideration by the Illinois General Assembly. So I would ask for a No vote. And I respect the sponsor of this bill, but, you know, with all of the organizations, the families that have mental health issues, this would be a very bad bill for them. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Senator Delgado, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Delgado.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Although I agree with the comments of my colleague who just spoke, I agree that there has to be an entire institutional

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

revamp and that must occur. However, this bill -- in terms of care and making sure your loved one is safe and the type of employees that -- that -- that actually work at these facilities. However, this bill, as a previous speaker -another speaker talked about, Senate Bill 145, is very specific as to where we're at today and knowing how comprehensive we had I chair this committee and I, too, took it -- knowing that not all the groups are on board, some because of lack of communication or some because, just maybe, their opinion wasn't taken at that time. I wasn't in that meeting. However, there's going to be subsequent meetings. But this bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, is comprehensive. We're talking about making sure that -- if we fail to pass this bill, we're going to send a hundred and forty-seven million dollars right out the window. We are looking at other ways, as we're all fighting to care for our loved ones and -- and take out the egregious behaviors, but that's another subject matter right now. And we're attending to that matter and many of you are involved in that. Failure to pass this bill will keep many of our friends in the developmental disability communities languishing in limbo right now, because they themselves don't have a solution. particular one talks about five particular facilities and these five particular facilities need to be brought out, not classified as a long-term. And right now, that's what this bill does. In addition to two -- many, many others, but we have the Health Care Council of Illinois, the Alliance for Living, SEIU Healthcare, the Don Moss & Associates, the INA. We're -- I'm --I agree. I'd love to get a hundred percent and that's why I asked the sponsor that after we do pass this bill, we're going

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

right back to the table so that we can continue to involve all of these good folks, because there's a lot of work to do. But, as a General Assembly, we have -- we have a mission and an obligation to make sure that we are funding -- putting a bill together that covers all bases and the few bases that are not covered are being attended to. But let's vote Yes and not lose a hundred and forty-seven million federal dollars. And let's give an Aye for the lady, Senator Steans' legislation. And I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Schoenberg, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the motion, Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think that Senator -- I rise in support of the motion. I think that Senator Steans has done an exceptional job on both components. I'd like to very briefly drill down further as to why it's essential that we do this. We heard an earlier comment that there were a number of long-term care facilities that would be paying out more that {sic} they would be getting back. That's because the way that we get the federal money is identical - not similar, but identical - to how we all get the money now - nine hundred million dollars a year, roughly - through the hospital assessment. According to the federal rules that govern the Medicaid enhancement, the formula has to be

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

redistributive. Some, by their very nature, have to pay out more than they get back. Institutions or providers can't be held harmless. If they're held harmless, they're in violation of the federal laws and, therefore, it would shut the whole program down. So failure to provide this correction, as Senator Steans very appropriately alluded to, will only mean that we will likely, through rulemaking authority, have to empower the Director of HFS and empower the Quinn administration to go -have more authority to negotiate with the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services, in the hope of getting over a hundred and forty-five million dollars in new money. finally point out that the climate in Washington right now is to wind down these Medicaid enhancement opportunities for states, both for hospitals and for long-term care. If you want to accelerate their shutting down our ability to get more federal money, you'll vote against this. I'm hoping you'll have the presence to vote for it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Our last speaker, Senator Jacqueline Collins, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR J. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Collins.

SENATOR J. COLLINS:

I rise reluctantly to support this legislation. And the reason I support this legislation, I was told by the Governor's Office that if this bill, Senate Bill 145, pass, there will be no need for Senate Bill 2147. As you know, last Session,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Steans and I worked on the Nursing Home Reform Act. It was a massive reform for nursing homes. Pretty much the genesis of it was based on a Tribune -- Chicago Tribune series and The Chicago Reporter. The reason that I'm going to support this legislation, because I am adamantly opposed to Senate Bill 2147. 2147 would gut all the nursing home reform that we placed in the Bill 326 last Session. It not only guts nursing home reform, but it takes away the staffing inequities that -- or, retains the staffing inequities that we find in majority black and brown nursing homes. During the discussions and debate on the Nursing Home Reform Act, there was never a contingency based on raising the level of staffing with the bed tax. And the reason that I am going to vote for this bill is to keep 2147 from moving And I was very disappointed yesterday in the House debate, right after Senate Bill 145 passed in the House, Senator Lang -- Representative Lang stood on the Floor to present Senate That's hypocrisy and I feel that we must move Bill 2147. forward 145 to stop that kind of politics from taking place in the Senate Chambers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans, do you wish to close? Senator Steans. SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you very much. I appreciate the conversation on this bill. Again, just to -- to recap, this really is raising standards of care for folks that are in our developmental disability facilities, as well as, I think, provides a framework now moving forward where we really can improve the continuum of care for our folks with mental illnesses in Illinois. It's sorely needed. Folks in here know I've been a long-term

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

supporter of rebalancing and getting folks out to the community. I see this as a step actually towards helping us do that, as it will provide a framework for developing what role we should have for some of these institutions and maybe not needed for those that are not as therapeutic in nature. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 145. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 33 voting Aye, 24 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 145, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President. On Senate Bill 122, I voted for that bill. Would like to be recorded as a No vote on Senate Bill 122. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. The record will so indicate your intentions. Ben Brady {sic} (Bradley), WLS-TV Chicago, requests permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you will turn to your printed Calendar, on page 60 of the printed Calendar is Senate Bill -- towards the bottom of the page, is Senate Bill 1178. Senator Raoul. Madam Secretary, indicates he'd like to proceed. Please read the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

record -- or, the bill -- motion. Please read the motion. SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1178.

Filed by Senator Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1178. Senate Bill 1178 contains the Congressional Redistricting Plan of 2011. For the -- for the record, I would like to state the following: The following -- the following -- following the tabulation of the 2010 Decennial Census, the Office of the Clerk of the United States informed the Governor of Illinois that Illinois is now entitled to only eighteen Representatives in Congress, due to population changes over the last ten years. This is one less Representative than Illinois currently has in Congress today. These population changes and shifts have also caused our current congressional districts to contain unequal numbers of people and -- inconsistent with one person and one -the one-person, one-vote principle. As a result, the General Assembly is required by the United States Constitution and federal law to enact a congressional redistricting plan. legislation fulfills that obligation. The legislation complies with the Constitutional criteria established by the United States Supreme Court that there be a fair and effective representation of all Illinoisans based on the one-person, onevote principle by achieving mathematical equality of population

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

across congressional districts. The legislation is also intended to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to fairness to the voting rights of racial and language minorities. In accordance therewith, the legislation retains effective African American and Hispanic -- Hispanic majority-minority districts, while also achieving population equality, the preservation of the core of existing district boundaries and incumbent constituent relationships, and maintenance of the partisan composition of these districts. redistricting plan, as a whole, takes into consideration the fact that the total number of districts is being reduced from nineteen to eighteen and balance the State's obligations under law, as well as observe traditional redistricting principles in light of the significant population shifts. doing so, existing district boundaries, relative compactness, communities of interest, and other traditional redistricting principles have been observed to the extent determined to be appropriate in light of the other factors I previously mentioned. I urge a Aye vote on this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Dillard, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. To ask a couple of questions, if I may, of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Senator, Latinos make up fifteen percent of the population

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

of the State of Illinois and they are obviously a growing, growing constituency, yet there is still only one Latino district in this map, which will govern the congressional districts for the next ten years. I mean, to me it looks like the 4th Congressional District is racially gerrymandered and the boundaries connecting the northern and southern parts would, you know, to me, seem to be drawn for the purpose of connecting two separate communities. But, you know, why is there only one Latino district drawn here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

First of all, Senator Dillard, the 4th Congressional District is preserved to be substantially similar to the 4th Congressional District -- as the 4th Congressional District was presented ten years ago by you, in the map that you sponsored. Secondly, we've listened to advocacy groups from various Latino communities and no -- no such advocacy group has advocated for more than one Latino majority-minority district. And we've balanced all of the redistricting principles in coming up with the -- with the map that we have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. Well, you know, that was ten or twelve years ago, and if you haven't read a newspaper lately, the Latino influx into America and the State of Illinois is a heck of a lot different than it was ten years ago. So you -- have you examined at all whether you could create a southwest side of

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Chicago -- on the southwest side of Chicago, two Latino districts or not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Before we go to Senator Raoul, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very important issue. If we could hold the conversation down, please. Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Not that I'm aware of, but, as you know, I -- I didn't draw the map.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Who did draw the map?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Staff members. I don't know which -- which specific ones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Continuing, you know, here -- here we're going to be stuck with these decisions for ten years and apparently we have nameless, faceless staff that are drawing the maps that twelve and a half million people of Illinois for ten years will have to live with. Senator Raoul, why does this map substantially dilute the Latino representation in proposed District 3?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

You stated a conclusion that I'm unaware of, so I can't -- I can't comment on your opinion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Senator Raoul, I'm a little perplexed. Chicago lost more than two hundred thousand people in population, but it gains a congressional district under this map. How can that happen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Senator, this map was drawn balancing the redistricting principles that I enumerated and -- and it was drawn in accordance with the federal Voting Rights Act and trying to maintain the core districts that, again, were introduced by you ten years ago, and balancing all the redistricting principles that I enumerated in my opening.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I guess, to the bill: Yesterday, I was reading the nationally recognized website Politico, which knows a little bit about congressional redistricting through America. And their term to describe this map was astonishing - astonishing. That they had never seen a congressional map drawn anywhere in America, not even the map that my own party drew in Texas years ago, that was ever this brazen. My district, the area I live in, in DuPage County, and he's a fine fellow, he's a friend of mine and he's a good --

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

good hockey player, but Congressman Mike Quigley now represents part of DuPage County. His district goes from Lake Shore Drive through Wrigley Field, down into my area, and I was trying to figure out what the -- what the community of interest there is. And I was kidding the sponsor last night - maybe the community of interest is that I got some constituents that actually fly Cub flags outside of their house from time to time. asked the people of DuPage County or Will County. So if you're a resident of DuPage or Will County, you have and are about to be involuntarily annexed by the Cook County machine into Cook County. So under this map, Will and DuPage County essentially gets annexed into the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago, as I said, is losing population, but they're picking up seats. I look, and Senator -- the sponsor is always willing to remind me that ten years ago I did sponsor the congressional map. actually that map was one of fairness. I think it turned out for the most time of that decade that it was evenly split between Republicans and Democrats as members of our -- of our Congress representing this State. But under this map we pass today, that's not going to be the case. In the election in November, the Republicans gained five congressional seats. people at the ballot box said they were immensely unhappy with what was going on in Washington. So what this map does and what the Democratic cartographers are doing is they are in the backrooms with a map trying to essentially take the ballot box decisions by real people that led the five Congressmen from my party being elected and make that obscure. I mean, this is clearly backroom versus electoral ballot box politics in the way these new districts are being drawn. The district that I live

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

in, which is the -- the 13th Congressional District, that district historically for multiple maps over the decades has been little changed whatsoever. But under this map today, it now falls into six different districts - No. 1, No. 3, No. 5, No. 6, No. 11 and No. 14. And these districts stretch far into the City of Chicago. We pick up U.S. Cellular Field, represented probably by my friend, Congressman Dan Lipinski, and as I said, Wrigley Field, the -- represented by Mike Quigley. This map is -- is unbelievable, and as Politico said, it is, quite frankly, astonishing, and nobody asked us in Cook -- or excuse me, in DuPage and Will counties if we wanted to -- to be annexed in. So, this map has lots of problems and I'm sure it will be challenged, especially by the Latino groups of this State who are essentially shut out for the next ten years of having more than one - one - representative in the United States Congress, and I think that is un-American. And I think we're going to find out real soon from a federal judge, it's unconstitutional as well. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Senator, do you actually believe that this map reflects the constitutional requirement that districts must be compact?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

There -- there is not a constitutional requirement imposed that congressional districts be compact. You may want to reread it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Do you believe that this map reflects the federal case law requirement that districts must be compact?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Federal case law does not require compactness. It's just a redistricting principle. You might want to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I suspect the Latino groups that Senator Dillard referenced will have the chance to vet that issue, and we'll see which one of us is right about what's required in that regard. But can you explain the rationale behind creating not just one of these earmuff-looking districts like we have now, but three, specifically the proposed Districts 6, 11, and, of course, the one we have now, 4?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

The map was drawn balancing traditional redistricting

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

principles, trying to preserve the core of the existing congressional districts, to -- trying to remain in compliance with the federal Voting Rights Act, with the Supreme Court and federal court decisions and -- and the United States Constitution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

How do you justify the bizarre shapes of the proposed Districts 4, 7 and 1? None of these districts fit any reasonable definition of compact.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

The map was drawn balancing the core -- the redistricting principles; trying to stay in compliance with the federal Voting Rights Act, which we must remain in compliance with; equality in population; and -- and the -- and the traditional redistricting principles, which I enumerated in my opening.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

This map appears to be a pretty substantial effort at partisan gerrymandering and I was wondering why, given that there are more Republican congressmen today than Democrat congressmen, why are no Democrat members put in districts with other Democrat members, like has been done in several instances with Republicans?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

The -- the map was drawn to try to stay in compliance with the federal Voting Rights Act, tradition -- traditional redistricting principles, compliance with federal court decisions, and balancing all of those -- redistricting principles, we got to where we are. And -- and -- and I may remind you that we also lost a -- one -- one of the seats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

To the bill, Mr. President. I -- I appreciate...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

...appreciate the answers, but the reality of the situation is, this is -- this map, this congressional map, is a national embarrassment. And I think the fact, Senator, that you're not even acknowledging really that it's your product belies a sort of admission on your part that -- that -- that this doesn't really reflect the type of product that I think the people of this State would be proud of. This is a power grab, and you have the majority, you have the ability to do it, you have the -- the power under our State Constitution to make a power grab. I'm not sure that you have done so within the confines of the law. I think a federal judge will weigh in on this and I think you'll find that some of the issues that are summarily dismissed out here on the Floor are not so easily brushed aside in federal court. I look forward to being back here sometime down the road

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

with a fairer -- a fairer, better congressional map, one worthy of the people of this State. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Raoul, the current version of the congressional map that we're discussing here today, it was first presented to the public about twenty-four hours ago. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I'm not sure precisely when it -- when it was. The House took this matter up yesterday. I don't know exactly when it was first revealed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You think that's probably in the ballpark, though, about -- about twenty-four hours, though, this final version?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Sometime probably within the last twenty-four or thirty-six

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

hours, or something like that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I think it is twenty-four hours, but just -- let's go thirty-six. Let's go with thirty-six. Thirty-six hours is not a lot of time to -- for the public to look at a legislative or congressional map and understand it, nor understand why the lines may have been drawn the way they were drawn. Would you agree with that statement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

The original map was -- was released more than thirty-six hours ago. There were some changes made in reaction to several -- several -- I can -- I can enumerate some of the changes, if you -- if you wish. Adjustments were made to -- the proposed 15th District to include more of Madison County. So we're trying to keep more of a county in -- in -- in one district, including the home of the neighboring area to Congressman Shimkus. A corresponding change was made to the 13th District, including more of -- the Champaign-Urbana area. Changes were made in the Springfield area to include more of the City of Springfield into the proposed 13th District. And the proposed 18th District took in more of the area around the city. A change was made in McLean County to include the remainder of the Illinois State University campus. We wanted to have the entire campus in a district -- same -- same district, into the proposed 13th District. And minor adjustments were made to the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

southern boundary of the proposed 16th District for population purposes. Then, the current congressional districts -- well, yeah, those -- those -- those are...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. So, Senator Raoul, with regards to the 15th and 13th Congressional Districts - and I'll comment on those because that's -- that involves people who have represented me and -- and my family - is when the map originally came out, current Congressman Johnson lived in the -- the proposed 15th District and current Congressman Shimkus lived in the proposed 13th District, and after the changes were made and rolled out twenty-four hours ago, now Congressman Johnson lives in the 13th District and Congressman Shimkus has been switched over to the 15th District. I guess that -- that brings to light my point, is that people who somehow have the time to track this issue on a hour by hour by -- basis are barely able to keep up with these changes, like people in here; how do you expect people back home to have any idea where -- how these lines are changing or why they're changing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I think we've -- I think we've provided more opportunity than ever has been historically provided to the people, whether it's been a map, such as a map sponsored by your colleague ten years ago, or twenty years ago, thirty years ago. This has been the greatest opportunity the public has ever had.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

The twenty-four hours of sunshine on the current lines is the greatest opportunity the people have ever had to provide input on a congressional map - twenty-four hours?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Absolutely. You know, we've -- we've put this up on a website, that, you know, no matter where people are, they didn't -- don't have to come down to Springfield to see it. They could see it in the comfort of their own home. No time ever has -- has the public ever had that -- such an opportunity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

How long was it, Senator Raoul, ten years ago, between the time the map was made public and the hearing process started till the vote was taken in the second Chamber of the General Assembly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I believe it was twenty-four hours.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, I think you're wrong about that, but that's just

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

fine. Let -- let's move on to another area to be respectful of the Chamber's and Mr. President's time. Tell me, who were the experts that looked over these lines to deem that they were constitutional? I recall, a few days ago, you and I had a conversation about the magical Dr. Lichtman and how he was able to divine that the lines on the State map were constitutional, even though he had not actually viewed the lines that -- that are now on their way to Governor Quinn's Office. Who were the experts responsible for these lines?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I -- I don't have knowledge of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Raoul, can you tell me what information the unknown expert utilized in determining that this map meets constitutional mandates?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Senator, based on my answer to your previous question, you're asking me to provide you information on -- on a topic that I don't have knowledge of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, first I asked you if you

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

could tell me the name, then I asked you about the statistics. So those are two separate questions. But let me ask you a third. Can you tell me the source of the statistics that the unknown expert relied upon in order to determine that this map was unconstitutional?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Well, given that I don't know his name, I probably -- his or her name, if they exist, you know, I probably don't know what he or she looked at and so I cannot answer your question. If I -- if I knew that, I probably would know the name and I would have been able to answer your first question. That's why, you know, I referred to your...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Excuse me, to the motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the motion. Thank you. Senator Righter

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I would suggest, for all of you who are thinking about voting for this map, which if you look at it in color, looks like something that one of my kids would have tried to draw with a crayon when they were two or three years old, don't take a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

close look at it. It's one of those the closer you look at it, the more nauseated you're going to become and the less likely you're going to be able to do what someone here or back home is telling you to do. The transparency - and I use this word very broadly - the transparency in this process makes it -- the transparency in the State process look like real transparency and, boy, that is not an easy thing to do. This is yet another insider game designed to protect people who are in power right now. That's exactly the wrong way to conduct this process. It's the wrong reason to approve a map. I urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

A question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, you mentioned to Senator Righter that the amendment that just took place, I guess, last evening or just, you know, a few hours ago, but between the 13th and the 15th, you -- you mentioned that a change was made in the southern part of the 13th District to take in more of Madison. I guess for the 15th to take in more of Madison -- more of Madison County. How much more was taken in?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I -- I don't know precisely how much more.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Take -- just -- just give us an estimate. Would that have been a square mile, a block, two blocks, three blocks, or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

More than was in the originally proposed map.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Boy, thank you for the direct answer. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Since the sponsor doesn't want to answer the question, the answer is blocks - not square miles, but blocks. I urge an Aye -- a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I -- you know, I'd just like to lay to rest some of the, what I find, perplexing comments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as it relates to the Latino community and the best interests of the Latino community. I spent the last week now

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

listening to Members of that side of the aisle defending the rights of the Latino community, as if they spent any time in the Latino communities. I think they woke up just the other night realizing that the Latino community is in their districts. so they had to -- comeuppance, make relevant the Latino community. You know, I -- I find it -- even from my colleague from DuPage who found this map perplexing, I find just as perplexing his amor and his love for the Latino community. find it insulting, immoral, and unconscionable that Members of that side of the aisle would spend so much time trying to defend the Latino community. I remind you, when we have asked you to come and defend the Latino community, Republican Party, when it came to driver's license for the immigrants, when it came to the Dream Act for the immigrants, when it came to secure communities for the immigrants, when it's come for ALL KIDS for the immigrants, when it's come for all kinds of social services and public safety programs for the Latino community, you -- many of you abandoned the Latino community - and today - today - you're for the Latino community. I find that insulting, hypocritical, and I -- I -- I challenge that side of the aisle that, in this next election cycle, you run some Latinos to represent you in the Latino community. The votes don't...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Excuse me. Excuse me. Senator, I'm sorry. Senator Sandoval, I'm sorry. Senator Sandoval, please continue. SENATOR SANDOVAL:

I'm done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Tom

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Johnson, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

I -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

I find the remarks of my colleague on the other side of the aisle who just spoke to be outrageous and moving the ball nowhere. My community is fifty-one percent Latino and has been for the last twelve years. To say that we do not live together community and that we don't care about Republicans don't care, I don't care - come on, Senator. get over this. At some point, we're all people of the State of Illinois, aren't we? And, yes, we do run Latinos on the Republican side. They don't run too many Swedes over on your side. You know, at what point do we get over it? And as we look at these remaps, it's a shame that we have to talk about drawing a line for this group or that group or that group. In the words of our President, there's not a Red United States, a Blue United States, a Black United States, a White United States, there is one United States and we are one people. President came out of this Chamber and that's certainly one of the things that I certainly agree with him on, and I think all of us do, because I know you all. This rhetoric in here just gets to be obscene and it moves us nowhere. And I would just hope that when we want to get up and make that big speech about Republicans don't care about this group, or from our side, Democrats don't give a damn about that group, at some point, let's get over it. Let's cut the aisle down the middle of this

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Chamber and put the desks together and realize that we are stuck here in one very rich State, called Illinois, and what blessings we all have to be here. And let's get beyond that kind of rhetoric. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Schmidt, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SCHMIDT:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Schmidt.

SENATOR SCHMIDT:

And I guess it's more of a comment and I want to thank Senator Johnson for his remarks. But -- and I'm about ready to cry. My dad is a Latino. Okay? So I guess I'm not enough Latino for you guys over there. And I don't wave them -- the Mexican flag, okay? My father is José Cruz Rejas, first generation in this country. Very proud of my grandfather, Estaban Rejas, who, by the way, was Poncho Villa's valet when he was a kid. I have wonderful Latino heritage that I'd be very happy to share with you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Delgado. SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Let's -- let's be perfectly clear, 'cause I'm Latino too, but I'm from Jersey. My parents are Puerto Rican. But let me be very clear: This isn't personal. This is -- and my great colleague, who I respect, is a personal friend. But let me say, this doesn't have nothing to

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

do with it. It talks about votes. The votes, the history -and with all due respect, God bless your family, but you got -you just arrived here as a legislator. The votes don't follow the rhetoric. We squeeze -- you're holding on so tight to the whole issue, and I respect Maldef, but you're holding it tighter than a Koala bear hugging an Australian pine tree, just for own purposes of -- of making an argument. But where are the votes throughout the year? I chair Public Health. I have to do battle every year on Human Services. Where are the votes? Where are -- where are the cuts always at? Where are -- where -- where are the votes that you don't want to cast? practicing what you're preaching. Then I expect you to practice what you preaching -- preach, because you're great-greatgranddaddy would be proud of you then. Where -- that has to be in practice. It cannot only be in theory. It cannot only be when it's for a map. It must be for the families. It's not about putting an aisle down the middle. It's about putting families together and understanding the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator. Senator Delgado, excuse me. We've gotten off the subject just a little bit here. Absolutely. Absolutely. Senator Delgado, please.

SENATOR DELGADO:

I need to close, because they talked about spreading the wealth. Well, then, let's spread that wealth, because right now we're -- I'd rather be at the table, but right now we're on the menu when it comes to so many cuts. So let's -- let's -- let's be straight; this isn't personal. But, please, if you're going to bring up our communities, we do have the right to get up and

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

help you understand that your practice should be what you -- you should preach -- you should practice what you preach. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Delgado. Our last speaker seeking recognition, President Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I've been waiting for this debate for ten years. Maybe some of you were here ten years ago. We, in -- I believe, historically, this is only the second time we have voted for a congressional map. the past, besides the last ten years and this time, I believe it was done by some federal judge. So, ten years reluctantly voted for the existing maps. And as was stated, it was sponsored by Senator Dillard. We reluctantly voted for it because our Congressmen asked us to vote for it, because our Congressmen all got together - nineteen out of the twenty got together - and they drew their own districts. They forgot to invite the -- the twentieth guy and -- because they, like now, were losing one. And so we voted for it, reluctantly - not everybody; Senator Obama spoke out against it vociferously. And the problem was that it was the incumbents getting together and doing their own deal. That's what I didn't like about it. Now, it was on May 26, 2001. I still have The State Journal-Register from that day. So I want to talk about the process. And I want to talk about how fair I think we've been. Here's the picture on the front page of The State Journal-Register. It says, "Before approving new congressional districts, the state" --"the state Senate's Executive Committee listens to legal counsel

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

for the Republican Party, Charles Marino", who presented the bill. And there's a map. There's a picture of the map. says, "Source, U.S. House Speaker Dennis Hastert's Office." And there's this picture of the 17th District, the current 17th District, that is the most amazing snake-like gerrymander. has nothing to do with the Voting Rights Act. Democrat, incumbent Senator who drew that, to protect himself. In fact, this district is so gerrymandered that the Senate Republican website earlier this year had this map up as an example of how not to do redistricting, forgetting to mention that they sponsored it and many of 'em voted for it. So, to say that we only -- and by the way, I remember, one hour - one hour to look at the map. So, if it's only been thirty-six hours and it's on Google Earth - it wasn't on Google Earth ten -- ten years ago - I -- I think we've done a very good job. This map -- this map that we talked about, you talk about compactness, this map that we currently live under split thirty-one counties and it looks crazy. This map that we're voting on today only splits eighteen counties. This map is -- complies with the Voting Rights Act, and if -- if there's any odd-shaped districts, it's because of the Voting Rights Act. politically fair and you'll see that bear out in the next ten years. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, President Cullerton. Senator Raoul, to close. SENATOR RAOUL:

Well, I'm going to take Senator Millner's advice and stay calm. And, you know, you guys shouldn't be yelling in this Chamber like you have been. You know, my name is -- Senator

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Schmidt, you know, I guess the Latino Caucus will be expanding. And, you know, my last name is Raoul and my people hail from the Island of Santo Domingo, so I'd like to join the Latino Caucus As -- as President Cullerton indicated, we have followed traditional redistricting principles in coming up with this map. Much has been spoken about the Latino population growth, and indeed, there's been a Latino population growth, but every Latino advocacy group that we heard from, including MALDEF, none have -- had advocated for a second Latino congressional district. With regards to the counties, President Cullerton mentioned, we've kept more counties intact than the -- the previous map. All in all, this map looks a whole lot better than the map that was presented ten years ago. I think it is a fair map. It -- it will allow for competition. And I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1178. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 34 voting Aye, 25 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional -- the majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1178, and the bill is declared passed. Continuing on the Calendar - we're on the top of page 61 - is Senate Bill 1179. Senator Raoul. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1179.

Filed by Senator Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Besides being tasked with redrawing the Illinois Congressional and Legislative and Representative districts, the General Assembly has the responsibility of drawing districts for the Cook County Board of Review. That authority is found in 35 ILCS 205/5(c) {sic}. The proposed map in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1179 is endorsed by the full composition of the Cook County Board of Review. In a joint letter, the members of -- to the Members of the Senate Redistricting Committee, the commissioners stated their full support for Senate Bill 1179. This plan received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Illinois House of Representatives and I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Raoul, do you wish to close? Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1179. 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? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 4 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1179, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you rise?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR MURPHY:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your announcement.

SENATOR MURPHY:

The Republicans request a immediate one-hour caucus in the Minority Leader's Chambers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The Senate Republicans have moved to recess the Senate for the purposes of a one-hour caucus. Seeing no objection, the motion to recess is granted. The Senate now stands in recess until 3:15 p.m.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate will come to order. Will all Members please return to the Senate Floor? All Members in their office, please return to the Senate Floor. We're ready to begin action. Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 1802.

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

House Amendment 2 and House Amendment 4.

We have received a like Message on Senate Bill 2407, with House Amendments 1 and 2. They all passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, will all Senators within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor. We're going to be returning to the Order of Concurrences. All Members please come to the Senate Floor. Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Secretary's Desk, Concurrences on Senate Bills, we have Senate Bill 539. Leader Clayborne. Senator Clayborne, on 539. Out of the record. Senate Bill 744. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1122. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1394. Senator Jacobs, on 1394. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1394.

Filed by Senator Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is a bill we passed earlier in Session. The only problem we had with it is we sent the wrong amendment over. So they've changed it in the House and sent it back to us with appropriate -- and put in two new safeguards for consumers. So I ask for your affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1394. 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? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1394, and the bill is declared passed. James Ward, WGN, requests permission to film -- videotape the Session. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. With leave of the Body, we will return -- and, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are on Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Concurrences, Senate Bills. We will return to Senate Bill 539. Leader Clayborne. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 539.

Filed by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Amendment No. 1 modifies the language in regards to what municipalities qualify to be designated a joint redevelopment project under the Industrial Job {sic} (Jobs) Recovery Law. It requires that both municipalities -- municipalities must be in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area. It also requires that the average rate of employment {sic} for the Metropolitan

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Statistical Area is at least 11.3 percent. It requires that the project area encompass an interstate highway exchange for each - exchange for ease of access and also be located at least in part adjacently to a landfill or waste disposal facility. It also requires that at least one participating municipality demonstrate that it has made commitments to acquire capital assets to start a joint development project, and that the acquisition will occur on or before December 31st of 2011.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Pankau, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PANKAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the -- to ask a question, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Senator, why can't they do that through intergovernmental agreements right now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

We're -- yes, we're trying to comply with the requirements under the Industrial Job {sic} Recovery Law and these are the requirements. They just couldn't have -- it couldn't have just

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

been done by an intergovernmental agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

But this is only for a specific area, right? Or does it apply to the entire State, that communities can go together now under this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Pankau, go ahead. Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

I'm sorry. Is this just applied to one community in Winnebago County, or -- or -- I'm sorry. Does this just apply to two communities in Winnebago County or does it apply across the State? 'Cause it seems like it's a pretty good idea. Why can't we open it up to communities all across the State to join together in projects that will help all their communities?

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

To -- to answer your question, the House narrowed it to only apply to Winnebago County, but we originally passed it to apply to -- statewide.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Okay. I urge an Aye vote on this, because it is a good idea. But I would also urge the sponsor to bring back legislation next year that it will apply to the entire State. With the economic times that we're in, in our municipalities,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the only way they're going to have money for big projects is if they join together and work cooperatively together. So, I see a reason to continue on with this, Senator, and I -- and I hope you do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 539. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 539, and the bill is declared passed. Mike Flannery, Fox Chicago News, requests permission to record the proceeding. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you'll turn the page of the Supplemental Calendar 1 to the second page. And Senate Bill 1613. Senator Martinez. Senator Iris Martinez, on 1613. Madam Secretary, out of the record. Senate Bill 1652. Senator Jacobs, on 1652. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1652.

Filed by Senator Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Jacobs, you wish to take it out of the record?

Take it out -- Madam Secretary, please take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1799. Senator Steans, on 1799. Madam

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1799.

Filed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1799 is deleting the Teacher Certification Article of the School Code and creating the Educator License Article. So this is replacing the current certification system, which has over sixty certificates, with a new three-license system. And it --we've been working on this -- gosh, they've been having intense meetings for over eight months with all the various teacher groups and unions, education reform groups, management groups, and this is now an agreed-to bill. I don't know of any opponents to this and would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

I will admit there's a -- there's a number of good things in this. I don't know how much it's going to change the success we have of educating our kids in this State. You know, and it -

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- it was mentioned by the sponsor that it's been worked on for eight months, or a long period. We received a federal grant so that we would do this. We didn't need -- we didn't need the grant to do it, but we -- we did it. You know, the -- the problem I have, it comes to our committee the last day of the Session and I -- I haven't heard a thing about it, nor has anyone else on the Education Committee. So, I was the only vote in the committee voting No. I just -- the -- the process to me was really perverted in the committee. Not enough members showed up to pass this through, so the -- the -- the sponsor herself was substituted as a member on the committee, and then another person was substituted, just to get it through on the last day of the Session. That's not a way do -- to do business in this State if you respect the -- the people you represent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I -- you know, I -- I agree with some of the things that Senator Kyle McCarter said. It -- it does -- 'cause this is a really big bill. This is bigger than most of the people -- certainly bigger than I thought. This is a complete rewrite of the certification. It is an important one. It is -- it is bigger than most people in this Chamber really realize right now. I would like to go on record as favoring this bill. I think there's some good things. Obviously, we had a lot of questions about it, but certainly I would -- I would recommend -- recommend voting for the bill. Thank you.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Meeks, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MEEKS:

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman {sic}. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

This bill has been a -- worked on by ISBE and it does clarify a lot of the certification process for teachers. However, I do want to note that this bill had absolutely no opponents in committee. Not one person showed up. Not one person slipped in opposition of this bill. As a matter of fact, all of the educational groups were there. All of them slipped as proponents. All of them said that they had worked together. And I want to commend the sponsor for her hard work on this piece of legislation and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

To the bill, Mr. President. I'd just like to congratulate the sponsor. This was a long, hard process, but it does clarify the certification process. And I'd just like to remind the -- the Body that this doesn't change anybody's current status. Anybody that currently has a certificate will retain the status of that certificate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Tom

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Senator, I -- I think I'm very much in favor of this. There's been a lot of -- I -- I forget how many different certifications we've had, which, of course, they all had their own special interests. But I notice one thing here that says the Illinois Teacher Corps is being eliminated. What is the Illinois Teacher Corps?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

You know what? I'm going to have to get back to you on what the Illinois Teacher Corps is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Does your staff person know who they are? Is this the federally funded volunteer teachers, or whatever, that are part of our -- our youth corps, sort of volunteer service?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

It's one of the alternative educator -- ways of becoming an educator, like Teach for America. It's one of the alternative routes to becoming a teacher.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Do you know why we would cut them out? Because this is precisely what we're asking our young people to do, is to give a couple of their lives in service - Teacher Corps being one, AmeriCorps being the others. And now we are cutting them out of any opportunity here in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yeah, I apologize. I just didn't recognize the name of that one. I do know about the alternative routes. supportive of them. Generally speaking, I think you're right. What this is doing is it's strengthening the alternative routes to becoming an educator licensee. Numerous alternative programs for teacher certifications exist currently and this streamlining the options and requiring more focused instruction for the candidate. The alternative educator licensure programs may be offered by a State-approved college or university, a State-approved not-for-profit organization, or a combination of both. The programs would consist of various phases which would include a course of study - instructional strategies, classroom management, and how to assess and use data to drive instruction; two-year residency program; and a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. We feel that this is really going to align and strengthen these alternative routes of becoming teachers. They've been involved in the program -- this process and coming up with these suggestions as well. And the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

education reform groups are also supporting this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

To the bill: I support this and I think it is a very major step in the right direction. But I am very concerned that it is also a step that says we want to protect our teaching positions and so therefore those young people who are qualified teachers through AmeriCorps or Teacher Corps, or whatever, certainly are never, ever going to replace one of our teachers in a classroom. And I just think this is counter to that and I hope that's not the case in this reform, and if it is, I hope we go back to the drawing boards and make sure we find a place for our young people to do this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR E. JONES:

Question to the sponsor, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator Steans, is there any fee increases to the -- in this bill? And if so, what for?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, there are fee increases in this bill from the current thirty dollars for an application for a license to seventy-five

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

dollars, but you only now have to do it once. In the current status, you have to get one as an initial teacher and then again five years later. You'll now just have to do it once.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Steans, do you wish to close? Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

This is a significant piece of legislation. The parties really have come around the table. I do want to assure a previous speaker that -- you know, my husband became a teacher through one of these alternative certification routes. I am a big fan and certainly will make sure that this does not -- if there are any problems that -- it will be unintended, 'cause the reform groups have been at the table and support the legislation; that we do fix anything if there are. This really is just meant to consolidate and streamline it, not preclude that from happening. I do very much urge an Aye vote and thank you very much for the interesting debate on the topic.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Steans. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1799. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. On the -- having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1799, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1835. Senator Millner.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1835.

Filed by Senator Millner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment 1 adds the sale of alcoholic liquors on the replica canal boat that is owned and operated by the Canal Corridor Association on the I&M Canal in LaSalle, Illinois. The Association runs a replica boat, where events such as weddings are held. However, the I&M Canal is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural -- Resources and they said that a statutory exemption is necessary in order to sell liquor at that location. And Amendment 2 is the amendment presented by the College of DuPage, which is in the process of constructing a Culinary Arts center. This center will incorporate a fine dining restaurant and a hospitality area. The restaurant will hold approximately a hundred and fifty patrons and will be open to the public. And this provision is similar to many others, such as Triton College, Kennedy-King College and Joliet Junior College. Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion on the Senator's motion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the -- shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1835. All those in favor will

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 55 -- 54 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having -- 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1835, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1943. Senator Delgado. Senator Delgado, on 1943. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1943.

Filed by Senator Delgado.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Delgado.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I'm asking for concurrence on Senate Bill 1943. And, as amended, it passed the House 111 to 0. Senate Bill 1943, as amended, is a recommendation of the Toy Industry Association. And, as amended, it makes changes in the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act to provide distinctions between various products as it relates to required lead warning labels. And I would ask for your concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1943. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1943, and the bill is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, next on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2133. Leader Crotty. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2133.

Filed by Senator Crotty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Crotty, to present your motion.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you very much. This amendment is to allow South Suburban Community College in South Holland to refinance a current bond issue. The project will provide for a new Allied Health services center on the South Suburban Community College campus. And it's also really important to note that this method of refinancing has been utilized to successfully fund other community college projects. I ask for...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2133. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

question, there are 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2133, and the bill is declared passed. Next on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2288. Senator Hutchinson. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you will turn to the first page of Supplemental Calendar No. 1, on the Order of Senate Bills, Concurrence, is Senate Bill 744. Senator Link. Senator Terry Link, on 744. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 744.

Filed by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask that all amendments be added. I'll -- I'll speak on the amendments now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Yes, they've already been adopted, Senator.

SENATOR LINK:

Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

It's all ready to go.

SENATOR LINK:

Okay. This is the gaming bill. I think we -- if we could have it a...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Senator -- Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

have your attention and some quiet on the Senate Floor here. We are doing substantial action here, important business. If we could keep the volume down and everybody pay attention. Thank you very much. Senator Link, to present your motion on Senate Bill 744.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the gaming bill. Excuse This is a bill that we have passed out of this Body about three times. It's similar to the same bill that we have passed. It would be adding a new -- new casino in the City of Chicago. It also would be adding one in Danville, in Vermilion County; Park City, in Lake County; Rockford, in Winnebago County; and in the south suburbs of Cook County. This would allow the Chicago facility to have four thousand gaming positions and the others to have sixteen hundred gaming positions. It would allow the have temporary locations, requiring the casinos facilities to be built and Platinum LEED for -- certified facilities. It would also have -- awarding the new licenses would be having -- the Gaming Board must consider extent which the ownership must -- applicants include the greatest number of minorities, women, and disabled persons. I'm just going over some of the highlights so that people who have no bill -familiar. It would allow, as I said, minority assistance in all of the -- minority assistance in -- for the boats. It would also - and I think this is the part that we want to emphasize the strongest - the State is estimating it will -- to receive 1.6 billion dollars in upfront licensing fees, initial fees, and reconciliation payments, all of which will be used to pay down old debts. The State -- also, annual privilege tax revenues

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

from all the facilities, with the existing and future, is estimated to be between seven hundred and sixty million to one billion dollars, once these are in existence. This would also be an additional to the Education Assistance Fund of four hundred million to six hundred and ten million dollars. And to local government -- gaming facilities are located, would estimate receive a hundred and fifty to two hundred and five {sic} annual dollars. It also between -- it would give a hundred and forty to a hundred and fifty million dollars annually towards various programs, such as agricultural promotion, depressed community assistance, and county fair grants. It would have assistance to downstate initiatives and county fairs. And it would -- I'll be more -- and it goes on and on of what things it gives assistance to. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Clayborne, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes, thank you. Senator Link, gaming has been in existence for twenty years. And currently, I believe, the boat in East St. Louis, that's probably just under two hundred million, pays about thirty-two to thirty-five percent in gross taxes. Does that number sound correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

And under your bill, the boat in Chicago, if they make over three hundred and fifty, they will only pay twenty percent, but yet, for twenty years, my boat has been paying thirty-five percent. Why is it that we're giving this boat in Chicago that has never been online -- why are we reducing their tax rate when we haven't done that for all the other boats?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Senator Clayborne, you know how much respect for -- I have for you, but I think you might go into a new profession, and that's making up political brochures, because if you look at the slant you just made, because we're reducing the taxes to all the boats, the existing and the new boats, and especially when they hit certain numbers. This will affect all boats, not just the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago has to hit a certain number, same as the Elgin boat, same as Harrah's -- Joliet boat and any other boat. When it hits a certain number, these factors go in. We're giving that boat that you're referring to a generous reduction in -- when other things go online, they will be getting a reduction. And we thank them for being in existence for twenty years. That's why they're getting a reduction. And we hope that they will be doing things positive

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

in the future by going and being land-based and doing other things and expanding. That's why they're getting this tax incentive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Does -- does their -- does -- the boat in East St. Louis,

does the tax rate go down to twenty percent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

If they hit certain goals, yes, it would.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

What -- what goal does it have to hit, Senator Link?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Three hundred and fifty million dollars, annually. And I hope, if they go land-based and they develop a bigger -- you know, if they go to the two thousand positions that they possibly can go to in the next - what is it? - four years after the institute of this bill, that they will hit that three hundred and fifty million. And I would love to see them go lower, and because they will have hit that three hundred and fifty million, will mean that the State will be making a lot more money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Senator Link, since 2007 -- well, let's say 2008 to present, how many -- we have nine casinos. How many hit the three hundred mark in 2008, 2009 and 2010?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

The last was in 2008 and it was two of the boats, and we have nine, but we have twelve hundred positions at those present boats. They will be allowed to go to sixteen hundred automatically and they will be going over to -- two years later, they will be able to go to two thousand and the Chicago boat will be operating at four thousand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

So, in other words, in 2009 and 2010, none of the boats - none of the boats - have hit that mark. So revenue is actually declining. So the only possible boat that would hit that mark is the new boat in Chicago. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

No, because, as I said in previous statement, they will be allowed to go to sixteen hundred machines, which is four hundred positions more than they have right now, and that will hopefully enhance them to go to a lot larger amount of money and maybe they will hit that amount in a lot of other boats.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Senator Link, in committee, they told you that they will not - because of the market - they will not buy those positions. They will not buy those positions, so why do you keep saying that? Do you know how many positions the Casino Queen uses right now, Senator Link?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

No, because I've never been on the Casino Queen and I do not look at their books.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

They have never used their twelve hundred positions, never in twenty years, and they probably never will. So, again, you're going to take a business -- or nine businesses that have been in business for twenty years and treat them differently from one who has not gone online yet. And, Senator Link, that is just unfair. That is unfair. Now -- I'll move on, though. Now, in -- in this bill, we already pay -- we're -- we're adding slots to the tracks. And in the tracks, are we still -- will we continue to subsidize the tracks and pay their property taxes, even though we're going to give them these slots?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Yes, but fifty percent of that will be going to marketing and that marketing will have to be reported. We will be showing that report. That report will be enhancing the amount of marketing to show that the increase will be going to the gaming process to -- hopefully to enhance that number that -- of people playing to get our bottom line a -- their bottom line up. That will increase our tax portion and will help more than -- bring back the amount of money that we've been giving them in the years past.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

So I should -- I should go home and tell the taxpayers that we continue to pay the property taxes and subsidize these millionaires and billionaires, and at the same time, we're giving them slots to make a profit, but we've got to pay their property taxes -- fifty percent of their property taxes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Well, we've been giving 'em a hundred percent and getting nothing out of it. Now we're paying 'em -- going to pay 'em fifty percent and get something out of it. I think it probably is a more prudent way to do it. And, hopefully, we'll see tax returns on it and make something out of it. So I think we're doing a lot better for the taxpayers than we were doing before.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne, perhaps to close.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Well -- well, I'll say this, that for us to add twentyseven thousand more positions and not to double our revenue, clearly indicates that our revenue towards our Common School Fund will decline, because some of that money will shift to the revenues for the casino -- racinos. So we're going to lose money in our Common School Fund. If we're truly about making these boats competitive, then we have to look at what our neighboring states are doing. Our neighboring states, at least Missouri, they allow the licensee to determine what he or she needs in terms of gaming positions. They don't charge them a fee to expand and do business. They allow the market to determine what they should do. If we're truly sincere about raising revenue, we will make Illinois competitive. We will make sure that those across the board have what they need, eliminate the smoking ban and make some other changes that need to be made, so that these industries can be viable, because we heavily depend on their -- their revenue. I would say until we come to the table, make the boats a part of -- of what we're doing here and make sure that we put them in a position to be successful, I urge you to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Bivins, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BIVINS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you. Is there any money in the bill for law

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

enforcement, specifically State Police?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill.

SENATOR BIVINS:

started my career in law enforcement in Ironically, that was the same year, I believe, that the Lottery started. And since that time, I've had the opportunity to watch -- to watch what gambling and expansion of gambling has done to families, as I've had those people come to my office. I recall distinctly a gentleman, sitting across in my office, who didn't know that his wife had maxed out their credit cards, had drained their savings account and their checking account, and they were now in divorce court and they had kids. And you can repeat that scenario over and over again. What the bill doesn't tell you and what you don't see in the bill are scenarios like that. What you don't see in the bill are the buses picking up the elderly and disabled and hauling them like cattle to the boats and casinos. And we don't see in the bill the poor, who can least afford to go and gamble and spend their money for the utilities, their rent, their groceries. And what you don't see in the bill are those parents, mothers and fathers, and

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

grandparents, who go in and gamble and leave their kids in the If you don't think that's happening, Google it right now, 'cause it's happening in Florida, in Illinois, in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, in Oregon, in Washington, and around our country. There won't be any new gamblers, I don't think, as you expand gambling. The revenues are down. But it'll be more opportunity for people who can least afford it to go and gamble. And what you don't see in the bill are the eight thousand two hundred people who have voluntarily signed to be banned from casinos and And I'm confident there are a thousand more -thousands more in our State that also probably wish they could stop the addiction of gambling. And we don't see in the bill the crime that it -- that surrounds it. We don't see in the bill -- as this was just pointed out, there's nothing in there for the State Police. This Body is probably not aware, many are probably not aware, that last year, in Appropriations Committee, I asked the former Director of the State Police if they're still planning on expanding the State Police gambling -- gaming unit from thirty to ninety, adding sixty more to that unit. answer was, yes. They weren't planning on having more cadet academies for two years. But they had one, graduated just this past March - March 16th, I believe. That was for video gaming. Guesstimates are going to be somewhere around a hundred. We're going to be doubling the gaming unit. So where's the money for those troopers? Keep in mind, we're talking millions of dollars. You can do the math yourself. Plus the pensions, which we have a problem with. We're going to add all these employees if we expand the gambling. We are basically shaking down the citizens for every nickel they've got, providing them

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

with false hope to go out and win the big bucks, spend their money, and to the people who can least afford it. And for what? So we can spend a billion more, a half a billion dollars more in spending than we did the year before, so we get more revenues. Government's first duty -- our first duty in government is to protect our citizens. This bill does not do that. It puts more citizens at risk. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Link, one of the issues that you and I talked about in Executive Committee was -- was an issue that's -- the Majority Leader talked about a moment ago and that is the provision of the bill that truly applies to all of the -- all of the casinos, if this becomes law, that after, I think it's three hundred or three hundred and fifty million, then the marginal tax rate starts to drop back down. I think it was also clear from the information that was given to us in the Executive Committee, which the Majority Leader reiterated here today, is that it's like -- in the last two years, nobody's achieved that mark and it's likely, going forward - this is what the industry people tell us - that there's only one casino that will achieve that mark and therefore enjoy the lowering of the marginal rate, and that's the casino in the City of Chicago. Now since then,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability - and I referenced that report in committee - I got ahold of the report and it speaks to this issue, and I want your reaction to this. It says: The graduated tax structure of -- especially for the Chicago casino, reduced under Senate Bill 744 -- the reduction of the tax rates would negatively affect State revenues. This is a major factor why, despite the increase in positions and significant increases in the -- gross -- adjusted gross receipts, State revenues show modest gains under full implementation. I want to -- and that is on page 10 of the COGFA report. Simply would like to ask for your reaction to that, Senator Link, considering again...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

My apologies, Senator Righter. I was a little quick on the switch. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

No, I -- I clearly gave you the head fake that indicated that I'd finished my question there, Mr. President. Sorry. Considering the evidence that the City of Chicago's casino is the only one who's going to enjoy this, tell me your thoughts on that. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Senator Righter. And, yes, we have talked about this. First of all, I wish -- you know, as a former business person, I wish that I could project and see in the future exactly what was going to happen, because if I could, today I probably wouldn't be sitting in the Senate. I'd probably be

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

sitting somewhere warm, enjoying it and relaxing, because I would have made multimillions of dollars, if I could have foreseen the future in the business world and knew what was going to happen. But by looking at reports like, what you said, on page 10 by the COGFA report, it's -- it's an opinion, which is like a lot of other opinions, that they're -- they're projecting what possibly could happen in today's economic world. And, truly, it probably was -- if today was when everything went online, tomorrow we opened the Chicago casino, tomorrow we opened the racinos, tomorrow we opened the four other casinos, it probably is true the only one that would go over that would be the Chicago one, true. By the time these go online, we're talking probably two years down the line. The economy could change drastically to the positive, which we all hope is going Indicators are showing the economy's getting better. Things are happening. People may have more disposable income. People may be coming when they see these other new casinos. great colleague in front of me knows when they built the new Rock Island casino, they doubled their -- they went up a hundred percent in their attendance and in their revenue with the new casino. This same type of thing can happen when these four new casinos are built. The revenue could go through the ceiling. When we hope that these other casinos go land-based and do other things, the revenue can increase immensely. So, I hope that the factors all involved make this report totally negative and that I foresee that we possibly could be a lot more beneficial to -not only to these casinos, but for the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. And, Senator Link, I -- I appreciate that projections are just that, they're projections. Like the projection that you used in Executive Committee that this is going to get us 1.6 billion dollars. That's a forecast. That's a projection by you as well, and I think we all admit that sometimes those come true and sometimes maybe not. The -the next issue I want to ask you about, Senator Link, really goes to an issue that people like myself, the Presiding Officer, others who represent downstate communities, have in this bill, with regards to the pledges or promises that have been made with regards to money for county fairs, money for soil and water conservation districts, money for the horse racing industry. And there is a -- a kind of an intricate system in the bill about when money gets collected from the wagering tax and then it goes into this fund and it goes into that fund. I would like you to walk through with me, in those areas that I just gave you, what has to happen on a yearly basis in order for the people who are talking to me, who are probably talking to the Presiding Officer and others who represent downstate areas, about -- about this is -- we want this bill because this is in it. They've been led to believe - and I'm not saying falsely they've been led to believe that if 744 becomes law that they will get this money. And I'm not sure for all of them exactly how simple they think that process is, but I'd like for you many of them are in the gallery here today - walk through exactly what that process is for me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Senator Righter, and I did check this out, and you're right, nothing is ever simple down here. It has to be annually appropriated, but as was stated, this is a totally dedicated fund, which has to -- which has to be dedicated to the exact amounts and the exact dedication that we indicate in the bill where it's going to. So -- but, annually, we will be dedicating the amounts that we appropriate in the bill that state -- annually we will be dedicating and appropriating ten million dollars, grants, for soil and water conservation districts; four million dollars for State Cooperative Service Trust Fund; 2.5 million dollars for Parks and Conservation Fund -- costs; 2.5 million dollars for Illinois Historic Sites Fund; one million dollars for Illinois Forestry Fund; two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the Quarter Horse Fund purses. That will be dedicated funds that are specified in the bill and will be -- have to be - as you are totally correct - have to be appropriated every year. But they are dedicated funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, I mean, I -- I appreciate those numbers, Senator Link. I mean, they're on every fact sheet that is covering this Capitol. Would you agree that, that for every one of those, that money has to be placed into a fund by the General -- by a vote of the General Assembly and then appropriated out of that fund by the General Assembly in order to effectuate the purposes that you've outlined? In other words, it's going take a separate act of the General Assembly and the Governor in order

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

to get that done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

In the legislation, it is automatically already appropriated into the State Gaming Fund and -- from the electronic -- under a -- or, under the State Gaming Fund. So it is automatically appropriated there from that. So we would have to appropriate the -- add to the amounts of those funds to where I said to you previously.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And -- and I apologize, Senator Link, I don't think I phrased that question very well. But I appreciate -- I appreciate that they go into that fund, but then the General Assembly has to appropriate the dollars out of those funds to reach the communities that we're talking about. And -- and I get the impression that's part of the reason why this language in the bill is so tempting to so many people that we represent, is because for the last decade, and maybe longer than that, every year they've come here and said, "Please appropriate out of this fund that's dedicated to us that which it says." And over the years, the General Assembly and the Governors have whittled away at that, and whittled away at that, and whittled away at that, to the point where in his introduced budget this year, Governor Quinn's suggestion was that we cut soil and water conservation funding by eighty percent - not to eighty percent, by eighty percent. Will -- you would agree that the General

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Assembly's going to have to appropriate those dollars every year in order to make this promise reality for these folks?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Yes, you are correct that we have to appropriate it every year. But the biggest advantage in this, we are given a dedicated fund from something that we had -- we did not have previously in the gaming bill, and I think that this is a positive way, instead of taking it out of GRF.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Last area of questioning. Thank you, Mr. President. And I want to go back to the casino issue for a moment, if I might, Senator Link. It's my understanding, in current law, that the current river boat casino licenses are up for renewal on a periodic basis. They have to be renewed by the Gaming Board. But as the language is written in Senate Bill 744, the license to go to the City of Chicago's casino, which will be run by an authority, the members of which are appointed all by the Mayor, that that license - it says in the bill - is granted in perpetuity. I -- I want to ask you, one, if that's a correct reflection of the language and, two, what that means as a practical difference between -- between the City of Chicago casino and these other riverboats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Yes, to the first part. Second part is, it does make a big difference. It's probably construed a different type of casino than we have. But I think when you're talking about over -what? - almost a third of the population in -- in one city of the State of Illinois, I think we have made a number of special type of legislations for it and I think there is a gaming -- or a special commission that will be running this, that will be oversight by the Gaming Board. I think we have enough safeguards in place to make sure that this is properly run.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, for your indulgence. So, Senator Link, I want to make sure I understand what you said. The reason that a gaming license is going to be granted in perpetuity for the City of Chicago casino is because it's being granted to a municipality, the City of Chicago, as opposed to those that are granted to private entities, and you think, therefore, that's why they should be up for renewal. Is that -- is that a fair summation of what you said?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Well, they are -- they are a municipality and they are accountable to the people of this -- of the City of Chicago, and I think that, like I said, there's a commission that is going to be governing that boat and if there's any irregularities, and -- and I think, as you -- you and I spoke earlier, if we see anything, we can also change the law at any time.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Holmes, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I can't we're back here talking about this, as we are every year since I have been here, and now this comes up with, I think, about eight hours left of the day to go. And as we have done in the past, this bill has some serious, serious flaws. The most serious flaw being the projected revenue that we're going to get from this little endeavor, should this pass. Those numbers are so seriously wrong, because those numbers are counting on extra positions. I will tell you right now, I have lived in Aurora since before Hollywood Casino was there, still continue to live there, and don't need new positions. What we have done to our boats has made it so that we definitely cannot utilize new positions. So they're not going to be looking to garner any new positions or buying any new positions. What has that casino done for Aurora? They have been probably one of the absolute best corporate neighbors you could imagine. The amount of charitable work they do, the amount of volunteer activities in the community, the number of people they employ from Aurora, and that speaks also to the additional businesses that supply services for the casino. While they're not directly employed, their jobs do count on that casino being there. So what have we done to reward this fantastic corporate neighbor? Hum, let's see, fifty percent off the top of their money goes to the State. That's interesting. As a business owner, and many of you in this Chamber are business owners, is your business paying that?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Would you want your business to have to pay that? What else have we done to reward them? Oh, we've made sure that we will harm their businesses further by putting in a smoking ban. That's caused a serious decline in their revenue. We've also made sure they subsidize a competitor, the racetracks. Well, they're all in the gaming industry and the racetracks are suffering, so let's have them subsidize the tracks; sort of like if McDonald's is in the neighborhood and Burger King comes -and one's more successful, maybe we should have that fast food restaurant subsidizing the other, because we think as a State that should be our job, instead of letting the market do what the market needs to do. If the business is ready to fail, that is the problem of the business and it should deal with it, not us making sure that we give them money and we tell them that money has to be used for marketing. Are we also going to pick out exactly the way they market? We're just going to go in and micromanage this. I don't think that's our job as a State. don't think that's our responsibility. In addition to all of this that we're doing, I want to talk about some of the little special provisions we've done in order to get votes. The reason we're addressing this again, yet again - it seems to come back every year - is because somewhere in the General Assembly, if it passes this Chamber, it doesn't pass in the House. So we're going to keep bringing it back, hoping it does. But this time, we have a new little caveat. We're going to try to pick off Members one by one in order to get the votes that we need. Let's see, what have we done? We have provisions in here for women and minorities. We have provisions in here for county fairs. We have provisions for the racetracks. We have a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

special provision for Chicago. Oooooh, you get a lot that way. How many Chicago legislators do we have in this Chamber? So, I think the only provision we're missing is probably a provision for dog owners. Please, bring that one up, because that may garner another vote or two. I just want to say, doing this in the final hours is not the best thing to do, and if you actually look at this bill, it is so flawed in the amount of revenue it's projecting. To vote for this, is doing ourselves a serious disservice and you're doing a huge disservice to the communities that have the casinos, and those casinos were brought into those communities to help them - Aurora, Elgin, Joliet. Look at the communities where these casinos were brought in. I just -- please, I beg of you, please vote No on this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Frerichs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR FRERICHS:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Yeah, I think we we're just asked to look at the communities where these were brought in. I think we should take a -- take some time to look at some of the communities where these boats might move into. In my district, you can look at Danville, Illinois, a town with a large manufacturing history that's fallen on hard times, like a lot of areas throughout the Midwest. It's a town that meets a lot of the original criteria for a boat - economically distressed. It's a town that's on the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

border. Would bring in a lot of its revenue from outside of our State. So we're talking about taxing people in Illinois, it'll bring a lot of money in from Indiana. You can talk with Senator Syverson, who I'm sure will probably speak in a little bit, about Rockford and some of the problems they've gone through and how close they are to the Wisconsin border and how they'd bring money in. Other Members might talk about Cicero. But what I don't want people to get too caught up within in this debate is provincialism. I mean, it's true we're elected to represent our districts. We're also represented to help out people of the State of Illinois. And when I'm here, the one thing that I frequently hear people on both sides of the aisle talking about is a need for jobs. And although this bill would help my district in terms of jobs in Danville, this also supports agriculture in the State of Illinois, our largest industry. racing industry has been -- will be very beneficially helped by I know that other Members would like to speak towards this, but this -- but this bill would help our downstate farmers as well. The other thing I hear people talking about are jobs. You know, there are very few things we can do to directly impact This is a bill that would create jobs and put people to work in the State of Illinois, not just at the casinos, not just at the racetracks, but in lots of ancillary industries. So I'd ask you, as you're thinking about this -- for me, for some of us, it is provincial; we -- we want to have something in our But this has benefits throughout the State of districts. Illinois and I encourage people to vote favorably on this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you, Senator Frerichs. Further discussion? Senator John O. Jones, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

I'll be very short. If this bill receives the requisite number of votes, I would ask for a verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. So noted. Further discussion? Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR SYVERSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, earlier there was some discussions from my friend, Senator Bivins, who talked about the problems associated with gaming and the fact that there are going to be a -- a number of individuals that, like any other vice, are going to have problems with gaming, which is a problem that exists now. As a State, our biggest problem, our concern, is what's happening all around us, as we have five states that have clearly declared war on Illinois by the expansions of gaming that they are doing right on their borders. To the north, both from your area as well as ours, there are large casino applications pending with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to try to build facilities that would dwarf anything we have in Illinois, which would drive

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

individuals, obviously, to those other states, which is why they're building them right on our border. My question is from a safeguard standpoint. From what you know of the gaming in other states around us, compared to the -- the safeguards that we have in place to protect problem gamers in Illinois, can you explain a little bit about the difference? Is it -- are our restrictions tighter than those from other states?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

What -- what amount that I know about it, we are -- you know, I -- I've checked with the State Police. I've checked with local police. I've talked with boat owners and that about problems that they've had on their facilities through the years and it's been minimal. You know, it might be somebody that had one too many drinks. It might be something of a nature of, you know, a squabble over something. But it -- it -- it's been minimal, the amount of things that they've had problems on these boats and casinos. So, you know, when we talk about this is -you know, the 1920s, it's not there anymore. And it -- it's -a lot of it is more focused when -- the family type of an outing and -- and husbands and wives going to these types of things as And Illinois is very restrictive and when -- as you said, Senator Bivins made the statement of eighty-two hundred people on a list. We have done every type of precaution. have -- in this bill, too, we allow more money for helping of those people who have problems with gambling problems and we -we have extended even further to make sure if there are people that have a gambling problem, that we get them help and we make

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

sure that they're not part of the gaming business in the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. And the reality is whether -- and if I had an opportunity to have no gaming anywhere, that would be great. would have no problem with that. The issue is that it is all They are building these casinos on our border. They're advertising in our areas. They're attracting our individual -- our -- our citizens to these other states. And so what we're left with is the problems associated with gaming, but not the benefits, as was mentioned earlier. companies are good employers. They're charitable. good corporate citizens. And so at least what we end up with is getting some of the benefits associated with the concerns that people have. Also, from the economic standpoint, it's not just gaming itself that is the economic driver, but what -- what comes with that, what is developed along with that. In our community, the agreements, both in the city and the county, is that the dollars that are coming to the cities are going to be used for economic development and for infrastructure improvement. So you can't build an economy on gaming, but you can take those dollars and use those and can build an economy on So the number of jobs that can grow because of this are significant. And again, these aren't new dollars. These are dollars that are leaving our State that we're talking about, keeping those dollars here. Last thing, and you may not agree with this, but by the time these -- these are up and running and

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the revenue is going to be there, we're going to determine how to revenue -- how those revenues are going to be split, I anticipate that we'll have a Republican Governor by then, so we'll have the ability to determine whether or not those funds are going to be swept or not. So, I'm less concerned about the concern over what might happen in the future Legislature with those -- with those sweeps. So, thank you for your time and for sponsoring the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are still eight Members seeking to ask questions or be recognized. It is getting late in the afternoon. All I ask is that you keep your remarks concise. If it's -- the issue's already been addressed, please try to avoid repetition. Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

To the bill, Mr. President. I -- I stand in strong support...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez, excuse me one minute. We are -- the President has requested that we use the timer. So we will be using the timer and after... I just want to let all Members know that. Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I will be brief, Mr. President. I -- I stand in strong support and I -- and I just want to -- I was listening to my colleague, my esteemed colleague on this side of the aisle, talking about, you know, all the good things that happen in her part of town. But even in Chicago, we watch tons and -- tons of

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

busses go from hotels to Indiana. And -- and all of our money, it's -- that's being -- that should be spent in Illinois and stay in Illinois is going to -- over to Indiana. So I stand here strong about Chicago. Chicago needs a casino. It's long overdue, long overdue. But I do say that, looking at the legislation, there are -- there are a lot of safeguards in here. There's a little bit of, you know, things here for everybody. And I think that that's all part of what has happened here with this bill. I know that many of the other casinos, you know, they -- they enjoy all the great things that their casino boats have brought to them and to that city. So I think it's time for the City of Chicago to receive its fair share, finally, of a casino. I just want to just say, you know, in closing that one of the things that really bothers me in these days is that while we're cutting away on important bills, on important funding that a lot of our -- our community organizations are -- are -are looking for, we -- you know, we -- here we have a gaming bill where billions of dollars are being talked about. hope that as we continue to start paying our bills, hopefully with some of this money, that some of this money's also geared into our communities so we can go ahead and restore the funding that some of our community-based organizations are losing. I have an HIV daycare center that lost a lot of its funding and right now that's what concerns me - the fact that I have a children's place that right now takes care of children with HIV, where no other daycare center will take them. I'm losing some of the funding there and that's, you know, a very unique place. So I hope that -- that some of that money starts coming back into our communities to take care of our community organizations

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

that are doing great work. And I ask for an Aye vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank -- thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Delgado, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DELGADO:

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

Senator Delgado moves the previous question. As I said earlier, there are two, three, four, five, six, seven lights flashing. Thank you very much. Further discussion? Senator Dillard, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'll be brief. To reiterate what I said the last time we had a gaming bill here and that's that I rise reluctantly and I think it's too big, but my concern here is for the future of horse racing and the agribusiness industry in Illinois, you know, and the harness horsemen are headquartered in my district, my hometown of Hinsdale. And I am concerned about the agribusiness jobs that are in this bill. And there's thousands of them. And these are jobs that are next to impossible to replace. It's not like losing a job in the Chicago metropolitan area. These are in rural areas and they are really hard to replace. If this were a manufacturer, a Navistar or a Motorola or Sears, we would be falling all over ourselves to save literally thousands of jobs. And these are If you're familiar with agriculture and family jobs. agribusiness, as I know you are, Mr. President, these are family businesses that have been in families for years. And these jobs are moving to Indiana. Illinois farmers are moving to Indiana

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and other states. And normally I would wait for a better or a cleaner bill, but I don't think the horse racing industry and the agribusiness industry can wait any longer. These jobs are massively moving across our borders. And just to close, Representative Jim Sacia, the Minority Spokesman of the House Agriculture Committee, sent a very good letter about what this means to agriculture and the very last line, before he signs it sincerely, is the word "vital". And he says, "Your support of this important legislation is vital - vital for agriculture in Illinois, our State's largest industry." And on this one I will trust Governor Quinn. I believe the Governor's instincts here are good. He has amendatorily vetoed things before. He has amendatory veto powers. But I don't think the horse racing agribusiness side or harness horsemen can wait any longer. And I reluctantly will push the Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Muñoz, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I stand in full support of this bill and let me give you a couple reasons why, in my opinion, I think this is good for the City of Chicago. My whole district is in the City of Chicago, and when I go out through my district when we're not here, I go home and you hear about foreclosures. You hear about

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

people not having a job, the trades especially. People have worked hard over the years. They go to school to become an electrician, a plumber. And you know what? Nobody has work right now. Right now, the State can't pay its bills. City of Chicago is hard. They can't pay their bills. While the casinos is not a quick fix-it and going to take care of everything, but I'll tell you what, it's going to help tremendously. And I appreciate our new Mayor willing to take the forefront and wanting a casino. And is he going to have to raise a lot of money to spend it? Absolutely. But I'll tell you what, and you know why it's good? Because it's going to create thousands and thousands of jobs for the City of Chicago, as well as the suburban areas and, needless to say, the trades, contractors, on and on. They'll be working for a number of years, not only for the Chicago casino, but for the other casinos around the State. When you see Indiana, which is twenty minutes from the City of Chicago, a lot of Illinoisans go there. Go there and you'll see what I'm telling you. They're there because they're going to gamble. We don't force people to gamble. That's just their nature. Some people like to do it, whether it's to relieve stress or they feel maybe they can win something. But they're going to do it whether we have it or not. But if the City of Chicago is given the opportunity to have this casino -- our former Mayor truly did an outstanding job with the City of Chicago - put it on the map as truly one of the best cities, not only in the United States, but in the world, Ladies and Gentlemen. The amount of business that comes from out of the country and throughout this State, we can compete with Florida. We will then be able to compete with Las

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Vegas for tourisms. I can't account for what's going to happen with the other casinos, but who am I to tell other legislators that it's not good for their district? But I know in my district that I represent in the City of Chicago, the City of Chicago will be able to compete with other cities that we were not able to compete with. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Lightford, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator Link, I know during Exec Committee we touched on my concerns regarding education funding to some degree. I'd like for us to, for the record, speak for a minute on the distribution of revenues. We know that there is a specific amount of funding that goes into our education school common fund and I'd like to know the impact that this bill will have. And I know that tax revenue from the casinos and riverboats will go to education and tax revenues from the racetracks will go to capital bill. And I also recognize that if there's any funding that exceeds the capital projects fund, that excess dollars would also go to the Education Assistance Fund. I guess I'm curious to know then why is it so much opposition inquiring that the education dollar amount will be lowered by this expansion of gaming? Can you answer to that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

I -- I think that that's a one-person opinion that it would be lowered, Senator Lightford. In our -- in our analysis, analysis that we -- we got and everybody, we show an increase of hundred of millions of dollars to the educational fund. I think that's why you got the -- the IFT, IEA, you know, neutral on this bill, because they realize that there would be an increase in money coming into the -- you know, into the educational fund, that they -- if they were losing money on this, I guarantee you they wouldn't be neutral or in favor of the bill. They'd be fighting this bill. And they realize that there would be two to three hundred or more dollars coming into this bill. And this is by all the figures that we have that this is what it's showing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

And so let me add onto that quickly. So, in committee, we spoke about Fiscal Year '09 and education receiving about three hundred and eighty-two million dollars, was the estimate. My inquiry was, then what would the new education amount range be about? You shared with me a number that I just want to make sure that that's the consistent number. So can you reiterate that number to the full Body on the anticipation of what additional dollars would be? Some believe that if your projections are based on selling all of the slots, and -- and that actually does not take place, that there will be a decrease in dollars.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

I will give you conservative numbers instead of the -- you know, we got numbers that if everything sold, it would probably be five hundred and thirty-six million to seven hundred and eighty-five million. But I'll give you the conservative numbers of four hundred to six hundred and ten million dollars, would be the -- the amount that we would be seeing every year, about. So that's what I would see.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Mr. President, then to the bill: I'd like to acknowledge the additional funding that will go into our Education Assistance Fund from this legislation. It's really important that we embrace dollars to go into our funding system. I'd like to also double back on one of the previous speakers noting that minority and female participation was added into this bill to buy off votes. My very first vote here in the General Assembly in Veto Session of '98 for the tenth license had minority and female participation in it. So it's nothing new that just came about on this legislation to encourage us. All of procurements and all of our agencies should have minority and female participation in them. I also want to add that the Chicago boat is something that I believe will enhance the City of Chicago, Lake Michigan, Navy Pier. All of that would have a significant area of support and funding; however, I'm a little concerned that is to the discretion of how those dollars will be

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

used. I would be elated if some of those dollars were also targeted or earmarked directly to education for the Chicago Public Schools. Now I know we have a Mayor - his top priority is education. I'm sure dollars will go there, but it would have been nice to have been drafted in the legislation. Couple other things that I think that are highlights of this legislation is the support for economically depressed communities; the fact that foreclosure prevention would have funding - only for two fiscal years. I believe that should have extended itself a little further. Foreclosure's a huge problem, not a minimal. And local shares established for municipalities and counties is also another reason why I believe we should support this legislation. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Bill Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill. Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

SENATOR HAINE:

I -- I want to take a moment to thank the sponsor of this bill, Senator Link, for his -- his -- his willingness to work with us who have very difficult votes to make on this. I have a boat, which I have long supported over the years, the first one in the State, the Alton facility. I also have a -- a venerable racetrack, the Fairmount Track, which is teetering on the brink of closure, which supports many ancillary industries, and that's at the other end of my district. So, his -- his willingness to

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

sit down and talk about the needs to see to it that I could vote comfortably for this is appreciated very much. I understand the moral and social issues about gambling. My late father was raised in the old Methodist tradition, where smoking, drinking and gambling were sinful. That was his ethic. Fortunately, for my brothers and I, he married an Irish Catholic woman, who came from a family of smokers, drinkers and gamblers. But the -- the genie is out of the bottle on gambling. It's out of the bottle. And we in Illinois, beginning some twenty years ago, have made a Faustian bargain with this genie in return for all the benefits which have been alluded to in the last few moments. My argument today echoes that of Senator Clayborne, Senator Holmes, Senator Syverson and others, that if we're going to make complete this Faustian bargain and maximize the opportunities at the tracks and the boats, we should take the recommendation of the manager of my boat, who said he would not object to any of this bill if we would simply repeal this ban on smoking at the -- at the gambling facilities. Gamblers smoke. That's what they do. It's part of the entertainment. I -- I really believe we can -we can do something about the problems of smoking without drying up the marketplace and further injuring these gambling boats, which injures the State and the -- and diminishes the dollars Again, we've made this bargain. Let's that we bring in. complete the contract and write a reasonable smoking ban, as Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa and Missouri have done. But I'm going to vote Aye. Thank you, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Further discussion? Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Purpose -- thank you, Mr. President. Purpose of the bill. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Want to speak to the bill? Senator Sandoval. SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I think that our Mayor of the City of Chicago has got it right. And I'm imploring today to all the legislators from northeastern Illinois to vote Aye for this piece of legislation. It's about time we take the horseshoe out of the -- Indiana's hide. He is right. He is totally right when it comes to Chicago's casino is in Hammond, Indiana, and we've allowed that to happen. We've all allowed that to happen. Let's stop, you know, being the whupping State in the Midwest by all our neighboring states. Because you know what? They -- they just laugh at us. Senator Haine has got it Those -- those states around -- around Illinois, our neighboring states, they just laugh at us. They think we're just a -- a big joke, because they know that any time that Illinois engages in trying to promote creating jobs and bring economic development, they end up screwing the pooch anyways, like implementing a smoking ban at a casino. That is an oxymoron, a conundrum. Let's -- let's -- and for those of my colleagues who are defending their boats and their parochial arenas and their parochial regions, you know, let's stop keeping it small and taking it all and let's start sharing with the rest of the State. There isn't a Session that doesn't go by where I hear, you know, legislators from throughout the State, from downstate to the western part of the State to northeastern Illinois that they all say that we need Chicago, Cook County;

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

they're the economic engine of this great State. Well, it's about time we start investing in the economic engine of this great State and that's the City of Chicago. Let's -- let's share the wealth with the economic engine. Let's put a little more oil in the engine so that we can create more jobs so that all your regions throughout the State can benefit from economic success that they've benefited throughout many years. I'd like to say that, you know, from a very parochial standpoint, my district in Cicero, Berwyn and Stickney stands largely to benefit from this piece of legislation, because like many parts of the State, it has been -- lots of manufacturing has left us. The economic downturn has hit us hard and the investment into our racetrack in Hawthorne Race Track in Cicero and in the western suburbs will bring a big economic boon to jobs and economic progress and in reinvestment in education. Let's not keeping it -- let's stop keeping it small and taking it all and let's invest in Chicago and throughout the entire State. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you. To the bill: I'm going to take half of a statement that Senator Haine once said. God made apples green and made Senator Sandoval eloquent. I think Senator Sandoval did a good job of highlighting the fact that when we mention the City of Chicago, oftentimes that's a bad word down here. But when you start talking about a casino for the City of Chicago, it's not just for the City of Chicago, it's for the State of

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Illinois. And I think we ought to be very clear about that. Instead of sending our citizens as visitors into the State of Indiana and to the State of Wisconsin, we ought to keep 'em here. And we ought to also capture the visitor dollars that we could capture by enhancing the tourism in the City of Chicago. I -- I've had the blessing of having represented the lakefront of the City of Chicago over the last seven years and we worked in a -- bipartisan manner to reform work rules at McCormick Place to enhance our ability to capture visitor dollars, not just for the City of Chicago, but for the entire State of Illinois. I personally have a confession. I'm a compulsive gambler. I self-diagnosed at the age of seventeen when I lost a hundred and fifty dollars playing blackjack, so I haven't gambled since. I don't gamble, yet I've voted for, I think, three gaming bills since the time that I've been here because people do gamble and it's legal. And they're gambling in our surrounding states. I had an opportunity to look at maps lately and my district map pushes further south and I get pretty close to being in -- in Indiana in my district and I hate to see all of those Illinois plates in the parking lot of the Indiana casinos. Let's keep our dollars here in the State of Illinois and stop making Mitch Daniels so happy that Illinois dollars are going over there. We -- we have an opportunity to do something, not just for the City of Chicago. And -- and I join Senator Lightford in taking exception to the notion, even if it were something new, having a provision in there for minority and female participation. There's nothing wrong with that, even if it were something new, which it was -- Senator Lightford did a good job of pointing -- pointing out that it -- it is not

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

anything new. So I take exception to that and I also take exception to characterizing existing casinos as victims. You know, if I could be that victim, I -- I would be so happy. I urge an Aye vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Our last speaker seeking recognition is Senator Trotter. For what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR TROTTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Looking around the room, it sort of reminds me of how long I've been here and how old I'm getting, 'cause I'm one of maybe four people that were here when we passed the original bill twenty years ago. And it was twenty years ago that we said that we needed to do something to -- to kick up our economy, 'cause it was failing, not just in the agricultural side, but we saw -- we were quickly becoming the rust belt that other parts of the -- the country had become. And the arguments that I've heard today are -- are the ones I heard then. You know, we shouldn't be bringing in gambling. You know, that's immoral. We're just going to have people jumping off bridges. We're going to have families going down. This is going to be tearing up the very fabric of our State. It's not a good thing. will not meet the resource or the revenue numbers that have been projected. It's a bad thing. And we made it temporary. We had the licenses and we told the -- those who were getting licenses,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

"You can get out of this in ten years. You know, if it's -- you know, it's -- if it's such a bad deal, you're going to take this risk, you can -- you can give us your license back." Nobody's giving 'em back. You know, usually around this place, people know I'm the guy that likes to spend money. Well, this is this bill. This is a revenue bill. This makes money. This bill, right here, will ensure that we're not just competitive with the states around us, but competitive with cities and countries in the world. They talk about Chicago. Chicago is not just a -- a great city; it's a world-class city that -- people come there for our museums. They come there for our -- our world-class zoos, our beautiful lakefront. But some of the people that come there might want to do a little gambling, which means they're going to do what? They're going to leave more of their money in the State of Illinois, City of Chicago. Those dollars are coming back to us. That's not -- that's not my neighbors, your neighbors. That's people coming from -- from Europe, coming from Africa, coming from South America. Coming to do what? Well, the only way -- we don't really know what they come here for. Might be for a convention or somebody paying for it, but we know they're going to spend some money when they get there. So, this is a good deal. And some of you may ask of -- of why is this bill so -- so thick? And why is it Members were cherrypicked or -- or given some -- some -- some leeway or giving some voice in this bill? It was -- that was done 'cause we wanted to ensure that everyone's concerns were going to be addressed. Yes, there's minority language in this bill, which has been in other bills, but it hasn't always been addressed. So what was addressed - thank you very much, Leader Link - is that we put

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

forth an oversight advisory board, which will ensure that those contracts are distributed fairly across the board, not just lip service, but who did you try to enlist to -- get -- buy into a contract? How many people did you talk to? It does the same thing for women. There's a board here that oversees that. for the downstate and the other programs you talk about, for the county fairs, that language is in here. So if you don't trust nobody, well, we're now putting it in law. Leader Link took a lot of time and it's been a lot of years, along with our friends in the House - and I see good Representative Lang - have taken a lot of time to ensure that everyone's concerns are here. Ensuring that in there was depressed community dollars that -because, remember, we put this whole deal together, saying we were going to address those depressed communities in our State. Believe it or not, you all, it was more than ten. expanding this base and then also creating this depressed fund, which goes into a General Fund in which grants will be disseminated throughout the State, on the conservative end, fifty to sixty million dollars will go in those funds, which will be able to go to your Main Street programs, even though you don't have a casino around you or a racino around you. Your community is going to have an opportunity to benefit from these dollars that are coming in our coffers, not General Revenue Fund. This isn't spending money. This is a plan of how we're going to get some more money, some more dollars. I live on the Indiana border. I see people go across that border all the time. Been over there a couple times myself. Got to tell my wife, "Don't buy no gas over there; you know, somebody going see the license plate and going to swear it's me." But we go over

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

there. We need to recapture our dollars. We got to make sure that these programs that -- that we care about are addressed. This bill doesn't cover everything, but it -- it covers most things for us. For those individuals that -- and I don't know if you've noticed and -- our good citizens from Illinois - it was -- it was quite apparent to me - with the exception of one person who has an existing boat, they tell you they're good neighbors. Best thing that ever happened to their community. The best thing - created jobs, stability. Well, that -- that can happen throughout the State, doesn't have to be just theirs. I mean, I -- I hear people saying, there's no new gamblers, but we're going to have all these new losers. There's no new gamblers, how we going to have new losers? I mean, we're double-talking this bill. We're double-talking it, one, for our own self-interests. And I know that more individuals will benefit from this. Since we're quoting people today, to quote the great former President Emil Jones, you know, "I am tired of fattening frogs for snakes." This will ensure that those dollars, as -- and I'm now being redundant, will go to those of us who are spending them - for those safety programs, the police programs, much more linked development. Language is put in this bill to ensure that other communities will benefit from it as well. Mr. President, once again, this isn't the perfect bill. It's a great bill, one of the better bills that we've passed in this Illinois General Assembly in a long time, and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Link, to close.

SENATOR LINK:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you, Mr. President. First, I just want for clarifying the legislation, in House Amendment 6, page 2, line 11, the language says, quote, on page 295, lines 21, 23 {sic} (24), and 26, by declaring {sic} (deleting) "or casino" each..., and end quote. The number 24 should be replaced with number 23. It was just a technical change. First, I want to thank one of the greatest staff members, Louie Mossos, that was there and probably took about a million and a half texts and quotes and phone calls and e-mails from me, and vice versa. He said, "Do you know my last name?" I showed him on my phone the million emails that we did back and forth to one another. I also want to thank President Cullerton, who I realize works seven days a week, because Sunday afternoons, Monday nights, you name it, we were on the phone about this bill. I want to answer a few questions that were stated during this debate. You know, I speak to a lot of senior citizen groups, not because I am one, but I speak to a lot of senior citizen groups. One of the first questions they ask me, "When's the casino going to be built?" Because they're all on bus trips going to casinos. And I don't think any of 'em are degenerates, these seniors that I'm speaking to. I don't think they are habitual gamblers. I think they're seniors that want to have a little bit of fun. Well, guess what? In my area, they're catching a bus and they're going up to the Potawatomi Indian Reservation Casino in That's where they're going to. And when we talk about there won't be any new gamblers. Guess what? going to be, because you know what? These -- the one group I'm going to put out of business in this bill is the bus drivers, because there's bus trips being advertised to go to Potawatomi

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and they're coming from DuPage County, Kane County, Lake County, going up to Wisconsin every day of the week. And guess what? They're going from the City of Chicago, south suburbs and they're going into Indiana to gamble there. Illinois people. And you know what? Those buses aren't going half-empty either. They're going full and there are not one or two buses, there are a lot of buses every day of the week. And they're going with our tax dollars and taxpayers going to Indiana and Wisconsin. And I'm sure, Senator Syverson and Senator Frerichs, they're going in Danville and Rockford area the same way. We got to stop that flow. It was mentioned about jobs. There's going to be a number of temporary jobs and that's building these facilities, that I hope will start immediately upon the authorization of these bills and the authorization of the go ahead. Plus there will be a number of permanent jobs. And somebody said, "Well, these jobs only pay about thirty/forty thousand dollars a year with benefits." Well, let me tell you something. When the Des Plaines boat, which is going online, opened up for -- it's soon to be opened up, advertised to have their people come on board, they had a line of thousands of people applying for those jobs. Guess what? They're very interested in those thirty/forty-thousand-dollar-a-year jobs with benefits. They need 'em out there. We have high unemployment. Unemployment's dropping. We want it to drop a lot more in the State of Illinois. This is a way of doing it. One of my colleagues said about how great it did for her community. Guess what? Park City, Rockford, Danville and the south suburbs and the City of Chicago could use that help in their communities also. And in those racino areas, could use it

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

in their communities too. And as Senator Trotter said, they can use it in all the communities in the State of Illinois for the depressed areas, because this is going to help the entire State of Illinois in their communities. And you know what? Every one of the nine existing casinos is opposed to this boat. But you know what we're doing for 'em? We're lowering their taxes. We're allowing them to use the comps. We're helping them out. So, I think, in this bill, we're saying, thank you for what you've done for twenty years of making a lot of money for yourself. Because you know what? None of 'em went broke in the twenty years. None of 'em are selling their boats because they're doing pretty good. They've been there. Yeah, nobody likes competition. Any of us that we're in business, we don't like competition. But you know what? There is competition in this world. None of us would like to run in competition. We'd all like to run unopposed. Maybe we could work that out. competition here in the gaming bill. No opposition for us. Make that a part of legislation too. It happens. competition in this world. There always will be competition. We hear in here all the time, we need help for our agriculture. We need help for our horsemen. We need the help to save the industry of the horsemen. We need the help to save the racetracks. This legislation's going to do it. It's going to save it. I'm in my fifteenth year in the Senate. Before I even got down here, I'd heard this. I've been working on this type of legislation to get it done. Today we have an opportunity. I have heard in this Chamber a number of times, I can't vote for this bill because of this. I can't vote for this bill because I don't know what the House is going to do. I can't vote for this

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

bill because of this. Guess what? You vote for this bill today, it answers everything about agriculture. It answers everything about the horsemen, and one other thing, it goes to the Governor's Desk if you vote for it today and pass this. other excuse, it goes there. It goes to the Governor's signature and I -- quess what? There's a list this long of people that support this bill and I think this list will be even be longer when it passes, because there's going to be a lot of people calling the Governor's Office. It's 5:20. I bet you by 5:30 the phone's going to be starting to ring in the Governor's There's going to be e-mails. There's going to be There's going to be every way to communicate to the faxes. Governor to sign this bill immediately, because this is going to be jobs. It's going to be helping to pay off the bills in the State of Illinois. It's going to be an economy -- it's going to be an economic boon for the State of Illinois. We need it. I'd like to see fifty-nine green lights. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall the Senate incur {sic] in House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 on House -- on Senate Bill 744. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 744, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. I know this is supposed...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Jones, just one minute. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have some quiet in the Chamber. If we can have some quiet in the Chamber. Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. In the essence of time, I know this is supposed to be the last day of Session, hopefully it is tonight, and I've looked around the Chamber and saw everybody in their seats for a change. I will remove the verification request.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Jones. Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Actually, I would like to request a verification of -- of a vote that is this important. I'm -- I -- it may be true that everybody is in the Chamber, but I was relying on the earlier request for a verification. I would request a verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen has requested a verification. Will all Members please be at their desks? Secretary will read -- read the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY ROCK:

The following Members have voted in the affirmative:
Bomke, Annazette Collins, Crotty, Delgado, Dillard, Forby,
Frerichs, Haine, Harmon, Hunter, Hutchinson, Emil Jones, Landek,
Lightford, Link, Luechtefeld, Maloney, Martinez, Mulroe, Muñoz,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Murphy, Pankau, Raoul, Sandoval, Silverstein, Steans, Sullivan, Syverson, Trotter and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen, is there any question -- does the Senator question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

No. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

On a verified roll call, there are 30 Ayes, 27 Nays, 2 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 744 is declared passed. Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 2062.

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

House Amendment 1, 3 and 4.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2172, with House Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 2293, with House Amendment 1. They all passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. 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 refused to concur with the Senate

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 3131.

Which amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment 4.

It was non-concurred in by the House, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen -- Gentlemen, the Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet. Will all members of the Committee on Assignments please come to the President's Anteroom immediately? The Senate stands at ease. (at ease) Senate will come to order. But the Senate will also stand again at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet again. Members of the Committee on Assignments will please come to the President's Anteroom immediately. Senate stands at ease. (at ease) The Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports. SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to the Agriculture and Conservation Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1852; refer to the Criminal Law Committee - Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 1237 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1228; refer to the Executive Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 1717, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 270, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 675 and Motion to Concur with

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 745; refer to the Human Services Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1802; refer to the Local Government Committee -Motion to Concur with House Amendment 3, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 540; refer to the Pensions and Investments Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1672 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1831; refer to the Revenue Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2168; refer to the State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 107 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1918; and Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 1723, House Joint Resolution 32, and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 {sic} (1 and 2) to Senate Bill 2172.

Signed by Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to the Executive Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2062.

Signed by Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, you just heard the Secretary announce the bills that have been referred to the committees and here is a list of the committees and at what time they will be -- be meeting this evening. So if I could have your attention on the committee announcements. Agriculture and Conservation will meet at 6:45 p.m. in Room 409. Human Services will meet at 7 p.m. in Room 212. Criminal Law will meet at 7:15 in Room 212. Local

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Government will meet in Room 409 at 7:15. Pensions and Investments will meet in Room 400 at 7:30. Exec will meet at 7:45 in Room 212. Revenue will meet in Room 400 at 7:45. And State Government and Veterans Affairs will meet in 409 at 8:30 p.m. Let me give you those times and -- and committees again: Aq and Conservation, 6:45; Human Services, 7 p.m.; Criminal Law, 7:15; Local Government, 7:15; Pensions and Investments, 7:30; Exec, 7:45; Revenue, 7:45; and State Government and Veterans Affairs at 8:30. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair requests that all Members do their best to be prompt to the -- to the committee hearings, so that we can return to the Floor and conclude our business. Ladies and Gentlemen, one addition, Energy will meet at 8:45. The Energy Committee will meet at 8:45 in Room 212. That's an addition. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to go back to Supplemental Calendar No. 1 on the Order of Concurrences, Senate Bills. On the second page of that Calendar is Senate Bill 1652. Senator Jacobs. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1652.

Filed by Senator Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Jacobs, on your motion.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Excuse me, Senator Jacobs. One minute. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention in the Chamber,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

please. Ladies and Gentlemen, please hold the visiting down. We're ready to go. We're back to the Order of Concurrences and Senator Jacobs has an important bill. Senator Jacobs. SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I hope we can move this along. You know, today electricity drives our economy in ways that Thomas Edison could never have imagined. Yet, today, Illinois, we are saddled with a grid that was developed over a hundred years ago, and it's brittle and it needs to be replaced. If we sign this bill into law, ComEd will invest 2.6 billion dollars - with a B - not maybe money, real money, and Ameren will -- will invest six hundred and twenty-five million. what we'll end up with is better service for customers. also make Illinois much more competitive. Our neighboring states, right now, are building new grids and we've got to get in the game. ComEd, by improving the infrastructure, will overhaul the cable system in Illinois; they'll replace four thousand seven hundred miles of underground cable. inspect and repair and replace over one thousand one hundred and thirty-one telephone poles -- excuse me, poles. And they will refurbish and replace twenty-eight thousand manhole covers. They also create nine -- one thousand nine hundred and fifty-two real jobs - not maybe jobs - real jobs with insurance and everything. They'll erect a modern grid which, in the end, means that there'll be men and -- men and women working. They'll install a smart meter in every home in Illinois. the forces on the green energy have been clamoring for smart energy. Here's your chance. Also, too, they will upgrade fifty-one substations; replace all the mechanical equipment and

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

-- with digital micro relays. They will also build a new training center, which will be in ComEd territory, to teach their new workers how to work. You know, in the old days, customers couldn't manage their energy usage. For the first time, under Senate Bill 1652, it'll allow Illinois customers to get in the game. The opportunity to modernize our energy infrastructure, with all the benefits it brings, will not be free. If we don't spend the necessary resources, we will lose on an opportunity to modernize our grid and still be working over the next hundred years with a grid that's a hundred years old. It's time to make our -- our State a leader in energy. I, too, want to thank Louie -- Louie Mossos, who has been a very helpful fighter in this issue. He's a senior legal counsel to the Senate President. I appreciate his time. In -- we were in -- in hearing -- in committee and we had to cut the hearing short due to getting on to the Floor, but I want to let people know that we've had joint hearings. We've had two joint hearings. We've held hearings all over the State. Everybody whose got a dog in this fight has actually barked and been bitten. And I understand -- we also -- you know, there's been a lot of editorials written on this, and I think, you know, sometimes we got to do what we got to do. So, I just want to ask for your positive support. I know of just a little opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Koehler, for what purpose do you rise?

mlerel a Me Decello

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I -- I

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

have some questions I want to ask for legislative intent. Let me just start, though, by saying this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

First of all, let me just say, this is an important bill just for reasons mentioned. If we're going to have, you know, success in the twenty-first century, we need to have a twenty-first century grid. This does produce jobs and it does -- one thing that I think is very important, and that is, we can procure electricity for five years going out and not just three years. That's important, especially when we see rates as low as they are right now. But for purposes of legislative intent, there -- let me ask this, are the -- the requirements contained in subsection (a) of Section 16-128, which this legislation amends, are they substantive and enforceable obligations?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I've been waiting my whole life to be asked legislative intent. Yes, subsection of 16-128 contains substantive and enforceable requirements, both under current law and as -- as amended by this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Koehler, before we go to that order. Senator Harmon in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you. Yeah. Thank you. Are the provisions of Senate Bill 1652 severable?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes, I have confirmed with the House sponsor, Representative McCarthy, in the lower Chamber, that this is definitely our intent, which is also consistent with Section 1.31 of the Statute on Statutes. The State Statutes, excuse me. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Will the sponsor yield for a couple of questions? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Sponsor indicates that he will yield. Senator Martinez. SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and -- Senator, let me ask you a question, because there's a lot of things that I -- first and foremost, I want to just say that I -- I really do believe that this is a great investment that's long needed to an antiquated service that we have going on right now. The infrastructure needs to be updated. But let me ask you a question, because of some of the concerns that I might have with the bill, but I'm still going to vote for this bill. The rates - you know, everybody's concerned when the -- with the real dollar figures. What are we talking about dollars? What -- what is going to increase on people's bills every single month? I think it's important that's upfront. And -- and also -- and I -- start with that -- start with that question first.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yeah. Yes, Senator. This bill does have a cost. The cost to consumers is three dollars a month, and if it goes to -- over that, the -- they can go to -- over a certain price and go 2.5. But, the point is, I think, is that for three dollars, or for one pull on one slot machine, you can get an updated grid to make sure all your power works, to make your laptop, your high screen TVs, and Lord knows what's going to come next.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

If -- if -- you're saying that it's going to cost three dollars a month, right? How long does that stay in place for three dollars a month?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

We must reapprove the program, the General Assembly, in 2017, under our sunset agreement put in the bill by Speaker Madigan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

So will those three dollars a month stay there until the 2017 -- it will not go up higher than three dollars a month?

C - - - 1 - - - T - - - 1 - -

Senator Jacobs.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR JACOBS:

Correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Another question. When you talk about -- I know that, under this bill, this is going to create jobs - and permanent jobs. There has been talk that meter readers will end up losing their jobs. Can you please explain that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. I have asked the company that and they've told me "No." They said the meter readers are among the best workers that they have. They're a little -- they're -- they're above average IQ because they have to interact with people and dogs, and so what they're going to do is turn 'em into linemen, turn 'em into people who install smart grids. The company has no interest in losing that valuable employee. In fact, they're going to add employees, around the two thousand -- two thousand mark.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

So, you're saying that these meter readers will now be retrained. They will not lose their jobs, but they'll be retrained to do other things. But at no moment are these losses going to take place, but if anything be reeducated and continue to work for ComEd. Correct?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. Many readers will be needed to install the new smart meters. Others will become technicians. And some will be trained to replace the retiring linemen and -- and people, as they have to put up all these new poles.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

To the bill. I think that those are some of the questions that I think were on people's mind. I got many phone calls asking that if, any time, the rates were going to change; if it's going to be three dollars a month added to everyone's bill. I think that three dollars a month to improve the infrastructure in an old, antiquated grill, it makes sense. I do -- I am very happy to know that the jobs of the meter people, who are out there that go door to door, the meter readers, those jobs are not going to be lost, but if anything, they're going to be reeducated to learn other things and -- and stay within the business. I -- I wholeheartedly support this. It does create jobs. It does invest in our infrastructure. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Holmes, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HOLMES:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes, this is a bill that, actually, I've given a great deal of thought to and -- and talked to a ton of people that have been roaming these halls here about. As a matter-of-fact, it was such a large issue I thought that I would go to the committee meeting today so I could hear all of the issues that people were going to bring up. And I was really disappointed that there were so many who wished to provide testimony and were not even cut short, they were just plain not given the opportunity. I'm a proponent of some aspects of this bill. There's some very, very strong clean energy provisions. those provisions would create jobs and reduce pollution. the bill removes barriers to new renewable energy projects and allow large rooftop owners to benefit by installing wind power and solar power on their roofs. That allows them to credit against their electric bill for any surplus power they produce, which is a -- is a great asset. We've allowed residential consumers to do that. This bill also creates a new market for distributed renewable energy projects and provides that one percent of the renewable energy procured under our existing renewable portfolio standard comes from small-scale renewable projects. This, again, would have a huge, excellent economic impact on some of our cities and suburbs. The infrastructure upgrade is definitely an enormous plus to this bill. Investing in the smart grid will cost money, but, hopefully, it will help consumers use less energy and that will reduce their bills; consumers will have the tools they need to use less power during peak power times. Many of these measures were covered in Senate

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bill 1365, which is a bill I sponsored and we sort of rolled that into this. So, like I said, I'm -- I'm a huge proponent of some aspects of this. But, I do have some serious concerns that I was hoping were going to be addressed today. guaranteed annual rate increase. And I'm concerned about the impact that higher rates are going to have on our consumers, who are already struggling right now in these tough economic times. Our economy is struggling to recover and I'm not sure that right now is really the time to add an increase in their utility bills. I have big concerns about a piece of legislation that actually locks in a profit margin of a little over ten percent. As somebody who has run a business, I would love to have had that guarantee running a business. So, anyway, I -- I just want to say that I think there's some good parts of this. I wish we could have had further discussion. And, at this point, I'm unsure which is the best vote for the consumers in Illinois. So, at this point, I'm going to be a Present vote on this piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Holmes. Senator Dillard, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DILLARD:

...you. Would the sponsor yield for a question, please?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Sponsor indicates that he will yield. Senator Dillard. SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. Senator Jacobs, which of the Madigans should I follow on this bill? Should I follow the Attorney General, who's opposed, or the Speaker, who let his lieutenant,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Representative McCarthy, negotiate this bill?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I would suggest that you support the -- the Madigan that is right, and that, my friend, is Speaker Mike Madigan. I -- I have no problem with Attorney General Madigan trying to influence the Chamber. She has a work force here, a lot of lobbyists working on her behalf here in the Chamber, and the State pays for those people. So I find it kind of funny that we have a business in Illinois that -- that wants to put money into the system, that's made the State money and been a very good employer, being protested by a State official.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I will take Senator Jacobs' advice here and follow the Madigan which is right. I rise in support of the bill. The last decade or so, we have had some huge electric reliability issues in the western suburbs, older infrastructure. And -- and to their credit, Commonwealth Edison has done a -- a very good job of investing and taking care of these problems, up to a point. But we all sit around here and we -- we clamor for manufacturing jobs and industrial jobs, and to keep those jobs in Illinois or lure companies to expand those types of jobs in Illinois, you've got to have reliable electricity. And, you know, there's a lot that's wrong with Illinois' business climate, but one of the things that is right about it is we are lucky to have companies that have a pretty

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

reliable, doggone good source of energy. And if you're running a manufacturing plant, you can't afford an interruption in service. I'm hoping that, over time, the smart grid portion of this bill is a wash. But overall, you've got to invest in your electric infrastructure to keep businesses here and to keep my grandmother and my elderly mother from having their air conditioning go out, which happens a lot - far too often in -- in August - or heat in the winter. And this is a -- a good bill overall. There has to be a rate of return on investment in utilities so that they reinvest in our system. And one of the pluses we have when we're trying to lure businesses to this State is we brag about a reliable electric system - and we got to keep it that way. So I rise in support of the bill, Mr. President, and thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Dillard. Senator John Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR J. JONES:

I rise in support of -- of the legislation. And I know Senator Jacobs -- he -- he commended your staff on that side and I want to say the same thing about Scott Foiles on our side of the aisle. They're -- they -- the staff has spent an awful lot of time on this and -- and it's changed an awful lot since it was House Bill 14, back in January, and -- and I think we've come a long ways. But I think the previous speaker said some of

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the things that I -- that needs to be said. You know, I -- I remember my folks telling me about the -- the first time they came down the country road out in the country where I lived in Jefferson County and they strung that first line and put up those first set of poles. It doesn't come cheap, folks. Somebody has to pay for it. And if we want to stay up to date with technology and -- and be able to access the things we want to on the Internet and the like, we have to have reliable energy sources and -- and electricity. And I know that some people are concerned this may cost a little money - and -- and it may - but I think, as one of the previous speakers said earlier, I think it'll be a wash whenever it's all said and done. In fact, I know Representative Winters has a smart meter at his place and he saved a little over fifteen percent last year on his electric usage. So there are some great advantages to this. But, you know -- I -- I do know there's some safeguards in here. -- is a big one, you know. And, quite frankly, if -- if all the things are not met in this legislation by 2014, it -- it's done. It's over with. And -- and then, if it goes to 2017, it sunsets and it will have to come back to the General Assembly and we'll have to redo it all over again. So there are some safequards in here. As far as the ICC, I know they're concerned. Doug Scott's a good friend of all of ours. I served with him in the House and I know he has some concerns. But I think there's plenty of safeguards in here for the ICC and the companies; that, you know, the citizens of -- of Illinois are going to be treated fairly by everybody. And -- and so I would just -- I would just strongly urge an Aye vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you, Senator. Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCARTER:

I've got a couple of issues with this bill. One being the process. But perhaps I'm just a little upset over a number of bills that have gone through and the process that I disagreed with. But, you know, this one, a hundred-and-fifty-page bill, took six minutes in committee. You've got -- the cost that's referred to as three dollars is really 3.7 billion dollars over ten years that the citizens will pay for. And then, as part of the process - that I know is just the way we do things around here and that's just the way Illinois politics is - you've got over seventy grand that was given by Ameren just this month to funds controlled by the Leaders in this Legislature. sponsor's father is a registered lobbyist, lobbying for who else but ComEd. Policy, that's what we need. We need an energy policy in this State that doesn't pick winners. The winners need to be the citizens of this State. But instead, we allow whoever with the most money and power to run a bill on the last day. We need to create a structure that identifies the need for reasonable capital and how we're going to pay for it. understand that we have to invest in technology and more dependable power for our people, I do. But we need to create a structure that welcomes competition and doesn't pick winners based on money, power, backroom deals, or slick political

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

maneuvering by powerful connected lobbyists. I suggest we slow this down...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator -- Senator McCarter, if you could please refrain from invoking personalities and stick to the subject matter at hand.

SENATOR McCARTER:

I suggest we slow this down, vote No, work with the Governor to develop an energy policy that looks to the future with the businesses' and residents' prosperity in mind.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Schoenberg, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

...motion, Senator.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I believe that we do need to provide incentive for capital investment, particularly massive capital investment at a time when technology affords opportunities to realize greater savings and economic growth. However, I don't believe that we should circumvent, if not entirely unplug, the entire regulatory process to roll out a welcome mat for that investment. That's - that's a covenant that the taxpayers don't buy into, particularly now when energy prices are actually on the decline. And yet, through this legislation, we would be guaranteeing an uptick, a steady upward trend guaranteeing rate increases, at a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

time when the market is on a downward trend. That's a -- that's a graph -- those are trend lines that I think are indefensible. We know that there's a need to have -- take full advantage of the technology so we have -- can have greater energy efficiency. We know that we need to be more responsive to the concerns of the environment. But unplugging the entire regulatory process, the very checks and balances which guide, steer and protect the rights of taxpayers, is the wrong course of action to take. Moreover, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have a concern about the potential use of the personally identifiable information that's obtained through the technology that could be used for commercial purposes or other purposes. There are not sufficient privacy protections in this bill. I believe Brandeis was right, that the right to privacy is something that we should protect at all costs. fundamental right. And yet, we're not taking into account how this technology can see a -- a gradual and pronounced erosion of individuals' privacy rights by having this data available for commercial sale or for commercial use or for use in the court systems. We need to have the ICC as an intermediary, as a countervailing balance in how utility rates are set. And I think that's precisely why Governor Quinn, Attorney General Madigan, and the consumer advocacy organizations - not all of whom agree with the ICC's decisions all the time - why they all stand in opposition to this legislation. Should we let the market take its course? Absolutely so. If we -- but if we let the markets take their course, we'll follow the downward trend for where energy prices are going. We won't artificially set an upward slope and guaranteeing rate increases in order to pay for

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

this investment. This is a clever, but inherently flawed approach to public utility regulation. And it's for that reason I encourage everybody to vote against the gentleman's motion. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Schoenberg. Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the motion, Senator.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

I rise in opposition to the -- to the motion. I was -we've -- we've heard a little discussion this evening about what happened in -- in Energy Committee. I happen to sit on that committee and there were a number of opponents, including the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Attorney General's Office and CUB. And those three organizations were invited to the hearing table and were -- were told that they were going to be allowed to present testimony and answer questions and cite why they are opposed to this legislation. But as I think everybody now realizes, they were cut off in the middle when the first -- when the ICC was giving testimony, they were cut off from their -from their -- making -- giving their testimony. I was actually asking questions at that time and -- and had we -- had they been allowed to continue their discussion, they would have made a number of arguments against this legislation and why they are opposed to it, including that it guarantees utility profits at an unreasonably high level by mandating a return for the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

electric company that is excessive, that the law sets the return, the utility does not need to make a case before the ICC. They -- they use the T-Bond rate and I don't know -- understand exactly -- I was hoping to ask this question, so I don't understand exactly how this T-Bond interest rate -- as it rises, that mandates a return that will rise faster than it would under today's marketing approach. You would have heard that it shifts even more risk to the taxpayers and provides no effective incentive for the utility to limit costs. You would have heard that - and, again, something I don't understand - but the reliance on the FERC Form 1 has major shortcomings, including FERC reporting reflects all financial transactions, including those not allowable for setting delivery service rates in Illinois. It reduces the ICC's ability to oversee utility spending practices. I could go on and on, Ladies and Gentlemen. And I -- and if you talk to the ICC and even the Attorney General, who - I've spoken to both, the AG as well as folks at the ICC, Doug Scott - they are not necessarily opposed to what we are trying to do, but this is not near the answer. We need to continue those discussions and that is why I rise in -- in opposition and ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Senator Jacobs, to close. SENATOR JACOBS:

You know, I don't know how many times I can say that we had to hurry through committee today because there was a failure in leadership, Leader. There was a failure in leadership. The leadership didn't have everything ready, so we had to move. I was told by the real Leader that I had to move. So I sort of

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

resent that you're trying to make this something that it isn't. You know, the opponents didn't testify, but neither did the proponents. And if they would have testified, what they would have said, to correct Director Scott, who's another governmentpaid lobbyist -- he's the head of the ICC. He's supposed to be a -- a regulatory board, not take a position. Well, let me tell you -- let me tell you what -- what -- what happened recently. The return number that the ICC gave to ComEd was 10.75. bill gives them 10.25. So I -- I reject that kind of language. And to my friend across the aisle, my young friend, it's not what you know that gets you in trouble in this building; it's what you don't know that just ain't so. The reason I support this bill is because it's the right bill. We need to move Illinois forward. If you don't have the courage to do it, I will. And I don't care -- you can look under my underwear. I don't care where you look. But the fact is, is I support this. I think it's wrong that we're regulating utilities out of Illinois. I think it's wrong that we're regulating business out of Illinois. Now maybe my Republican friend across the aisle thinks we should regulate people out of business. And I really believe that we shouldn't spend seventy-nine million dollars a year to have the Attorney General lobby against my bill. I think that's wrong. I think there ought to be investigation. How much money's being spent to lobby by State organizations to lobby against our bills? This has nothing to do with this bill. This is a good bill. As the Chairman of Energy, I've watched people come in front of me time after time, especially the green folks, some of those folks on the left, and they want their green technology. They wanted a smart grid. And what did ComEd

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

do? They walked up and said, "Okay, here it is." And now you're saying, well, we don't want that one. We want another one. Look, if we don't -- if we don't get moving in Illinois, we are going to become the laughing stock. And in closing, I just think that we really have to be careful about evoking personalities and motives, because all of us have things that we believe in. And the thing that I believe in is moving Illinois forward and I'm with ComEd and I'm with Ameren on this bill, because it's going to make it easier for my child to get ahead. I was told this afternoon, eleven months ago, there was no such thing as a iPad. The big one, is that what they call 'em, Senator? The big iPad? iPad. There was none. You know how many there are today? Sixteen million. And you want the utility companies to make sure the line gets there. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1652. 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 31 voting Aye, 24 voting No, and 4 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1652. And the bill is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, earlier the Chair announced that the Senate Energy Committee would be meeting this evening. That committee announcement was in error. The Senate Energy Committee will not meet this evening. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we're

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

going to continue on the -- the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrences, found on Supplemental Calendar No. 1. We are turning to Senate Bill 1122. Senator Link, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1122.

Filed by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Link, on the motion.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill was worked out by the Illinois State Bar Association -- the Chamber -- the Illinois Chamber of Commerce has worked out with the Illinois State Bar Association, the National Employment Lawyers Association, Department of Human Rights and the Human Rights Commission on this amendment to streamline the employment discrimination process for individuals being charged -- changes of employment -- discrimination and employers defending against the charges of employment discrimination. The bill will help improve our business climate and help -- and also help individuals who are -- experience discrimination in the workplace to advance their cases to get remedies in a more timely fashion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion of the motion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Sponsor indicates that he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's my understanding, Senator Link, with the -- with the language that was added to this bill in the House, that the opposition of the business groups has been removed. Is that correct, Senator Link?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

As always, Senator Righter, you're totally correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Yeah.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Please note that remark in the record. Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Link, do you wish to close? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1122. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1122, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Bomke, for what purpose do you rise?

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Please state your point, Senator.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. There's a gentleman on the Senate Floor tonight. This is his last night with LIS. Part of his responsibility is keeping our voting system working, the voting boards lit up and our laptops humming. Dwain Harmon is retiring after thirty years with the Legislature. He's right down here. Let's all welcome him and thank him for his thirty years of service.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you for your service. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HAINE:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Please state your point, Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Since it was brought to my attention by my distinguished colleague, someone's retirement, I want to call the Chamber's attention to two retirements -- not two -- one retirement and one change of duty. The first retirement is Mr. Dick Edwards, the head of the Legislative Reference Bureau for twenty-four years. This attorney and counselor at law has been our chief legislative draftsman. He is responsible for -- for whimsical, vexatious, idiotic, as well as substantive, requests from every Member of the General Assembly for twenty-four years. He has accomplished this with academic brilliance, an eye for detail, the patience of Job and the steady hand of a man who tolerates

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

people such as us in this line of work. This gentleman is responsible for our laws being clear and concise, readable, understandable by anyone, except for a local circuit judge in some circuits. This is a person to whom we owe a great deal of -- of gratitude for making sense of what our great ideas -- that what we dream of as a great idea, Dick's job was to make it into legislative sense and we owe him a tremendous round of applause. And thank you for a job well done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Let's all salute Dick Edwards for all of his hard work on behalf of the Legislature. Senator -- Senator Haine, is it true that at five minutes to 5 today you brought an urgent request to Mr. Edwards to draft a resolution honoring his career? Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

And -- and they said he wasn't in. My second note, and Senator Crotty brought this to your attention a few nights ago, the Director of Insurance, Mike McRaith, is leaving us to be the first Director of Insurance for the United States Government. This is a newly created office. His responsibility will be primarily reinsurance, property casualty issues, of which he is exceptionally qualified. He's a practicing lawyer in that field. He served here as Director of Insurance for six years. He has appeared before the Insurance Committee, of which I am so honored to be Chair over these years, and he is a man of integrity, competence and faithful devotion to the law. He is also one of the reasons why Illinois has a vibrant insurance market. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's people like Mike McRaith that staff our bureaus, that staff our governmental agencies and

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

make them work, and he does it honestly and he does it with integrity beyond question. We owe him a great deal of thanks for his long years of service to the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

The Senate wishes Director McRaith good luck and Godspeed in his new duties for our country. Please give a round of applause. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Supplemental Calendar No. 2 has been distributed to the Members' desks. At the top of the Order on the Supplemental Calendar is Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. Therein is House Joint Resolution 32. Senator McCarter, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Joint Resolution 32, offered by Senator McCarter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, this House Joint Resolution designates the portion of Interstate 70 from mile marker 23 to mile marker 65 as the Frank Watson Parkway in honor of Frank Watson and his contributions to the State of Illinois. As you know, I was very honored to -- to be appointed to replace Senator Watson and I always said that it was -- it was nice to follow Frank, because I always said I was just with Frank, because everybody loved Frank. And, you know, I could have followed a scoundrel and been apologizing everywhere I went. But instead they said, "If Frank is for you, I'm with you", because everywhere I went, whatever the party was, whatever age, they all love Frank. So, I -- I think this is one way we can --

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I -- I suppose this 65 mile marker ends where the Demuzio highway picks up going north. So I'd ask for a favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

I join with the gentleman in his motion out of a deep respect for Senator Frank Watson and his tenure here, his service of -- being a Member of the Illinois Senate, with honesty and integrity in his leadership. I would also add that there's a rumor that during -- that this area of highway that is being dedicated the Frank Watson Parkway, there's only allowed right-hand -- extreme right-hand -- departures or exits. Is that true, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Yes. Yes, Senator. It's every -- everything in that area goes to the right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator McCarter. Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. By the way, Senator Haine, you will not be able to turn off on that road, it appears. You'll just be going straight ahead all the time. As you -- as many of you know, Frank and I became probably best friends in -- in the Legislature and as -- and without him -- if it hadn't been for Frank, I wouldn't --

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

wouldn't be here. I -- I hope that's good. But I -- as you watch legislators on both sides of aisle, you, I think, come to conclusions that there are -- there -- there's some better than others. Some, I think, are respected by both sides of the aisle and -- and that's always good. Some are able to get things done for their -- for their constituents, never let up - never met a person who worked harder at that than he did. I've always felt that if -- you know, if I had to - and -- and I think some of you agree with me - if I had to pick out a legislator that I've watched over the years who was the best in the business, it would be Frank Watson. So I think he deserves an honor like this and I would like to, again, be with the sponsor of this and certainly hope that the rest of you are. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Luechtefeld. Senator Radogno, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you. To the resolution. Well, I,...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the resolution.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

milike Senator Luechtefeld, would not be here, at least in this position, but for Senator Watson. That probably isn't enough to name a road after him, but all of the other good things that he did here - his -- his relentless dedication to the capital bill, his leadership and his class. I mean, he was not an angry, vindictive person. Has a great sense of humor, and heaven knows we can use that around this place all the time. He really is someone that deserves this honor and I am pleased

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

that we're doing this today. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Radogno. Senator McCarter, do you wish to close or should we proceed right to the roll call? As this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution 32 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. And House Joint Resolution 32, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared adopted. Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 1533.

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

House Amendment 1 and House Amendment 2.

Passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we are standing at ease just for a moment while the paperwork for the Committee on Assignments is prepared. The Committee on Assignments will be

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

meeting shortly. The Committee on Agriculture and Conservation will be meeting in Room 409 at 6:45 p.m. and those -- those committees can meet concurrently. So if members of the Committee on Agriculture are ready to -- to -- to head to Room 409, we can get started there. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Committee on Assignments will meet. The Senate will stand at ease while the Committee on Assignments meets. If all members of the Committee on Assignments could please report immediately to the President's Anteroom, the Committee on Assignments will meet immediately. The Senate stands at ease. (at ease) Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to the Executive Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1533.

Filed by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we are turning to the portion of our evening when committees will be meeting. Most of these committees have already been announced. I'm going to run through the list one more time for folks. The Agriculture and Conservation Committee will meet almost immediately, at 6:45 p.m. tonight in Room 409. The Human Services Committee will meet in Room 212 at 7 p.m. The Criminal Law Committee will meet in Room 212 at 7:15 p.m. The Local Government Committee will meet in Room 409 at 7:15 p.m. The Pensions and Investments Committee will meet in Room 400 at 7:30 p.m. The Senate Executive Committee will meet in Room 212 at 7:45 p.m. And a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

new announcement, the Senate Executive Committee will meet in Room 212 at 7:46 p.m. The Revenue Committee will meet in Room 400 at 7:45 p.m. The Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs will meet in Room 409 at 8:30 p.m. The Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committee meetings, the Senate will reconvene to receive committee reports and for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Frerichs, Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture and Conservation, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1852 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Hunter, Chairperson of the Committee on Human Services, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1802 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Noland, Chairperson of the Committee on Criminal Law, reports Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1237 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1228 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Raoul, Chairperson of the Committee on Pensions and Investments, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1672 and House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1831 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive,

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

reports Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1717, Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 270, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 675, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 745, Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1533, and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2062, all recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Hutchinson, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2168 recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

House Bill 1723. Senator Koehler. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Senator Koehler seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1723 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1723. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Koehler, on your amendment.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment becomes the bill and I'll be happy to discuss it on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, 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?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 1723. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1723.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill in committee was presented as House Bill 1815 and I told the committee that it would be changed to another vehicle bill. But this is a bill brought to us by the Illinois Emergency Management Agency. And what the bill does is it amends the Illinois Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act. It increases the annual fees paid by the owners of nuclear power reactors and requires owners of nuclear power reactors to pay a one-time appropriation to the Nuclear Safety and Emergency Preparedness Fund. Fees collected would be used to modernize nuclear safety programs. During the testimony, Mr. Monken, the Director of IEMA, talked about the need to upgrade the -- the whole system that, you know, really monitors nuclear safety and especially after the -- the tragedy that occurred in Japan with -- within that nuclear power plant. The question - and I see that Senator Righter is not here - so I will ask the question that he would have asked if he were here, and that is about, you know, in the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

past, you know, we have funds that are swept and that's always a concern. It's -- it's an excellent question. What I have - 'cause -- 'cause I'm concerned about that as well - I have a letter from the Governor's Office of Management and Budget and it says here, quote, "The purpose of this correspondence is to reassure you that the fees in this bill will be used solely for the purposes set forth and will not be transferred for other purposes." The bill also contains language to that effect. It's important that we keep up to date with our nuclear safety programs and I'd urge an Aye in support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 1723 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Yea, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 1723, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Holmes, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 107 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1918 recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Crotty in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Millner, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR MILLNER:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you, Madam Chairman {sic}. Could you - President, rather - can you put me as a Yes vote for that last bill? I believe it's House Bill 1723. Is it 723? 1720 whatever. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Record -- the record will so reflect. Supplemental Calendar No. 3 is being circulated. These are bills under Concurrence. We'll be going to those. Okay, on Senate -- Secretary Desk, Senate Bills under Concurrence, we have Senate Bill 107. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 107.

Filed by Senator Kotowski.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Kotowski.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

I'm going to move a motion to concur on House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 107. Do I address the amendment on 3rd or just... All right. It's a concurrence motion, the -- what the -- House added an amendment to this bill. As you know, we've run this bill three different times in three different years in this Chamber. It allows for the Treasurer to invest a very small percentage of the investment portfolio in venture capital funds that invest in Illinois companies and it's been very successful in the State of Illinois. It's led to -- for every dollar that's invested in the Treasurer's investment portfolio in venture capital funds that invest in companies, there's been twenty-three dollars of investment from private sector, about a

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

half a billion investment. Also, creation of several thousand jobs. This continues on. This successful program, it -- worked with Treasurer Dan Rutherford on this, as well as the Illinois Venture Capital Association of Illinois. And the House amendment does this, it actually makes it more specific that any fund in which the State Treasurer invests in invests a minimum amount that is equal to twice the Treasurer investment in Illinois-specific companies. The amendment also adds reporting requirements for the fund manager, including names of companies the fund has invested in. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

There any questions? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments {sic} No. 1 to Senate Bill 107. All those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Having received the -- oop! Senate Bill 107, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Muñoz in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senate Bill 270. President Cullerton. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 270.

Filed by President Cullerton.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. adopting -- by concurring with Amendments No. 2 and 3, we will be passing a version of a bill which we've already passed that deals with restoring the Illinois State Lottery to its status as an independent department. Currently, it's a division of the Department of Revenue. It would provide for a salary to be specified in the law for the new Superintendent of the Lottery, who would be appointed by the Governor and, most importantly, with the advice and consent of the Senate. It does create minimum qualifications for that -- who could serve and has a requirement that hiring former Superintendents in there would be prohibited. Requires regular reporting to the Chief Procurement Officer and the General Assembly on the activities of the Lottery's private manager. And it was -- as was stated in an earlier debate, it's anticipated, but I can quarantee because we did not appropriate any more money for this Department, that this will not -- this will not cause any -- an increase in costs in government, but rather be a more effective way of managing the Lottery. So, with that, I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 270. 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 45 voting Yea, 9 voting Nay, 0 voting

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 270, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 675. Senator Jones. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 675.

Filed by Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Let me first start off by saying this is not my cemetery legislation. If you can recall, a little bit over a year ago when we passed cemetery legislation, we required that the Comptroller's Office transfer all powers dealing with the -- the Oversight Act of -- of cemetery care funds over to the Department of Professional Regulation. Senate Bill 675 simply allows the Comptroller's Office to retain those powers to oversee over the trust funds. I'll be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 675. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 45 voting Yea, 6 voting Nay, 0 voting

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 675, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 745. Senator Forby. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 745.

Filed by Senator Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Forby, to your motion.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. I concur with the House. And all this is, is a technical amendment that clarifies there is a -- a metropolitan and not a county. That's all it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 745. 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 40 voting Yea, 14 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 745, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1228. Senator Dillard. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1228.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Filed by Senator Dillard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. This is another chunk of the CLEAR Commission Criminal Code rewrite. This one deals with Article 16 of theft. It organizes the theft Article and combines most of the specialized theft defenses outside of the theft Article into the general theft and other theft provisions. This results, like all the CLEAR Commission bills, in a clean and streamlined Act - in this case, the Theft Act. And I would appreciate a favorable roll call. It's been worked on by the staffs of all four caucuses and the Legislative Reference Bureau, as well as the CLEAR Commission, and I know of no opposition. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

President Cullerton, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, I also rise in support. Just to refresh one's memory, the CLEAR Commission was established a number of years ago and we went through the entire Criminal Code, which had been originally initiated back in 1962, and it had been accumulating a whole bunch of new penalties and new provisions and many of which just overlapped each other and it was really one of the more complicated Criminal Codes in the nation. There was literally a book written by a judge to try to explain to judges how to interpret the -- the Criminal Code. So, Senator Dillard and others served on this Commission. They did a spectacular

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

job. We have spent -- actually one of the reasons why we couldn't pass it right away was because it took so long for the Reference Bureau to draft the bill to make sure that it was accurate. But we've done a great service to the -- the practitioners in the criminal field, as well as the judges. And I want to congratulate the CLEAR Commission and Senator Dillard for his work on this. And ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Any discussion? Any other discussion? Seeing none, Senator Dillard, to close.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, want to -- this wouldn't happen without the Senate President, who in those days was the Co-Chairman, with myself, of the Senate Judiciary, but John was the real Chairman. It was an idea that Carl Hawkinson, our colleague on this side of the aisle, had. And Senator Cullerton, like he does day in and day out, put a lot of time into this. And there's a couple more of these, I'm told, coming during the Veto Session, Mr. President. And -- you know, but this just shows that we can roll up our sleeves, write an -- and completely organize an archaic part of the statutes when we have to. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1228. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yea, 0 voting Nay, and 0 voting Present. Having received the required

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1228. The bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1533. Senator Trotter. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1533.

Filed by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is legislation that we have heard in this Chamber and passed out of this Chamber, along with the House, to the Governor, who vetoed it. This is the Leucadia legislation. will require gas utilities serving fifteen hundred {sic} customers to enter into thirty-year contracts with the clean coal substitute natural gas brownfield facility, which will be operated by the Chicago Clean Energy. There's other provisions. The Governor had some concerns about it. In the past few months, the Chicago Clean Coal -- Clean Energy Corporation has met with those that -- that had problems; have made some modifications to the legislation. One, it had -- has enhanced consumer protection. It will -- make and put a hundred and fifty million dollars into an account, whereas a hundred million dollars was initially proposed. It has enduring consumer benefits to prioritize that consumers will be the first to get paid in this legislation. It also ensures that all retail customers at a utility - residential, commercial and industrial

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- will participate with below market savings and a hundred million dollars in guaranteed savings. It proposes to create eleven hundred new jobs under construction, two hundred permanent jobs. It will also generate -- projected to generate 716.4 million dollars in sales tax over construction period alone. Upon its completion, five hundred and seventeen million dollars in local sales and property taxes revenue. This is a tax generator for a neighborhood that has long been decimated with the advent of the steel mills closing. It is certainly something that is very, very needed in my community and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

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

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I -- I'm -- I just want to repeat, I think it is very important that we have a energy policy in this State and I -- I really think we ought to step back and decide how we're going to pay for capital projects in this State, instead of seeing who can run a bill through this -- through the Legislature at the last minute on the last day. I'm sure there's some good parts to this bill and I'm a big fan of -- of using clean coal, but I think we need to lay out a -- a plan for how -- our energy policy, because, really, the deregulation of the last decade has worked. You know, if you're defending

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

business interests in this State, you can't be real happy with the tax burden. You can't be real happy with the work comp situation. But one thing you can be happy with is the low cost of power. ADM and Tate & Lyle in my district, their number two cost of goods sold, other than grain, is power. Tate & Lyle has the opportunity to invest millions and millions of dollars in new facilities in the biotech industry. If we raise the cost of power in any way, they may go elsewhere. I understand this is not electric, this is gas. But I just think we need a comprehensive plan on our energy policies and then let's let everyone compete so the consumers and businesses can be the beneficiary. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Pankau, did you seek recognition? Senator John Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

To the motion, Senator.

SENATOR J. JONES:

You know, I -- I rise in support of this. I -- I know there's people that have apprehension about these projects, but you know what? At some point in time, we're going to get to the point where we're going to run out of natural gas. And if we don't start changing and -- and using Illinois coal -- this is going to use Illinois coal to change coal into synthetic gas that we can burn in our factories, in our homes, and -- and the like. You know, I know there's -- there's people that's concerned about what the cost might be to the consumers. This

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

will be five percent or less of the natural gas that we use in this State. So if there is a little added cost, it will be very minimal. And I know companies are all excited about it and -- and they've got to watch their bottom line in this day and age and I respect that. But if we don't start moving forward in this State, we're going to be left behind, and this is a great way to not only change coal into a synthetic natural gas, but to put people to work with good-paying jobs that, quite frankly, they won't get foreclosed on their homes. I mean, a lot of us are worried about people getting foreclosed on their homes. These will be excellent-paying jobs in the construction and then when the plant is built, the permanent workers there. So I rise in strong support of it. And I thank you, Senator Trotter, for bringing it forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Will the sponsor yield for a question -- for a couple of questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Senator Trotter, I -- I know this bill somehow seems to never go away. It just keeps coming back at the last moment. But, is it -- I'm reading on the analysis here, they enter into a thirty-year contract with this company? Is that what happens here, a thirty-year contract?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. This legislation requires that those groups with fifteen hundred -- fifteen $\{ sic \}$ thousand or more customers must enter into contracts. Your answer is, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

And let me ask you a question. How many permanent jobs is this going to create? I see here that it says it'll create a thousand jobs and, you know, two hundred full-time jobs, but how many permanent jobs will actually be created from this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

The number projected is two hundred and twenty permanent jobs, but that doesn't take to -- into account the -- the growth and the jobs that will be created by those two hundred and twenty workers, by those truck drivers that are coming in. It'll also create jobs in the communities for the need for restaurants, for gas, for places to stay. So, in the aggregate, it actually creates many, many more jobs than that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

One final question. I -- I'm still -- I still am a little bit wary when it comes to entering into a contract for over thirty years, but this is something that in your community is something that's needed. And when will the actual construction

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and -- or, the job really start? Would it start in the next year? You know, longer than that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

should start immediately if we can pass this legislation. The jobs -- or, the construction won't work, but -- they're still in the process of ensuring that they have the best, most modern up-to-date permits to allow them to sequester eighty-five percent of these -- these carbon dioxides. So the job will start within the near future. They're projecting that it will take maybe from now till 2016 to get this facility up and running. So those construction jobs will be there for a while. It also has the -- when you -- when you talk about jobs, it's not just the construction of the site itself, this is a -a brownfield, so there's cleanup that has to be done. there's a lot of preparation and a lot of jobs created in -- in all those different kinds of markets as we go forward. And -and you're absolutely correct - we keep bringing this back and -- back and forth and we've fine-tuned it and so it's not the last minute. It's a question of there were some concerns and over the past six months those concerns have been addressed. CUB, which you know has been the watchdog on utilities and services with gas and electricity and for the consumer, is -- is neutral on the bill. So there has been a lot of work done to ensure that the protections for the individuals are there, that those cost estimates are realistic, that the safety features that are necessary to ensure that we're not polluting the community are in place. It's now time for us to go forward so

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

we don't have to keep coming back and forth.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Any other discussion? Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, Senator Trotter, did you want to close? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

...President, yes. Mr. President, I -- I agree with everyone. It is time that we start. I agree certainly with my colleague on the other side that we -- we do need a comprehensive plan. There are plans out here. But we can -can plan for the rest of our lives. This is not new technology. It's -- it's cutting edge, but it's not new. Other states has this technology, are doing this. It's over in Indiana, other states throughout the country. I think, believe, it's in Texas So this isn't a "let's check it out and see if it works" technology. It's time for us to realize that one of our best resources, one of our -- and certainly one of our biggest resources is coal here in the State of Illinois. guarantees that some of our coal -- some of our -- and -- and it's actually the law can't say, Illinois coal, but we know that the makeup of the coal, the phosphorus level of the coal, is -will -- that we produce here in the State of Illinois will be used. So it's not only putting people to work in my community on the southeast side of Chicago, but it's also putting people to work in southern Illinois. So when you talk about, again, the aggregate amount of jobs created, the wealth that this is going to generate, this is the plan, and I'd like for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

The question is -- the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1533. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 voting Yea, 16 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1533, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Harmon in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, continuing on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrences, on your Supplemental Calendar No. 3 is Senate Bill 1672. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1672.

Filed by Senator Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Raoul, to explain your motion.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Amendment 1 puts all retirement systems in compliance with the federal Heroes Earnings Assistant {sic} (Assistance) and Relief Tax Act, otherwise known as the HEART Act. The HEART Act provides tax benefits and incentives for military personnel. In regards to pensions, the HEART Act provides tax-qualified pension plans to entitle survivors of plan participants who die while on active military duty to

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

additional benefits and benefit accruals provided under such plans for participants who resume and then terminate employment due to death. Perhaps not germane to the bill, Mr. President, since it is 9:30 on May 31st and my wife and children are online watching, I just wanted to say - Good night. I love you and I'll be home tomorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Is there any discussion or anyone else wanting to say good night to their children? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur... Senator Jones, did... All right. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1672. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional amendment {sic}, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1672. And the bill is declared passed. Continuing on Supplemental Calendar No. 3, Senate Bill 1802. Senator Steans. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1802.

Filed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Steans, on the motion.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1802 allows the Department of Healthcare and Family

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Services and Human Services to implement various program changes operate under the Fiscal they need to appropriations. Department of Human Services can make rate adjustments only by rule for Mental Health, Developmental Disability, DASA, CHP, and DORS programs. It also enables DHS to collect fees on a sliding scale from students at the Illinois School for the Deaf and the Visually Impaired. They've worked with the parents and the school administrators that are -they're neutral on the bill. It also enables the Department of Public Health to maintain a waiting list for the ADAP program. And the Department of Healthcare and Family Services - it makes some changes to the prompt payment rules, enables the Department to start some co-payments, and make some changes to the pharmacy payment process and the hospital assessment programs, as well as gives them some ability to have flexibility in the Illinois Cares Rx program that enables them to work within the fifty percent of the program that we restored when the Governor's budget had cut it entirely. Would be happy to answer any questions and would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the motion, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the motion, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of the lady's motion to concur. As

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the Senator has already laid out, these are a laundry list of other tools and mechanisms that we and the Department can use to continue to tighten this program that continues to grow at a -- a significant rate and also provide for greater efficiencies in that program. I would urge a Yes vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1802. 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 57 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1802, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1831. Senator Raoul. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1831.

Filed by Senator Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Raoul, on the motion.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1831, as amended by the House, contains many changes to the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. These include: provisions from three House bills which have already passed both Chambers this Session -

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

House Bills 1471, 1956 and -- 3253; various disclosure requirements, removes certain boards and commissions from IMRF eligibility, and a provision requiring IMRF employers to pay for the present value of any pension benefits given to employees resulting from a greater than six percent raise; language exempting Rosemont employees from IMRF; language involving auxiliary police officers working under IMRF.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Duffy, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DUFFY:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the bill, Senator.

SENATOR DUFFY:

I'd like to commend the sponsor on this bill. This bill, a provision of it, eliminates eleven State boards and commissions pensions plans. So, thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Any further discussion? Senator Link, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LINK:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Senator Raoul, in House Amendment 1, are you allowing the police and pension -- fire pension boards to go under IRMF $\{sic\}$ (IMRF)?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

House Amendment 1 did. House Amendment 3 took it out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Link. Thank you, Senator. Further -- any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1831. 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 55 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and No. 3 to Senate Bill 1831, and the bill is declared passed. At the top of page 2 of your Supplemental Calendar is Senate Bill 1852. Senator Luechtefeld. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1852.

Filed by Senator Luechtefeld.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Luechtefeld, on the motion.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President. This -- 1852 basically is an attempt to set some guidelines for farmers' markets throughout the State. A task force has been set up with the Department of Public Health to do that. This particular amendment just added another member to that task force, I think Lieutenant Governor

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Sheila Simon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1852. All in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1852, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1918. Senator Trotter. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1918.

Filed by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Trotter, on the motion.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1918, as amended by House Amendment No. 2, requires money appropriated for grants to local tourism and convention bureaus through the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity be divided starting in FY'12 with eighteen percent being directed to the Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau and eighty-two percent going to convention and tourism bureaus throughout the State according to the population-based formula.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1918. All in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1918, and the bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 2062. Senator Sullivan. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2062.

Filed by Senator Sullivan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sullivan, on the motion.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The original Clean Coal for -- FutureGen project expired earlier this year. With this amendment, it's designed to minimize the State's exposure to liability and provide a sufficient liability protection to enable the project to move forward. It sets forth mechanisms to reduce the State's exposure to liability as an operator. Further, the -- the operator will retain title and liability for an additional ten years after the operating period concludes. That's -- that's basically in Amendment 3. Amendment 4 says that the -- the actual sunset if construction on the FutureGen Project has not begun within five years of the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

effective date, and then it gets into an area with regard to the Illinois Power Agency and it places that agency and its staff under the jurisdiction of the Executive Ethics Commission. The Director of the IPA -- IPA will be appointed by that Commission, subject to Senate confirmation. And be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Sullivan, we addressed this issue of the Illinois Power Agency and the Executive Ethics Commission new oversight roles, a role which clearly wasn't in the bill that you sent over into the House. I asked at that time if you had any feel for why the House had added that. You weren't clear at the time. I wonder if you have any new information.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Yes, Senator, I -- actually I think I have some clarity on that issue. I -- I talked to some of the Members over in the House. And a few years ago -- a couple years ago, we passed procurement reform and put the procurement -- much of the procurement process under the Executive -- or Ethics -- Executive Ethics Commission. And because the Illinois Power

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Agency also is a procurement entity and purchases power, procures power, the House felt that this should also be under that entity as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Sullivan, were -- were any of these changes discussed with you prior -- I'm under the impression they weren't, because in committee you didn't seem to have an answer. What troubles me is, is that -- I mean, this is a significant change and I think that you would agree with that. And I -- I guess I'd like to hear your thoughts on, after you've heard the explanation from someone in the House, whether you think that that is -- that's an appropriate change for us to make.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Well, I was - as I said in committee - was not a part of the discussions with regard to this aspect of the Power Agency, but I will say that the FutureGen Alliance folks were. They're the ones that were working on the bill with Members of the House. They were aware of the discussions that took place over there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the motion, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

To the motion, Senator.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going -- I'm going to support the gentleman's motion to concur here. I -- I do -- I'm a little bothered by this language which kind of popped up over in the House and brought over, and apparently know one in the Senate was consulted on this. This is a major change with regards to oversight; however, I do agree there's some symmetry with the fact that the Executive Ethics Commission has a lot of oversight when it comes to procurement and the Power Agency is, in fact, a procurement agency. With that, I would urge a Yes vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2062. All 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 voting Aye, 1 voting No, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2062, and the bill is declared passed. The last item on Supplemental Calendar No. 3 is Senate Bill 2162. Senator Clayborne -- I'm sorry, 2168. Senator Clayborne. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2168.

Filed by Senator Clayborne.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Clayborne, on the motion.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President. 2168 just adds the -- the City of Peoria to the Rivers Edge Development {sic} (River Edge Redevelopment) and makes the tax credit -- historic tax credit consistent with the federal tax credit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2168. All in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2168, and the bill is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to return to Senate Supplemental Calendar No. 1. On the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence is Senate Bill 2288. Senator Hutchinson, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2288.

Filed by Senator Hutchinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Senator Hutchinson, to explain your motion.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bill -- I'm sorry, Senate Bill 2288 is an initiative of a company in Indiana that wants to locate into Chicago Heights and recycle municipal waste. House Amendment No. 1 allows -- or specifies that the USEPA or Pollution Control Board shall make the formal compliance determinations and grants rulemaking authority to the Board. This was drafted in response to concerns of the IEPA and incorporates the agency's suggestions. As I understand it, most folks are neutral on this now and I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HARMON)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2288. All in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 2 voting No, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2288, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Sullivan in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, if you'll turn to page 58 of the printed Calendar, on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 1717. Senator Harmon. Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1717 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1717. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator -- Senator Harmon, to present your amendment.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment is a new provision to the bill. It -- it also amends the -- the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. This is a -- a clarification of the revolving door provision relating to folks moving from one government to another government... I'm sorry, Mr. President, I'm getting ahead of myself. I have two amendments. In -- in sequence here, the first amendment is an amendment to -- also to the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. It governs -- it's the same subject matter as the House bill, but it does it in a slightly more refined way. It provides for the freezing or the divestiture of election funds held by boards and commission members. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, 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?

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon, on Amendment 2.

SENATOR HARMON:

SECRETARY ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Now I'm with the program here. This is also an amendment to -- to the same Act and it's a clarification on the revolving door prohibitions to permit an

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

employee to move from -- employment with one government to another government, even if there's intergovernmental agreement between the two. I'd ask for your -- I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on Amendment 2? Seeing none, 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 ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 1717. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1717.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The bill is now the combination of the two amendments I presented - a change in the -- the revolving door prohibition and the freezing or divestiture of election funds held by members of boards and commissions. Not aware of any opposition and I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 1717 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 1717, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing on the Calendar, we're still on page 58 of the printed Calendar, House Bills 3rd Reading, is House Bill 1719. Senator Raoul. Indicates he'd like to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you. House Bill 1719 -- you know, we just passed Senate Bill 1831, as amended by the House. 1719 was what the underlying bill in 1831 was, which we passed out of here unanimously. It amends the Chicago Teachers Pension Fund Article by updating the way the pension credit is awarded. Currently, there is a five-day/ten-day rule in which a teacher can -- who works five out of ten days receives a two-week pension credit. If a teacher works less than the five days, he -- he or she receives no credit. 1719 will move the calculation to a one-day/one-day rule to ensure that a day's pay equals a day's credit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 1719 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 1719, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 2188.

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

House Amendment 1.

Passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. 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 passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 42.

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

House Amendment 1, 2 and 3.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 335, with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3; and Senate Bill 1914, with House Amendments 3 and 4. They all passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 63.

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

House Amendment 1 and House Amendment 3.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2169, with House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4; and Senate Bill 2405, with House Amendments 1 and 2. They all passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I have Senator Hutchinson standing directly behind me and she has noted for the record that we are now officially done

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

with the May baby birthday month. So I would officially like to note that in two hours and fifteen minutes, we begin the June baby birthday month and Senator Kirk Dillard hopes he's not on the Floor at midnight to celebrate his June 1st birthday.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Happy birthday. Ladies and Gentlemen, will all the members on the Committee on Assignments please come to the Anteroom? Committee on Assignments will be meeting immediately in the Anteroom. Will all the members of the Committee on Assignments please come to the Anteroom? The Senate will stand at ease. (at ease) The Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to the Executive Committee - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 42, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 63; Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 335, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1914, Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2169, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2293, and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2405.

Signed by Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention for some committee announcements. The following committee will meet to take up concurrences: The Executive Committee will meet

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

tonight at 11:01 p.m. That will be in Room 212. The Executive, tonight at 11:01 in Room 212. Senator Schoenberg in the Chair. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senate will come to order. Will all House Members please retire to the rear of the Chamber, where you belong? All House Members... Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 620.

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

House Amendment 1 and 3.

It passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR MURPHY:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I was just rising to ask if we could slow down for a moment to allow my personal paperwork to catch up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Supplemental Calendar No. 4 has been printed and

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

distributed. On the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bill 1914. Senator John Sullivan. He wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1914.

Filed by Senator Sullivan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Amendment 4, the concurrence, provides that a property owner is not authorized to use purple marks on trees or posts if doing so would violate any law, rule, ordinance, order, covenant, bylaw, declaration, regulation, restriction, contract, or instrument.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Sullivan, do you wish to close? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1914. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 48 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1914, and the bill is declared passed. We'll next proceed -- Secretary's Desk, Senate Bills, Concurrence. Senate Bill 2293. Senator Frerichs. He wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2293.

Filed by Senator Frerichs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2293, as amended by the House, creates two new income tax checkoff boxes and corresponding funds. Taxpayers are able to direct a portion of their income fund -- tax refund to certain charitable causes. The Illinois State Crime Stoppers Association Fund and the Criminal Justice Information Authority to make grants to the Illinois Crime Stoppers Fund {sic} (Association) and the After-School Rescue Fund. I'd answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Frerichs, do you wish to close? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2293. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2293, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Murphy, your personal paperwork is in order. For what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Purposes of announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your announcement.

SENATOR MURPHY:

The Senate Republicans request a twenty-minute caucus immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Contrary to the overwhelming sentiment in this Chamber, Senator Murphy, that request is always in order. The Senate Republicans have moved to recess the Senate for the purposes of a twenty-minute caucus. Seeing no objection, the -- motion to recess is granted. The Senate now stands in recess until after the Senate Executive Committee.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The Senate will come to order. Will all Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor? All Members in their office please come to the Senate Floor. Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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 1556.

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 1 and 2.

I have a like Message on Senate Bill 1968, with House Amendments 2 and 3. They both passed the House, as amended, May 31st, 2011. 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 refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 2189.

Which amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment 1.

Non-concurred in by the House, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 42 and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 63, both recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, shortly -- shortly we will be going to Supplemental Calendar No. 5. I believe it's being distributed, with Concurrence of Senate Bills. We'll be going to that just momentarily. Ladies and Gentlemen, as I just indicated earlier, we are on Supplemental Calendar No. 5, Secretary's Desk, Concurrences on Senate Bills. And we have

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senate Bill 42. Senator Haine. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 42.

Filed by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Do I want to table Amendments 1 and 2? Okay, I don't. Thank you. This is a bill that's emanated from a need of Olin Brass Corporation, in my district and Representative Beiser's district, to be able to take large trucks bearing huge brass things across a highway. It only applies -- it applies to Madison County because the Secretary of Transportation, whose staff drafted this bill, will be the one to determine that. It just gets them there. They have a plant separated by a five-mile road.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 42. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 42, having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 42, and the bill is declared passed. Next on the Calendar

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

is Senate Bill 63. President Cullerton. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 63.

Filed by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a bill that's sponsored by Representative Cross in the House, myself in the Senate, in response to the growing population out in Kane and Kendall County. Representative Cross asked me to sponsor this bill. It divides the current 16th District, which is Kane, DeKalb and Kendall, and it puts it into the 16th Judicial Circuit, just Kane. And then the two other counties would be the 23rd, a new judicial circuit. That would be those two counties, DeKalb and Kendall. Provides that the 16th Judicial Circuit shall have four subcircuit districts, instead of five, with two subcircuit judgeships in each district. Currently, there's only one in each district. And the boundaries of the current Subcircuit 3 are reconfigured to include the portions of Kane not in the subcircuit. It does create one new judgeship in Kane County, which will be filled in the second subcircuit in 2012 general election. It also creates one additional resident judgeship for Kendall County, the fastest-growing county in Illinois. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, so there's a total of two new judges overall and the rest of this is reorganization. Is that a fair characterization?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 63. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 63, and the bill is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental Calendar No. 4 is Senate Bill 335. Senator Steans. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

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

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Amendments 2 and 3 $\{sic\}$ (1, 2 and 3) to Senate Bill 335. Filed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill is -- deletes all, becomes the bill with this amendment, and is the budget implementation or BIMP Act. Makes various fund transfers and other substantive changes necessary to implement the Fiscal Year '12 budget. This is our BIMP bill that we do every year to implement the appropriations bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Senator, this includes implementation language pertaining to House Bill 2934, which was the interfund transfer that we reached across the aisle to work with you on with certain agreements that have absolutely thoroughly been violated by this bill. Does -- does this bill, as amended by the House, extend from one month to eighteen months -- does this bill extend from one month to eighteen months the period of time that the Governor has to pay back the interfund borrowing that had been authorized in House Bill 2934?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR STEANS:

It allows the interfund borrowing that we authorized last year to be deposited into the Healthcare -- the Healthcare Fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

So what happened to the agreement we made on House Bill 2934, where we all agreed to authorize one month of narrow interfund borrowing if agreed to by the Governor, the Treasurer and the Comptroller?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

This doesn't impact that agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

How does it not affect it when that agreement allowed for one month of borrowing if the -- if the Governor, the Treasurer and the Comptroller authorized it and narrowed it and eliminated the Road Fund and State Construction Account Funds from being borrowed from, which was all in House Bill 2934 that I asked the people on our side of the aisle to support with the understanding that that would -- be how we addressed the Medicaid bills and now this bill completely unravels that? How does it not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I do understand that there may have been a drafting error in this and it may have occurred that way. We'll ask for an amendatory veto to rectify that if that's the situation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

A drafting error? I get that it's the House, but you decided to call it - a drafting error? He added an eight after the one in months. He -- he curiously scratched off the -- the -- the Treasurer and the Comptroller from having any say over this and, not coincidentally, totally changed which funds can be raided. That is one heck of a drafting... Have you ever seen a drafting error that specific?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

I think they may have done it so we got to hear you pontificate on this tonight, Senator Murphy. It's very enjoyable. I do -- we really, truly, will ask for an amendatory veto on this to fix it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I understand it's late and I understand that you didn't draft this, but the truth of the matter is this was a deal. And I did stand up here and ask colleagues, who don't typically trust people very much, to vote for this and they did. And this is a billion dollars almost of our money. We walked out on that limb and just got it cut off behind us. And I appreciate the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

effort and the statement that you're going to ask for an amendatory veto, but I suspect the person who had something to do with the writing of this and this convenient scrivener's error in the House may not give you that amendatory veto. And we're not in a position to put votes on this, because this -- this really goes back on an agreement we had that was pretty fundamental and is extremely disappointing. And I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. Senator Steans, it appears from a cursory look at the amendment that the Local Government Distributive Fund that all of our mayors and our village presidents have been so concerned about, that remains intact?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

That is absolutely correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

However, it also does appear that the personal property replacement tax revenue has been reduced somewhat. Can you tell me in what amount it has been reduced and what those moneys have

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

been reallocated for?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

The -- the amount is for county stipends in the Department of Revenue. Waiting a moment to get what the actual amount is. It's revenue neutral. They're using the PPRT replacement tax, rather than GRF, to make the county stipend payments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

My understanding, though, is the personal property tax replacement comes from the locals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

And that amount would be that the locals are not giving? How much is that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

And -- and I -- I also want to note that it does also go back to the local governmental entities to pay these stipends. And he -- they are trying to look up the actual amount. I don't -- I don't have that right now, Senator Althoff.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I -- I would -- again, I would appreciate if they could get that number so that it is in the record so that our locals do understand exactly what is being reduced from them. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

It's about fifteen million dollars, Senator Althoff. And, just again, this is revenue neutral. I mean, this was coming from GRF before. We're now doing it from here instead and it is going back to the locals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 335. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 32 voting Aye, 24 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 335, and the bill is declared passed. Continuing... Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental Calendar No. 2 that was distributed earlier. Supplemental Calendar No. 2, Secretary's Desk, Resolutions -- no, excuse me, Secretary's Concurrence on Senate Bills, and we have Senate Bill 2172. President Cullerton. Madam Secretary, please read the motion. SECRETARY ROCK:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2172.

Filed by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This amendment becomes the bill. Extends the end of the Fiscal Year 2011 lapse period to December 31st, 2011. All liabilities payable from Fiscal Year '11 appropriations during the extended lapse period must still be received by the Comptroller by the end of the normal lapse period, or August 31st. This is what we also did last year. We extended it, and during that period, approximately four billion dollars in Fiscal Year '10 liabilities were paid by the Comptroller's Office. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none -- Senator Althoff, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I just would like to speak in favor of this piece of legislation. In fact, I rise to support it. I think this Chamber made a wise decision in not engaging in borrowing and we do need tools to ensure that our bills are paid and I think this is a wise measure. And I would encourage an Aye vote.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2172. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 44 voting Aye, 13 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2172, and the bill is declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar No. 4, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence on Senate Bills, we have Senate Bill 2405. Senator Steans. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2405.

Filed by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This -2405 now makes Fiscal Year '11 supplemental appropriations for
Medicaid assistance and also contains cleanups to the House
Bills 2168 and 3700, the recent appropriation bills we passed,
which referenced the incorrect end date for the fiscal year.
The Amendment No. 2 appropriates an additional 1.38 billion
dollars from the Healthcare Provider Relief Fund to the
Department of Healthcare and Family Services. This allows us to
accelerate payment for Medicaid claims to take advantage of the

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

enhanced ARRA match - federal matching dollars at sixty-two percent that ends at that end of June and reverts back to fifty percent. So doing this will help us gain an additional ninety to hundred million dollars we estimate from the federal government.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she'll yield. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Senator, this is the appropriation of the money that you're going to get from the interfund borrowing from the deal that was broken. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

What I would say is that this is the appropriation for the money from the interfund borrowing. We will try to rectify it so it's not a deal broken. But that is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

The -- the BIMP bill, with what I would characterize as the broken deal in it, has an effective date of July 1, 2011, which is Fiscal Year '12. Isn't that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

So if you can't borrow the money under the broken deal legislation until July 1, which is next year, why do you need a supplemental appropriation in Fiscal Year '11 to spend money that you don't have the right to borrow until Fiscal Year '12? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

We have a trailer bill that's correcting the effective date so that we can start doing the borrowing now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

So you have a trailer bill that if -- that changes the effective date. Does it also change the previously referenced drafting errors of eliminating the Treasurer and the Comptroller from having any say over the borrowing? Does it also eliminate the change to extend the borrowing to eighteen months from one month, and does it go back to the original deal we struck that limits the funds from which the borrowing can occur? Are all of those other things -- since we have a trailer bill and we don't have to wait for an amendatory veto, I assume all of those things are going to be in that trailer bill. Is that an accurate statement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Sadly, the House also did the trailer bill and they unfortunately missed making that correction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

So, yet again, the House dictates to the Senate. Is that what you're telling me, Senator? One last dictation from the Speaker of the House to those of you on the other side of aisle and all we get to do is laugh and say, "Aw shucks", about it. The Speaker pulled one on us again and I guess we'll just take it. Is that an accurate assessment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Well, I would say Speaker Madigan and Leader Tom Cross had something to do with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion, Senator Murphy? Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I know this is going to come as a shock, but I'm going to urge a No vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Seeing none, the question -- the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2405. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 35 voting Aye, 22 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill -- 2405, and the bill is declared passed. The Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet. Members of the Committee on Assignments will come to the President's Anteroom immediately. The Senate stands at ease. (at ease) Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Be Approved for Consideration - Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 620 and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1968.

Signed by Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, Supplemental Calendar No. 6 is being distributed. I believe it has been actually distributed. On the Order of Concurrence, Senate Bills, we have Senate Bill 620. Senate Bill 620 coming up on the board. There it is. Senator Martinez. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 620.

Filed by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I'm going to take it out of the record for a minute. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Out of the record. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 6, still on Concurrence of Senate Bill {sic}, we have Senate Bill 1968. Leader Clayborne. Leader Clayborne. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1968.

Filed by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you. This bill ensures that only the Section regarding cash flow borrowing and general fund's liquidity takes effect immediately, instead of July 1st, 2011.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he'll yield. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I feel so much better now. Now, this is the second opportunity to try and halt the process that admittedly the House started of violating an agreement between the two sides of the aisle in this Chamber. The passage of this bill essentially seals the breaking of the deal on House Bill 2934. So I'm going to ask you if you'll consider pulling this out of the record for

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the integrity of your side of the aisle and for the benefit of the ability in the future to enter into good faith agreements.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

It sounds like a great request, but, no, we're not going to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

To the bill, Mr. President. The -- I guess the party of No has spoken. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1968. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 34 voting Aye, 22 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 2 and 3 on Senate Bill 1968, and the bill is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar No. 4, Concurrence on Senate Bills, is Senate Bill 2169. Leader Clayborne. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2169.

Filed by Senator Clayborne.

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a bill that we've passed numerous times in the past. We've made certain changes that have brought Citizens Utility Board and the Attorney General's Office to a position of neutral. And it will create two thousand union construction jobs and over seven hundred permanent coal mining jobs, with a total investment in excess of ten billion dollars. This is a jobs bill. I would ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Any discussion? Senator John O. Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the motion, Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

I -- I rise in strong support of Senate Bill -- 2169. As Senator Clayborne said, and Senator Forby would also say, "This is a jobs bill", you know, and it is. But I tell you what, what you need to understand about this bill, there -- it was vetoed by the Governor and we didn't -- we didn't have an opportunity to override his veto. He recommended some changes. We made those changes, and -- and, quite frankly, the consumers, regardless of whether it's individuals or businesses, will not see an increase in their gas rates because of Power Holdings. So I would strongly recommend an Aye vote on this, and thank

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Jones. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2169. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 38 voting Aye, 16 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 2169, and the bill is declared passed. Ladies -- Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental Calendar No. 6, we have Senate Bill 620. Senator Martinez. Madam Secretary, please read the motion.

SECRETARY ROCK:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 620.

Filed by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Amendments 1 and 3 amends the School Code to implement the findings and recommendations of the Chicago Educational Facilities Task Force. It allows the Task Force to continue meeting to report to the GA on CPS compliance with the new facilities-related requirements. As amended, it maintains the following provisions: students' protection in the wake of school closures, phase-outs, and co-locations; ten-year

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Facilities {sic} (Facility) Master Plan; five-year Capital Improvement Plan; transparent budget -- budgeting; establishment of facility standards; and public comment requirements for CPS facility-related decision. This has been agreed to by the City of Chicago. So we have a perfect bill or close to a perfect bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Any discussion? Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. We had some problems with this bill early on, I think with the amendments. I -- I would advise -- or, hopefully this side of the aisle would vote for this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 620. 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, the Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 620, and the bill is declared passed. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

Point of personal privilege and to correct the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point.

SENATOR HAINE:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mr. President, because of my -- the late hour, my great affection for the Majority Leader, Senator Clayborne, and my usual positive view of life, I mistakenly voted Aye on 2169 and I wish to be a negative voice. I know it's tough for me, but would you correct the record, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, the record will so reflect your intention. President Cullerton, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Purposes of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention, President Cullerton has an announcement. President Cullerton. SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I believe we have completed our work for the evening. I want to thank everyone and the staff for all their hard work this year. We -- we have -- we have accomplished a lot in this last few months. We've restored the constitutional balance of powers relating to the advice and consent process of the Senate. We've passed some historic school reform bills. We passed the workers' comp bill. And we have also passed a balanced, but incomplete budget. So I want to thank everybody for their -- their hard work. And I can't tell you when we're going to come back. You do have the schedule for the Veto Session. It may be before that, though. So thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Mr. President. Madam Secretary, Resolutions. SECRETARY ROCK:

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senate Resolution 262, offered by Senator Mulroe. It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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

SECRETARY ROCK:

No objections have been filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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

SECRETARY ROCK:

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

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

House Joint Resolution 34.

Offered by Senator Hunter. Adopted by the House, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House. It is substantive, Mr. President.

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint

58th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 39.

(Secretary reads HJR No. 39)

It was adopted by the House, May 31st, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House. Offered by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

On the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 39. Madam Secretary, read the resolution. Senator Clayborne moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 39. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Senator Clayborne moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 39. All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. President Cullerton in the Chair.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Pursuant to the adjournment resolution, the Senate now stands adjourned to the call of the President.