22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 91st General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? Our prayer today will be given by Rabbi Barry Marks, Temple Israel, Springfield, Illinois. Rabbi Marks.

RABBI BARRY MARKS:

(Prayer by Rabbi Barry Marks)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Sieben).

SENATOR SIEBEN:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Sieben.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal. Senator Myers.

SENATOR MYERS:

...President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Tuesday, March 16th, and Wednesday, March 17th, in the year 1999, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Myers moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcript. There being no objection, so ordered. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Tom Walsh, Chair of the Committee on State Government Operations, reports Senate Bills 805, 848, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1125 and 1148 Do Pass; Senate Bills 180, 311, 359, 1158, 1174 and 1207 Do Pass, as Amended; and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 70 Be Approved for Consideration.

Senator Klemm, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Bills 928, 1163 and 1227 Do Pass; and Senate Bills 349, 412, 916, 968, 997, 1033, 1087 and 1104 Do Pass, as Amended;

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senate Resolution 41 Be Adopted, as Amended.

Senator Peterson, Chair of the Committee on Revenue, reports Senate Bills 284, 373, 434, 468, 545, 546, 548, 878, 946, 1025 and 1144 Do Pass; and Senate Bills 11, 35, 40, 132, 227, 338, 376, 417, 641, 802, 861, 1032, 1082 and 1118 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Burzynski, Chair of the Committee on Licensed Activities, reports Senate Bill 239 Do Pass; and Senate Bills 68, 124, 125, 238, 435, 445, 487 and 736 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Madigan, Chair of the Committee on Insurance and Pensions, reports Senate Bills 211, 945, 1047, 1103 and 1146 Do Pass.

And Senator Lauzen, Chair of the Committee on Commerce and Industry, reports Senate Bills 962, 981, 990 and 1182 Do Pass; Senate Bills 272, 812 and 834 Do Pass, as Amended; and Senate Resolution 50 Be Adopted, as Amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Messages. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the President, dated March 18th, 1999.

Dear Mr. Secretary - Pursuant to Senate Rule 2-10, I hereby revise the Senate Schedule for the week of March 22nd. Please be advised that the Senate will be in Session on Monday, March the 22nd, and will convene at the hour of 4 o'clock p.m. that day.

Signed by President Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bills 80, 152, 254, 530, 779, 860, 887, 1401, 2125, 2187, 2677, 61, 287, 402, 517, 720, 882, 1730, 2044, 2631, 2640, 2680, 2723, 274, 1893, 2845 and 2847.

All passed the House, March 17th, 1999.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 66, by Senators Hawkinson and Shadid and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 25, offered by Senator Luechtefeld. It's substantive.

And Senate Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment, 26, offered by Senator Obama.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

It's the intention of the Chair, we're going to go to page 2 of the Calendar and start at the top with 2nd Reading, Senate Bills. Might advise everyone that -- get your legislation in final passage status, and I would suggest you move your bills to 3rd Reading as soon as possible. So we're going to start right at the top. Senator O'Malley has got the first bill out of the chute, and he's out of the record. Senate Bill 13. Senator Syverson? Senator Syverson, are you on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 23. Senator Mahar? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 23.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Environment and Energy adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 24. Senator Mahar? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 24.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 25. Senator Jacobs? Out of the record. Senate Bill 26. Senator Petka? Senator Petka on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 29. Senator Parker? Out of the record. Senate Bill 31. Senator Sieben. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 31.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Sieben.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 1 is a

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

clarifying amendment to add the words "on a roadway on school property". It was approved by the committee. It was the recommendation of the Transportation Committee that those words be added. There's no opposition, and I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator O'Malley, on Senate Bill 32. Out of the record. Senator Parker, on 46? Out of the record. Senator Sieben, on 71? Out of the record. All the remaining bills till -- on page 2, except for Senator del Valle, are out of the record. Senator del Valle, on 79. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY HARRY:

...Bill 79.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Commerce and Industry adopted two amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator del Valle, on Senate Bill 80? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senate Bill 80.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Geo-Karis? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary. Senate Bill 84.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 84.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 101. Senator Parker? Out of the record. Senate Bill 111. Senator Clayborne? James Clayborne. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 111.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 113. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 139. Senator O'Malley? Out of the record. Senate Bill 171. Senator Klemm? Senator Klemm on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 175. Senator Klemm. Out of the record. 177. Senator Mahar? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 177.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 185. Senator Syverson? Dave Syverson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 202. Senator Welch. Senator Pat Welch, are you on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 204. Senator Rauschenberger? Out of the record. Senate Bill 206. Senator Radogno? 206. Out of the record. Senate Bill 223. Senator Halvorson? Out of the record. Senator Larry Walsh. Larry Walsh, you -- out of the Bill 224. record. Senate Bill 230. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 235. Senator Dudycz? Out of the record. Senate Bill Senate Bill 277. 268. Senator Parker? Out of the record. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. Senator Cronin, on Senate Bill 282. Out of the record. Senate Bill 286. Senator DeLeo. Do you wish your bill called, sir? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 286.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill -- Senator Demuzio, for what purpose

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

do you rise, sir?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

State your point.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I'd like to recognize, for all of those that -- when we heard all those cheerful good-byes and everything from Howie Carroll, he's back. I'd like to recognize Howie Carroll's back. Nice to have you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Good to have you back, Howie. Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I would like to recognize in the President's Gallery, Erica Harold, who is Miss East Central Illinois, on her way to the Miss America {sic} Pageant that's going to be held in Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois, on June 17th through 19th. She has a platform of abstinence education, and she's joined today by Virginia Nurmi. So I'd like to wish her the best in her competition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Very good. Would you -- our guests in the galleries please rise? And best of luck. Senator Cronin? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary. Senate Bill 291.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 291.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd. Senate Bill 293. Senator Burzynski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 307. Senator Mahar? Senator Mahar on the Floor? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 307.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 323. Senator Parker? Kathy Parker. Senate Bill 323. Out of the record. Senate Bill 330. Senator Link? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 330.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted two amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 336. Senator Maitland? Senator Maitland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 363. Tom Walsh. Senator Tom Walsh? Out of the record. Senate Bill 374. Senator

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Larry Walsh. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 374.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 385. Senator Rauschenberger? 385, sir. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 385.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Environment and Energy adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 395. Senator Parker. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 395.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 397. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 397.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 423. Senator Maitland? Out of the record. Senate Bill 427. Senator Radogno? Out of the record. Senate Bill 430. Senator Bomke? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 430.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Bomke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bomke, on Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 simply -- merely deletes a June 30th, 1999, repealer date and replaces it with a September 30th, 1999, date.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Syverson? Senator Syverson, on Senate Bill 457? Out of the record. Senate Bill 460. Senator Silverstein? Senator Silverstein. Out of the record. Excuse me. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 460.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 469. Senator Sieben. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 469.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 477. Senator Parker? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 477.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. Committee on Judiciary adopted one

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senate Bill 483. Senator -- 3rd Reading. Pardon me. 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 483. Senator Radogno? 483, ma'am. Out of the record. Senator Geo-Karis, on 486. Please read the bill. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 486.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 498. Senator Rauschenberger? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 498.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Public Health and Welfare adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

There any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 503. Senator Cronin. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 503.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 507. Senator Dillard? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 507.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 509. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 527. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 529. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 550. Senator Dudycz? Out of the record. Senate Bill 554. Senator Cronin. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 554.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 556. Out of the record. Senate Bill 563. Senator Radogno? Out of the record. Senate Bill 566. Senator Halvorson? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 566.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson?

SENATOR HALVORSON:

There should be a Floor...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Halvorson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Secretary of State bill deals with a few changes in the franchise tax administration. The Taxpayers' Federation had a few concerns in their interpretation of what these changes would do and requested that they be removed. So this amendment removes their concerns, and I know of no other opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Weaver. Senator Weaver. Any discussion? You've heard the motion. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise for the purpose of an announcement. If I could have the Body's attention. Rules Committee will be meeting in the morning, so I would suggest that all of you who have Floor amendments, get those amendments filed with the Secretary today so we may act on 'em tomorrow, because we're rapidly approaching 3rd Reading. Some of you have amendments. I'm just reiterating: Get 'em filed today so we can act on 'em in the morning. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Moving right along. We're on page 6 of the Calendar, and it's Senator Hawkinson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 575. Senator Dudycz. Senator Dudycz. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 575.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 576. Senator Parker? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 576.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 578. Out of the record. Senate Bill 642. Senator Munoz? Senator -- no. Out of the record. Senate Bill 648. Senator O'Malley? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 652. Senator Cronin? Senator Cronin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 653. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 666. Senator Peterson. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 666.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 672. Senator Radogno? Senator Radogno on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 673. Senator Radogno. Out of the record. Senate Bill 721. Senator

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Bomke? Senator Bomke, you wish your bill to be read, please? Out of the record. Senate Bill 723. Senator Sieben? Out of the record. Senate Bill 724. Out of the record. Senate Bill 728. Senator O'Malley. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 728.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senate Bill 729 -- 3rd Reading. Out of the record. 729 is out of the record. Senate Bill 734. Senator Fawell? Out of the record. Senate Bill 735. Senator Bomke? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 735.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 737. Senator Mahar? Senator Mahar on the Floor? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 737.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Geo-Karis? Please read the bill. 739. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 739.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

... Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 748. Senator Cullerton? John Cullerton on the Floor? Senate Bill 749. Senator Cullerton. John Cullerton on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 753. Senator Radogno? Out of the record. Senate Bill 759. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 760. Senator Parker? Out of the record. Senate Bill 764. Senator Fawell? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 764.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Environment and Energy adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 775. Senator Bomke? Please read the bill -- Oh, I'm sorry. Out of the record. Senate Bill 778. Senator Peterson? Bill Peterson on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 794. Senator Petka? Ed Petka? Out of the record. Senate Bill 795. Senator Petka. Out of the record. Senate Bill 800. Senator Noland? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 800.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Licensed Activities adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Noland.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Noland, on Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR NOLAND:

Mr. President, Floor Amendment No. 2 is merely technical. It involves some capitalization and changes one word from "upon" to "successful". So it's just a technical clean-up amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 824. Senator Noland. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 824.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 826. Senator Klemm? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 826.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 827. Senator Klemm? Please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 827.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 839. Senator Parker? Out of the record. Moving right along to page 8, top of page 8. Senator Parker. 849. Out of the record. Senate Bill 867. Senator

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Noland? 867. Out of the record. Senate Bill 881. Senator Burzynski? Senator Burzynski. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- 890. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 897. Senator Klemm? Out of the record. Senate Bill 906. Senator Jones? Out of the record. Senate Bill 933. Senator Rauschenberger? 933. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 933.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 935. Senator Dillard? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 935.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 936. Senator Dillard. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 936.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Donahue? Senator Donahue, on 937. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 937.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Klemm, on 941. Please read the -- please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 941.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 956. Senator Philip. Pate Philip, would you like your bill called? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 956.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 958. Senator Klemm? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 958.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 966. Senator O'Malley? Pat O'Malley. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 966.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 967. Senator Radogno? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 967.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Environment and Energy adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 980. Senator Emil Jones. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senate Bill 980.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 987. Senator Philip? Senator Pate Philip. 987. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 987.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 989. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1010. Senator Dillard? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1010.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1011. Senator Petka? Senator Petka on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1042. Senator Madigan? Lisa Madigan? Senator Lisa Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1046. Senator Sullivan? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1059. Senator Shadid? Senator Shadid. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1059.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1062. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1070. Senator Sieben? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1070.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1073. Senator Geo-Karis. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1073.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1075. Senator Cronin? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1088. Senator Sullivan? Dave? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1112. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1122. Senator Emil Jones? Senator Jones? Do you wish your bill called, sir? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1128. Senator Parker? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1128.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1129. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1131. Senator Bowles? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1133. Senator O'Malley? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1133.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1136. Senator Molaro? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1136.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, we've got Senate Bill 1141 on the board. This was Senate Bill 1136. Any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 1141. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1141.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1142. Senator Larry Walsh? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1143. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1150. Senator Viverito? Senator Viverito on the Floor? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1150.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1151. Senator Fawell? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1151.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1155. Senator Lauzen? Senator Chris Lauzen on the Floor? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1155.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Transportation adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1168. Senator Berman? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1168.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Education adopted one amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1171. Senator Berman. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1171.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1183. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1184. Senator Demuzio? Senator Demuzio, do you wish your bill called? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1184.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1189. Senator Myers? Please read

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1189.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1192. Senator Cronin? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1199. Senator Maitland? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1202. Senator Myers? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1202.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. We are at the top of page 11, and we are going to proceed with Senate Bills 3rd Reading. I would advise all the Members to be in your chairs. This is final passage. Try to hold down the volume of noise so that we can hear the debate, and we will proceed with Senate Bill 7. Senator O'Malley? Out of the record. Senate Bill 17. Senator Rauschenberger? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 17.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

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

Senate Bill 17 revises the reporting dates for the life safe healthy -- life safe -- the Health/Life Safety Code review group

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

that the State Board is -- currently has convened. We -- the original bill that we passed during Veto Session required them to report by the end of March. They've asked -- they're going to need more time. It simply extends the reporting date.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, this is final passage, and the question is, shall Senate Bill 17 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who voting is open. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting 17, having received Present. Senate Bill the constitutional majority, is declared passed. And didn't vote for his own bill. Senator -- Senator O'Malley, on Senate Bill 19. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 19.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 19 creates the Non-Support Punishment Act and repeals the Non-Support of Spouse and Child {sic} (Children) Act. Creates the offense of failure to support. Defines that defense {sic} in detail. For your information, a first offense under paragraphs (1) or (2) - there are four paragraphs that define how you can commit it - under the first two, it's a Class A misdemeanor. An offense under paragraphs (3) or (4) or a second or subsequent offense is a Class 4 felony. A person convicted of a first offense under paragraphs (1) or (2) who is eligible for the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Earnfare program, would, in lieu of the sentence, be referred to the Earnfare program. Also provides that any action that was commenced under the Act that's being repealed and is pending shall be decided in accordance with the new Act. There was a committee amendment that was added to address a number of concerns that were raised during the subcommittee process. In addition to certain elements of that amendment, I'll recite a few here. Provides that a State's attorney can only bring an enforcement action upon filing of a verified complaint by the person or persons who are receiving support. Provides that the AG may bring an enforcement action upon referral from the Department of Public Aid; and the Department of Public Aid shall notify the person receiving support services prior to bringing the action. If the original support order was entered pursuant to a default judgment, the indictment must specifically allege that the obligor has knowledge of the existence of the order and that the person has the ability to pay the support. Clarifies that restitution shall be ordered and that any amounts paid by the obligor shall be applied first restitution and then to any fines. I'd be happy to answer any questions there may be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Demuzio. Senator Demuzio? SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. If the Senator would yield, like to ask him a question, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Senator O'Malley, where are the Illinois Bankers on this, or the Community Bankers, on this program? Do you know?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any further discussion? Is there any further

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 19 pass. those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 19, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared Senate Bill 20. Senator Rauschenberger? Rauschenberger. Senator Karpiel, on Senate Bill 38? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary. Pardon me. Senator Karpiel wishes Senate Bill 38 returned to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 38. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 38 simply removes the immediate effective date and changes it so that the bill will apply to the 2000 -- year 2000 assessment year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Very good. Everyone has heard the amendment. Any discussion?

If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 39. Senator Bob Madigan. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 39.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR R. MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the -- or, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 39 comes at the request of the City of Havana, asking that the life of their TIF district be extended from twenty-three to thirty-five years. The Havana Community Unit School District is in support of this request of the City of Havana. The legislation is drafted so that it applies only to the City of Havana - no other TIF districts - and I would be glad to answer any questions on Senate Bill 39.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 39 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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, 1 voting No, no voting Present. And Senate Bill 39, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 43. Senator Lauzen? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

Senate Bill 43.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 43 creates a Prostate

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Cancer Research (Fund) checkoff on the personal income tax return. I'd like to thank Jerry Sodaro as the project leader in moving this forward. He's also battling this type of cancer who -- that affects very many men in this State and in the country. I'd also like to thank the many cosponsors in the Senate who have lent their support to this initiative. It passed out of Revenue Committee unanimously, and I would appreciate your support today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 43 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take -- have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, there are -- there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 43, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Sullivan, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

State your point.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we are joined today in the gallery above the Democrat side by students with the Hersey High School orchestra.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? And welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 44. Senator Lauzen? read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 44.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 44 increases the Public Aid funeral rate from six hundred and fifty dollars to a thousand dollars, and increases the burial rate from three hundred and twenty-five dollars to five hundred.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 44 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 44, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 51. Senator Burzynski. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

Senate Bill 51.

SECRETARY HARRY:

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

This bill will allow governmental units that purchase parcels at scavenger sales to use their own checks, rather than having to purchase certified or cashier's checks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 51 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 51, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Radogno asks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 70 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. She — seeing no objection, leave is granted. And on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 70. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Radogno.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you. This amendment simply adds the State's Attorney to the Attorney General as the individual who may bring action against violators of this Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 82. Senator del Valle? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 82.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR del VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill does exactly what is stated on the Calendar. It adds nurse practitioners and home health aides to the list of persons required to report possible child abuse or neglect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 82 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 82, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 85. Senator Klemm. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 85.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 85 amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptions Practice {sic} (Deceptive Business Practices) Act. What it does is makes it unlawful to disclose specific information about what a member of a shopper's club were to purchase and you put that and sell that information to others outside the company's own internal use. This would make that a —an offense. It would clear up the questions that we had about being able to share the information between, say, inventory and different entities of the company, but it would prevent those companies from perhaps telling others what you buy at the grocery

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

store, or how many cans of beer you buy, or toothpaste or anything else, without your permission, type of thing. We did talk to the committee. They wanted to see if we could work out some arrangements that in case people are violating this. The industry and IRMA has said that if there's any violations that come forth, that we would correct this. This at least codifies it. It prevents 'em from doing it, and I think it's a good consumer protection bill and I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Just a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Now, my understanding of the committee action and how we moved this out of the Senate Commerce and Industry Committee was that there was going to be an agreement reached with an amendment that was going to come back to the committee with the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. Has that action been taken?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

We talked to the Retail Merchants, and I talked to several of the Members. They had said they would have had to oppose that type of legislation change. So I said, all right, as long as we have no law that prevents them from doing anything now, that this bill is better than nothing. They said that if we have a problem with it, if you can come up and the consumers have a problem, that they would come up and we would amend the bill and try to change it, but they didn't think there was a problem at this point in time. So the absence of this bill would prevent us from having

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

that protection of that information to be sold to anybody. At least this -- gives us some measure of protection. I wasn't able to reach a total agreement, and I've tried to reach all the members of the committee to tell them about that. I didn't get to you. You were tied up over there...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

All right. Because we have so many more days that we can go through 3rd Reading before the deadline next Friday, would you feel that it'd be appropriate to have that detail? It was a firm commitment made to the members of the committee. First of all, by the way, the concept of your bill, I think, is very good, but, naturally, commitments made to the committee that then lead to the vote of 7 Yes, 1 No, 0 Present, it was based on that understanding. I haven't had the opportunity to go back through to see what IRMA's -- because it passed out based on that assumption. Now that assumption has changed and we haven't been able to check it. I'd respectfully request that you give us the opportunity to button down where that stands now, with all the parties concerned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Well, I -- I have to partially agree with what you've said, because, obviously, I think most of the committee members felt this was a protection that is lacking in the -- in the code and the statutes at this point in time. And I had promised that I would try to sit down and work with both sides to see if we could reach an agreement. I was unable to do that agreement to the effect that you wanted. So I talked to as many members as I could after I was able to find out where we were on this. They said

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

that it's a better bill being passed than it would be without any protection at all. Now, if you want me to hold it for one week while you talk to IRMA to see if you can change it, I'll be delighted to do it, but I don't think the bill is — is at the stage where you would not want it to become law, as I think everybody on that committee agreed, even those who voted — the only one person who voted No agrees the bill is much better than what we have today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Did I hear you say you wanted this out of the record?

SENATOR KLEMM:

Well, if -- if Senator Lauzen insists on taking it out because he wouldn't want to vote for this good bill, I'll wait and hold it one week, but if he wishes to, I'll -- at the request of the committee chair, I will hold it. I'll leave it up to him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I do appreciate your consideration on that - not one week, but perhaps just one day. And I'll make a commitment that I'll immediately call them to get this out. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Out of the record. Moving right along. Senate Bill 94. Senator Halvorson. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

Senate Bill 94.

SECRETARY HARRY:

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

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

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Bill 94 is an important bill to punish those who might harass young children on the Internet. This legislation makes it a Class felony to send Internet messages that try to arrange a sexual act with a child. This bill was prompted by a case in Will County where a nine-year-old girl was the victim of a cruel crime where an adult posted her name on the Internet and said the young girl was offering sex. Currently, such a terrible act against our children can only be prosecuted as a misdemeanor. I know of no opposition to this bill. And there is a new federal law on this issue, but that can only be prosecuted on the federal law. We must give our State's attorneys the power to prosecute Internet harassers, just the federal Justice Department. not legislation passed the Judiciary unanimously, and I ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Discussion? Senator Larry Walsh.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the jury -or, of the Senate. Excuse me. Of the Senate. Wasn't -- wasn't
yesterday Saint Pat's Day? Okay. I -- I stand in strong support
of this bill and compliment Senator Halvorson and our State's
Attorney, Jim Glasgow, for the hard work that they did in putting
this bill together. And it is something that we have to
continually -- to work on. With technology moving at the rate
that it's moving right now, that we are going to have to always be
prepared to protect our innocent children from pedophiles and
predators that are going to use the Internet for that purpose. So
I urge my colleagues of the Senate to -- to join in and support
this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Thank you, Mr. President. I also stand in strong support of this bill. This occurred in Will County, the incident that Senator Halvorson's referring to, but because of the adverse effects of this on the child and the family involved, they are now constituents of mine. They have moved into Kane County. And when something like this can make a family have to move to get away from the situation, it really is something that we need to correct, and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 94 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting question, 94, Present. Senate Bill having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Moving over to page 12, top of page 12. Senator Munoz? Out of the record. Bill 110. Senator Clayborne? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 110.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 110 allows for an R and D tax credit for subchapter S corporations, partnerships, as well as limited liability corporations. Last year we passed a -- a bill allowing the big guys to receive this R and D credit, so this year I'm asking for your favorable vote to get this R and D credit for the little

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

guys.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 110 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 110, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 121. Senator Cullerton? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 121.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is an initiative of the Illinois State Bar Association, and it affects the amount of money that's paid to appointed counsel other than the public defenders. This is in cases where there's a conflict of interest and the public defender can't represent the defendant. The -- another counsel is appointed. This bill simply says that they shall be paid reasonable fees. That's the standard for a hundred and one counties, except for Cook, but in Cook there have been caps put on the -- the amount of money that is paid to the attorneys. The caps are very, very low. So what we're saying here is that in Cook County, it'll be treated like the rest of the counties. They should be paid a reasonable fee. Be happy to answer any questions, and as I indicated before, it only applies to Cook.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Is there any discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. Sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator Cullerton, is this dealing with the indigent in Cook County? Did you remove the caps?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

In -- in removing the cap, then they who will decide what the attorney shall be paid?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

The judge would, and he would have to -- he or she would have to make sure that it was reasonable fees. That's the way the law reads in all the other counties.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Well, it will have a financial impact on Cook County. Is the -- did you talk to President Stroger about the -- the fiscal impact on -- of this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Mr. -- Mr. Jones, the -- Senator Jones, in the committee, there was no witness slips indicated in opposition by the County. I assume that it will result in greater fees because right now the hourly rate is capped at -- I think it's fifty dollars an hour -- forty dollars an hour for in-court time and thirty dollars an hour for out-court time. So I assume that the judges will -- will pay more than that. But, I mean, that -- that amount of money -- plumbers make more than that, I think, and electricians. So I don't think it's unreasonable to say that -- that lawyers should be paid more. But, again, that's up to the -- the judges and that's what the rest of the hundred and one counties have. The judges decide what reasonable fees are.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Well, the reason why I raise the question, because I did talk to the President when he was down this week on — on those issues as relate to mandates, and there is no — will be no accompanying appropriation to deal with this. In the criminal justice system in Cook County, we keep imposing more mandates on it, and — which will create a financial burden. And — and you can't give me a figure and then — those dollars to be paid must come out of the county budget. And, you know, I wish you — the bill has proceeded this far, but I wish you could possibly take it out of the record and perhaps maybe there could be an amendment. If the State's going to mandate that they do this, perhaps the State should pick up the cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

I would have been happy to have talked to the County at the time that the bill was in committee. Apparently they didn't see

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

it. So now that you're aware of that, I'll be happy to take it out of the record and discuss it with them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Out of the record. Senate Bill 122. Senator Burzynski. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 122.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The Professional Land Surveyor Act sunsets this year. This is the bill that takes that place, renews several provisions within the -- the law, and I would be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 122 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 122, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 123. Senator Burzynski. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 123.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, this is very similar to the past bill. It's a department bill and renews the Sunset Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 123 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 123, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 126. Senator Burzynski. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 126.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Again, this is another sunset revision and be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 126 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 126, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 127. Senator Burzynski? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 127.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Again, Mr. President, this is -- deals with Professional Engineering Practice Act, which sunsets this year, and extends that sunset to January 1st, 2010.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 127 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 127, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 128. Senator Peterson. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

Senate Bill 128.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 128 creates a tax credit for individual filers in an amount equal to fifteen percent of premium costs for qualified long-term care insurance coverage for the taxpayer, spouse, parent or dependent. It's limited to two hundred dollars per qualified policy and may not exceed the taxpayer's liability, and there's no carryforward

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

provision. The incentives could make policies more affordable for older individuals and save them from having to spend down all their assets to qualify for Medicaid. The current average annual cost of nursing home stay is forty thousand. If only one thousand people bought the long-term care insurance, Illinois could theoretically save twenty million dollars in Medicaid costs annually. I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 128 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all -- take -- take the record. There's 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 128, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Fawell? Senate Bill 164. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary. I'm sorry. Out of the record. Senate Bill 178. Senator Smith? Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 178.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Jury service can impose a great hardship on those who care for children and seniors, especially children and seniors with disabilities and special needs. This bill, as amended, would protect those who care for children under the age 12, persons of any age who have a physical or a mental disability, or persons of any age with a medically diagnosed behavior disorder. This bill requires jury commissioners to

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

examine the hardships imposed on both the caregiver and the person cared for and would require them to excuse the caregiver from jury service where there is no reasonable care alternative available which would not burden with an undue hardship either the person cared for or the prospective juror. This will protect those already burdened caregivers from adding the burden of jury duty to their already difficult duties while preserving the integrity of our jury system. I ask you for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. Chairman -- Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I agree with the sponsor of this bill because undue hardship is not always recognized in the cases that Senator Smith has mentioned. And I certainly support it and ask everyone else to support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? Is there any other discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 178 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 178, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 188. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 188.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 188 is an initiative of the Illinois Retail Senate. Merchants Association, and it amends the Criminal Code and creates a new section entitled "Counterfeit retail sales receipt and Universal Price Code...", which is the UPC computer code we see today on so many products. And it is in response to a growing of people that submit fraudulent receipts or alter receipts. Just recently there was a major counterfeit ring around the Midwest that took these UPC codes, altered 'em and changed them and made quite a bit of money when they returned merchandise to the retailer. So what we do is we make it a Class 4 felony to possess, use, transfer, make, alter, counterfeit or reproduce a retail sales receipt or a UPC label, and if you do it more than one occasion -- or, on one occasion, it's a class -- it's a higher class of felony. I'd be happy to answer any questions and appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, there was some discussion, I think, in committee of trying to differentiate the type of problem you're getting at from, say, an individual who just makes a pencil mark on a receipt. You going to continue to work on that in the House in terms of perhaps the penalty provisions to differentiate those situations?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Hawkinson, it's funny you should ask that question. Senator Cullerton and I -- before called the bill, I wanted to make sure Senator Cullerton, who asked the question in committee, was -- was satisfied, and I believe he is. We will continue to explore this in -- in the House. It is a class -- it's a misdemeanor of some sort today to take what I call the old-fashioned receipt, if you're a teenager, and alter it and change two ninety-five to three dollars and ninety-five cents. Hopefully, a prosecutor in that situation will charge someone with the misdemeanor, not the more stringent standard in Senate Bill 188. But Senator Cullerton and I spoke, I will speak with the Retail Merchants and ask them to reconsider in the other Chamber and think about in great detail whether the old-fashioned receipt, so to speak, needs to be taken out of here and we just leave this with the modern-day Universal Price Code portion of the bill. So, I'm going to continue to watch this thing, but I think we ought to pass this out of here today, get it over there and continue to work on it. And I'm very much cognizant of your concern, Senator Hawkinson, and of Senator Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Excuse me. Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. My concern was along the same line. A Class 4 felony seems awful harsh for a small violation of -- of a minor item returned with a different UPC symbol. You're -- you're going to work on this in the House? Is -- is it going to be back to the Senate? Will there be some amendments so we can bring it back and vote on it somehow or other?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dillard.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SENATOR DILLARD:

You know, Mr. President, let me -- and I -- I apologize to the Body. If there is this concern, and I -- my guess is I could pass this out of here, but let's leave it here. Let me work on it for twenty-four hours. And I -- I very much apologize to the Body.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Your apology is accepted. Senator Bomke, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I simply want to correct a prior vote. On Senate Bill 128, I inadvertently voted Yes, and I meant to vote Present.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The record will so indicate, Senator Bomke. Senator O'Daniel, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I have very special guest with me today. I'd like for the Senate to recognize this young lady. She sang the -- she sang the National Anthem at the Class A basketball tournament last week in -- in Peoria. She's here today with the Music Education Day at -- at She's a very exceptional young the Capitol. lady, beautiful young lady. You know, traditionally, southern Illinois is known for beautiful girls and handsome boys. But she -- she is really an exception and her name is Amanda Alburtus. She -- been here today. She's an outstanding student from the Newton High School. She's a senior there, eighteen years old, has three sisters. Her parents and other students and different ones are -and the regional superintendent are in the President's Gallery. So I would like for all of you to recognize this young lady and let's give her a big Senate welcome. She's really a super young lady. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Well, we -- very good. Bill, would you mind introducing her? What -- what is her name?

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Amanda Alburtus. I -- I got so excited, I guess I forgot to introduce her.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

I'm sorry. I stand corrected. I guess you did introduce her. We're glad to have you here today. Thank you very much. Senate Bill 214. Senator Peterson. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 214.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Under current federal law, the taxable income of property in casualty insurance companies is modified by adding back fifteen percent of the federally tax-exempt interest. Under current Illinois law, a hundred percent of that same income is added back. The net effect is the company ends up paying Illinois corporate income tax of a hundred and fifteen percent instead of the hundred percent. And this bill corrects that by excluding the federal add-back from the Illinois taxable income. Ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 214 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 214, having received the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 217. Senator Syverson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 233. Senator Welch? Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 233.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is similar to other legislation that has passed the Senate and the House and is law. It concerns regional development authorities. This bill would allow the bonds issued by the Illinois Valley -- Upper Illinois River Valley Authority to be tax-free. Exempts their -- the incomes from the bond from taxes. There are two other authorities, in the -- in the Moline area, the Quad City Development Authority and the South -- I believe it's the Southwest Authority southern Illinois, that have these bonds that are tax-exempt. believe that this would be equitable to have the Upper Illinois River Valley Development Authority have this same benefit. would help develop Illinois and bring in more business, in our opinion. And there's a very small burden because of these -- this tax exemption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 233 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 233, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

O'Malley, do you wish to have Senate Bill 234 returned to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment? I'm asking for leave. Is there any objection? Hearing none, on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 234. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator O'Malley.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, the underlying legislation here deals with the unlawful purchases of firearms, specifically straw purchases. This amendment deletes the provision in the bill that would make it only a Class A misdemeanor to purchase a firearm with the intent to deliver it to a family member who does not have an FOID card.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 234 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. I beg your pardon. This is an amendment. Yes, sir. Do you ask for approval of the amendment? You move for adoption? He does. All those in favor, say Yes. Is there any opposition? Amendment is adopted. Are there any other Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 257. Senator Cullerton? Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 257.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a bill supported by the Bar Association. It allows detective agencies to act as private process servers with court appointment. Currently, only persons registered as private detectives can act as special process servers. This statute would allow detective agencies to act as special process servers with the approval of the court. Didn't have any opposition in committee. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 257 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting, no voting Present. Senate Bill 257, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 259. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 259.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator -- Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This legislation contains the single licensure language. Maintains current eighty-five-percent trusting level for pre-need sale of

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

outer burial containers, known as vaults. Amends the Illinois Funeral and {sic} (or) Burial Funds Act to add the identical storage and warehousing provisions currently contained in the Illinois Pre-Need Cemetery Sales Act and creates the Funeral Consumer Protection Fund by requiring that five dollars for each contract for the pre-need purchase of goods and services covered under this Act to be deposited in the fund. In committee, Comptroller's Office I just talked to the was neutral. representative. They are wanting to continue to work on some consumer protections, but they said they didn't want to hold up the bill. They will be working with the House sponsor. So I ask for your support of Senate Bill 259.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Peterson, those concerns of the Comptroller's Office, will you be amenable to an amendment in the House that would include the consumer protection booklet and contract disclosure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Yes, that's right, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 259 pass. All those in favor, say -- vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 259, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cronin, on Senate Bill 276? Out of the record. Senator Tom Walsh. Please read the bill, Mr. -- Madam Secretary, on 283.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 283.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Tom Walsh.

SENATOR T. WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 283 amends the Illinois Act on the Aging to allow the Director to send designees to the coordinating council. It incorporates the 1993 executive order reorganizing the division within the State Police. It changes the deadline for DHS and the Department on Aging's joint service report. Alters usage of the Fertilizer Control Fund. It removes the minimum physical education course requirement for teacher training. It eliminates unnecessary or unfunded State agency programs, advisory group(s), reports, and duties. This is the annual bill of the Legislative Audit Commission, and I would — this is to address audit findings that agencies have had, and I'd be happy to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I reluctantly rise, but I feel bound to do so this Session. I -- if there's ever a bill that violates the single subject rule, this would seem like it does, and for that reason, I'm going to vote Present.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? Any other discussion? If not,

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

the question is, shall Senate Bill 283 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 40 voting Yes, no voting No, 19 voting Present. Senate Bill 283, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 287. Senator Syverson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 306. Senator Donahue? Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 306.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 306 is a shell bill, but I want to tell you what exactly it's going to be used for. And many, many of you are sponsors of this, and it deals with the small rural telephone issue, and since we've got a lot of bills out there that deal with telephones, this specifically will be used for telephone companies under thirty-five thousand lines. And it will deal for what the Commission — what the Illinois Commerce Commission already does, but we're trying to quantify it in law. So that's what this will be used for. The negotiations on the specific language is continuing, and we will be doing that as the House bill comes over and the Senate bill goes back. So I would ask your indulgence. It'll deal only with small rural telephones under thirty-five thousand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 306 pass. All those in favor,

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that who wish? question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Bill 306, having received the required Present. Senate Senate Bill 310. constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 321. Senator Senate Bill 324. Rauschenberger? Out of the record. Senator Maitland. John Maitland on the Floor? Out of the record. Bill 331. Senator Hawkinson? Out of the record. Senate Bill 353. Senator Sieben. Out of the record. Senate Bill Senator O'Malley. Senator Pat O'Malley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 356. Out of the record. Senate Bill 357. Out of the Senate Bill 358. Out of the record. Senate Bill 360. record. Please -- please read the bill, Senator Sullivan. Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 360.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 360 amends the Illinois Department of Revenue Sunshine Act. It requires the Department of Revenue to include in the tax return information booklet that all taxpayers are sent to file their taxes a summary of State revenues and State expenditures. The Department of Revenue is neutral. There's no known opposition, and this basically just casts some sunshine on State revenue for taxpayers. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not,

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

the question is, shall Senate Bill 360 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 360, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 367. Senator Burzynski? Out of the record. Senate Bill 368. Out of the record. Senate Bill 372. Senator Rauschenberger? Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 372.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 372 effectively prospectively ends the new development of methane cogeneration at landfills under the current structure we have in the Act. You may recall in Veto Session we had to go back and technically permit the existing methane land —methane-generating landfills to receive their tax subsidy. This ends the retail rate exemption prospectively for landfills that generate methane gas.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Jacobs.
SENATOR JACOBS:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

I thought Senator Shaw might be on the Floor. I think the question was asked in committee on this particular bill whether this affects the funding of Robbins. Do you remember what that response was, or is that in this particular bill, or am I mistaken?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you for asking that question, Senator Jacobs. It has no effect whatsoever on Robbins. Robbins is an incinerator that was receiving retail rate. This is a totally unrelated part of the statutes. This is for landfills that -- that -- that produce methane gas, where they enter into cogeneration contracts and we agree to pay them the retail rate for their electric -- electricity that's generated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

It was -- and I'm trying to get it up here on my -- it was my understanding that because the fact that the tax revenues are going to be reduced then from this which were to be utilized for the Robbins money, is going to be reduced, and therefore there may not be, as part of the agreement that was made last year when we did the Methane Act. Correct me if I'm wrong, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger. Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you for raising that point, Senator Jacobs. It -- since this does not affect any of the existing landfills or any of those who have already applied to the Commission, the -- the proposed funds that would be available to Robbins are based on those existing landfills. This should have no effect because it's

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

prospective development of future landfills. So it does not -- it does not eliminate a section in the law. It -- it simply eliminates the ability of the -- of the Commerce Commission to approve new facilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you. I did my job. I -- I just filled in time till Senator Shaw come back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

You got 'em all lit up now. Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. On this, what is the -- will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

What -- what is the purpose of this legislation? And I'll -- and -- well, go ahead. Answer that one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Senator Shaw. What -- the purpose of this legislation is to end the current practice we have where we permit landfills that generate methane gas to collect that methane gas and use equipment to generate electricity. What they provide for the State is base-load electricity that has a value of about one-half of a cent. Under the statutes we have today, they're allowed to collect almost six and a half cents back from the taxpayers for the value of their electricity. What we're doing in this bill is we're leaving all existing methane-producing landfills alone. All that have applied to the Commission are not

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

affected. So all of the -- the -- the methane people that worked with you in the agreement related to Robbins in Veto Session are not affected. But what this bill does do is prospectively makes it impossible for the Commerce Commission to approve another site using methane to generate low-value electricity and making the taxpayers pay for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

The -- the -- once the -- once the methane gas has ran out of the agreement that we now have in place, under your bill Robbins would not share in any future -- would not get any revenue in the future under your -- from the new people that are coming on board. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Shaw, to the best of my knowledge, okay, future methane gas-producing landfills that weren't a party to your agreement during Veto Session would not pay you a set-aside anyway, number one. Number two, the average life expectancy of these methane-producing landfills is like fifteen to twenty-five years. And I think that's longer than the statute that -- or, longer than the agreement you have. I'm not positive, 'cause you understand the agreement better than I do. But it's -- it's my intention and my understanding that this should have no effect on the Robbins arrangement you made. It only says prospectively, in the future, that they can't do new landfills for this electricity. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Where -- why is the -- is the City of Chicago on board with this -- with this bill?

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

The City of Chicago has not ever registered a position for or against it. I don't think they have a lot of methane-producing landfills inside the City limits. But I -- they've never said to me one way or the other. I can tell you clearly that Neil Flynn is opposed, Waste Management will be opposed, Browning-Ferris will be opposed. Those people who go to landfills now and -- and build electric generation to give us electricity that, under the deregulated law, we don't need, the wrong kind of electricity, are -- are selling us electricity at a about a half a cent and the taxpayers make up about six cents of the price. I'm not going to take it away from any of those guys who've already figured this I'm just saying in the future we shouldn't -- if they're out. going to do it, they ought to produce electricity we need and they ought to do it at a market rate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

The -- on our analysis, it -- the City of Chicago is listed as an opponent of this legislation, but you're saying that they never talked to you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Shaw, I apologize. Apparently they did notify our staffer that they are not in support of this. So I stand corrected. I apologize.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

They are opposed to it. Now, the -- the next question I wanted to see, you -- when you say it should not affect Robbins, are you emphatic? Will this bill affect Robbins, or will it not? Can you be more emphatic in terms of that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Shaw, I'm -- the agreement, as I understood it, and I helped with that legislation, but I wasn't involved with the Robbins agreement. Okay? To the best of my understanding, what -- the existing land -- methane landfill generators who wanted the cooperation in the House made an agreement with the City of Robbins to give them a certain sum, I think, over six years, was my understanding. There's -- this should not change that at all, because all of those landfills are still in existence. They -- none of them will be affected by this law. So to the best of my knowledge, as clearly as -- it's clearly my intent not to affect Robbins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Well, to the bill: I think that what we should do here until we can get some clarity, real clarity, and get everybody on board, including the City of Chicago and also Robbins on board, that I think that we should take this bill out of the record and go back into negotiations and -- and maybe we can draft an amendment where we can be a little more emphatic that this bill will not affect Robbins in -- put it in -- in the proper texture that you want it, and then you wouldn't have to guess about this situation, because right now you're speaking on the record and you are saying maybe it will and maybe it won't. And being as a learned individual as you are, and tell me that you don't know what the agreement in the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

previous legislation with Robbins was - and I know you are one of the most astute Senators in this Body - and I -- I have to feel as though that you know what the agreement is. And I also feel as though that you know how this impacts on Robbins. And at this time, I would -- if you choose not to take it out of the record, in light of the -- the City of Chicago is against it, I would have to oppose the bill at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The astute Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Senator Shaw. And I appreciate your concerns. Let me explain a couple of things real quickly. Site agreements that Robbins made with the methane generators, I just don't have personal knowledge. There is no way that — that the — that the end of future permits should affect any agreement that Robbins has had. I mean, I'm 99.9 percent sure. I don't believe the City of Chicago, or Waste Management, or Browning-Ferris, or any of the other people who know about this kind of sweet spot in the law will ever be enthusiastic about this bill. So I respectfully argue that it wouldn't do me a lot of good. In fact, it's actually an opportunity, over in the House, for your friends who worked on methane again to perhaps bring the same people to the table. So I would urge a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Rauschenberger, your theory on this bill is that the -- the cost of energy should be determined in the marketplace

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

based on competition, and this is a subsidy for using methane gas from landfill and it artificially inflates the price. Is that your argument?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Yes, Senator Welch. And you probably said it better than I did in my explanation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I'm not quite as astute, apparently, but thank you Will the -- the theory though that you're using doesn't take into consideration social benefits by doing this. particular, what you have here is a situation where, many years ago, we passed this bill saying that the gas that naturally comes off of landfills, in everybody's landfill, is -- goes into the atmosphere - it pollutes the atmosphere. When we passed this bill years ago, the idea was we would capture that gas, it would be turned into some beneficial use, not only to create energy, but also to save the environment. In the years subsequent to doing that, we had a landfill crisis in Illinois. We didn't know where to put our garbage. We couldn't get landfills approved, and when that bill started going into effect, there was more encouragement to companies to build landfills. Now you don't hear anything about a landfill crisis. There's space enough to put landfills, and part of the reason was because of this bill. Now, if we eliminate this benefit, you're going to go back to the situation where there are going to be fewer landfills. That will re-create the landfill crisis we had of several years ago. I think that that is one of the major benefits of this bill. A second benefit is the -- the elimination of a great deal of air pollution,

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

certainly in the northwest -- northeastern part of this State, we have a lot of air pollution problems. There's a lack of compliance. There's EPA restrictions on what can be done as far as building in the northeastern part of Illinois. So it seems to me that -- although I understand you're trying to bring us back to competition, I think by not taking into effect the benefit of cleaning up the air, of encouraging the use of these landfills, I think that it's not the proper way to analyze this situation, and so I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Yes. I have a question, actually following up on Senator Welch. If we remove this subsidy, do you anticipate that market conditions will encourage them to burn the methane gas to create electricity?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you for that question, Senator Radogno. Yes. As a matter of fact, what -- what we really hope to have happen from this, get rid of the old program and then the industry will be willing to come and work with us on a program where they can take the methane gas and do peak generation. Peak generation is not as easy to do. It's more expensive to install. As long as this subsidy program is in effect, no one will convert, in the future, to peak generation, which is what we do need on the electric grid. We do not need base load. And just very quickly, Senator Welch, the landfills that they're harvesting methane gas for are not active landfills. And I beg to -- I don't think this has anything to do with the capacity of landfills. What's happening today is companies are going out and surveying old landfills and drilling

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

for methane to get the subsidy. So it's -- it really -- it may have to do overall with the profitability of -- of past landfills, but it has very, very little to do with current capacity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Welch, for a second time.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, since he mentioned my name, let me just say that as -landfills are not just created as one big empty room like this,
and you pour the garbage in until it's full and you cover it up.
They do it by cells. So after you create each cell, which is
one-twentieth, let's say, of the landfill, that's covered, that -that immediately starts producing gas. You don't have to wait
till the whole landfill is full. They can start using it
immediately. So -- so it would apply to existing landfills, as
well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, Senator Rauschenberger, to close.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, I appreciate the thorough going over, and I appreciate Senator Shaw's concerns. As I say, I'm 99.9 percent sure there's no effect on Robbins. I can tell you with complete surety that the — that solid waste companies will not change what they're doing as long as this statutory safe harbor is in place. I really do think this is the right thing. I certainly understand people need to — to vote their conscience on the bill. Thank you all very much for your attention.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 372 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 26 voting

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Yes, 30 voting No, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 372, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Karpiel, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am? SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. To announce a Republican Caucus immediately in Senator Philip's office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

How long do you think you might need, ma'am? SENATOR KARPIEL:

I don't think we need a great deal of time. Perhaps half an hour to forty-five minutes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Well, the intention of the Chair is to return and proceed on 3rd Reading from this point. So we will start at the top of page 14 at roughly 2:30. Let's try to be back here promptly at 2:30, and we will proceed on with 3rd Reading. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, there are committees scheduled for this afternoon. Is there any intentions of going ahead with those or not? I think -- they're on the Calendar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Committees will meet. Yes, sir. We will be recessed to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The Republican Caucus has concluded, so would the Members please proceed back to the Floor? The Senate will reconvene. We are on 3rd Reading. Page 14. Top of page 14. We have Senate Bill 380. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 380.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill comes from the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois and is quite simple. It says that a tax bill is not delinquent if it was postmarked before the date that it should have been received by the taxing body. For those of us - and I don't want to disparage any other branch of government - but for those of us who live in the suburban Chicago area, sometimes it can take five and six days to get a letter from one town to the other. And it is now problematic and a lot of people who mail their tax bills on time don't have 'em arrive wherever they're supposed to be by the date. And this bill comes from the Taxpayers' Federation and says if it's postmarked before the due date, it's okay. Be happy to answer any questions, and appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 380 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 380, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 384. Senator Rauschenberger? Senator Rauschenberger on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill -- Lisa Madigan. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senate Bill 387.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lisa Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 387 makes some changes that would allow high school seniors to act as election judges. This does two things. It practically will provide us with the opportunity to fill election judge positions when currently we are unable to do so with the current population who is certified to be election judges. Also it will allow us to involve students in this process of elections, with the hope that they will continue to engage in the democratic process after they become eligible to vote. And I would look forward to your favorable roll call on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

What about the Republican process? Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield for some questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

One of the problems with this bill originally was that under the current law, and under existing law, you have to give your party affiliation to become a judge. Was that taken care of in this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Yes, this was. We amended the bill in order to provide that a student election judge would certify for what party they would be representing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

You know, there's a lot of retired people that are up in age and they -- they rely upon these election judges' jobs in order to give themselves some supplemental income. Why do you want to take away jobs from our senior citizens?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

The bill's intention is not to take away jobs from senior citizens. In fact, this is a permissive -- this is permissive legislation, so there is no requirement that students be used as election judges. So, again, it is certainly not our intention to take away jobs of older people.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

So we are permitting them to take away the jobs from our more senior citizens. But let me ask you another question. Why do we stop at, you know, seventeen? Why didn't we go to kindergarten? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

There are a number of qualifications in this bill that would make sure that we probably wouldn't be able to go down to kindergarten. There might be some problems in terms of height. You know, one of the responsibilities of our election judges is to actually put the ballot into the ballot box. So I don't know if

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

somebody in kindergarten would have that ability.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, there are those that would say that most of the kindergartners have more brains than the people that are running for election. But I did notice here that Hawaii is one of those areas that has a successful program in utilizing this. Did you go on a State-paid junket to Hawaii in order to get this information? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

No. I've had -- not had the opportunity to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Just to -- to follow up a little bit on -- on Senator Jacobs' comments. Senator, have you ever heard of the AARP?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

Yes, I have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Are you a member?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I am not eligible to currently be a member.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, I guess my point being that if you were of that age bracket and -- that you would be more sensitive to the needs to the elderly. I'm very concerned that our -- our election officials might consider this to be a mandate, that they must have one student serving there. And -- and -- or at least two students. Isn't it two students, a maximum of two students?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

That is correct. It is a maximum of two students.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, I'm just very concerned that they could take that as a requirement, and -- and what if you have, you know, too many students applying? How are they going to go through that selection process?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

The bill very clearly makes this permissive. It is in no way a requirement. And we were very sensitive to the fact that in some areas there is not a problem in finding election judges. And we are simply trying to provide election judges in areas where we currently don't have enough of them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Who does appoint these students?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

There is a series of qualifications that a student would have to first fulfill prior to being able to be appointed. So it would be the normal process, but you would have to have a principal agree to this. Your parent would need to agree to this. You would have to have a good academic record. And I can go on and cite a few of the rest of these qualifications.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

So -- so, though, the election authority would have the opportunity to choose who that -- whether or not that student serves?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

The student election judge would have to go through the same process as any other judge to -- or, any other person to become an election judge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, thank you. I -- I'm very concerned about this, because in some ways I can see where students might be even more qualified because many of our election authorities are going to what they call optical scans, where you circle in -- color in the circles and everything. And perhaps they're more used to that when

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

they're taking their ISAT exams or their IGAP exams, or whatever. But certainly I don't know if they know how to do that "Punch 10" type thing that we talk about from time to time. So I -- I really have some reservations and perhaps we need to really reconsider this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor will yield, Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Senator Madigan, was there any consideration given at the time that this bill was being drafted to confine it to Cook County and the City of Chicago, as opposed to making it statewide, as a -- as a protocol or a test?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

There was discussion and the -- that is one of the reasons that this language is permissive. So if there are counties in areas that do not want to participate, for whatever reason, or that they already have enough election judges, they would not be required to participate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Are we changing the Election Code as to the qualifications for a judge of election from a registered voter to a seventeen-year-old who cannot register under the existing law, or are we changing the law?

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

We -- we are retaining the current provisions for people who are above the age of eighteen to become election judges, and we are adding in a provision that would allow, with certain qualifiers, a student to become an election judge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Thank you, Senator Madigan, but I want to express some concerns about this. I would prefer that it had -- be tried as a trial pilot program in the Cook County/Chicago area at the present time. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

I -- as Senator Silverstein knows, I -- I do like to advocate bipartisanship among the freshman class, but I do feel the need to ask a couple questions. I understand that this is a -- comes from Cook County? Cook County Clerk David Orr?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

The Cook County Clerk, David Orr, is one of the proponents of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Sullivan.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

In light of the fact that it comes from Cook County, is there a requirement that these judges have to be alive, or can they be dead?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

Right, it's my understanding that it is the voters who need to be alive in Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

So the judges can be dead?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

Again, I think it would be difficult for somebody who is dead to meet these requirements.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Will the Senator yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Yes. The Senator says she'll yield, Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Senator Madigan, I know you're a Democrat and I know you've worked very hard on this proposal. I certainly feel I might be able to support it, but I -- being a Democratic committeeman, celebrating my thirtieth year come March 17th next year, I -- I was just wondering -- all right now. All right, guys. But did you arrange it that we have many more Democratic judges than the other side?

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

We specifically provide in this bill that there can be one student from each -- for each party. So you can have one Democratic student and one Republican student.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

You are a Democrat, though, and you didn't -- and you weren't able to arrange anything out in Cook County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

It was my intention to be bipartisan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Spoken like a true Democrat.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to request a few questions of the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

...the sponsor. Thank you. Senator Madigan, you've just mentioned that this will require each polling place to have one Democrat student and one Republican student. That's correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

No, it will not require a polling place to do that. Again, the bill is optional.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

So -- so you can have actually two Democrat students and no Republican students serving as -- if it's optional, then there could be one of -- of -- both of one party, or -- or what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

No. The idea here is that -- and how I was responding to you, the question that I believed you were asking was whether or not it was required for -- for election judges who are high school students to be used, and I want to make it clear that this is permissive. So nobody has to use it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

I'm just curious to know, how do we identify a student? Who is this individual who is identified as a Republican student in the City of Chicago? I'm just -- I'd like to meet him or her, whoever he is, but I, you know, in this -- this is your first bill, isn't it, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

That is correct, Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, Senator Madigan, you know, there's an identical bill that just passed out of House committee, House Bill 2035, and it

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

passed out unanimously. And I'm just wondering what makes you think that your legislation has a chance of passing in -- in the other house, since you are a freshman?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I can only hope that the democratic process in the House works.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Does that mean you believe that the House is not working democratically?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I am simply affirming my belief that it does, and hope that it will on my behalf.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, why does it say here that the University Professors of Illinois support this bill? What did they have to do with this? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I am unclear, but I am happy to have their support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

What do you have against students that have a 2.0 grade point average?

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I was hoping that we would be able to recruit students who were qualified, who were diligent and who were interested students. And by making sure that we had students with a higher GPA, I thought that would be a better idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

And they must be citizens, right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

What do you have against immigrant students who are good students with a A-plus average? Why can't they not be...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan. Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Enough is enough. I just had one question for the Senator. If it requires students to have a 3.0 grade point average, do you have any idea, if you applied that to the Members of the Senate, how many would be eligible under this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield?

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Senator Madigan, I understand that there -- that some Republican judges in Chicago are really Democrats and they want to become judges -- Republican judges just to protect their Democrat turf. So would you say that your bill would be an improvement of what they have in Chicago?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I would say that, unfortunately, it seems to be difficult for us to find Republicans in Chicago. And that is the reason that we are using people as judges, but we're only hoping, with this bill, to allow students to serve as election judges when other people are unavailable to do so. And we really want these students to continue their involvement in the Democratic process and the Republican process and vote once they become eighteen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, judging by some of the results in some of the wards in Chicago, I think your bill might be a definite improvement, because they couldn't do any worse.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Does it bother the sponsor that you're going to have someone

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

policing or involved in the election process when they can't take part in the election process because of their age?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

No, it doesn't bother me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Second thing is, would you consider an amendment? In some of the ward organizations that I'm involved in, they're pretty tough precinct captains. I'm just a little nervous about the safety of seventeen-year-old judges and -- and the abuse that may be heaped upon them by some of my precinct captains. So consider that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Myers.

SENATOR MYERS:

Mr. President, would the sponsor yield for a question?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Myers.

SENATOR MYERS:

Senator Madigan, you have my deep sympathy. I have a vivid memory of my first bill, too. But I sat through sixteen years of discussions with the people who run elections in the State of Illinois, and I wondered if there is the full support of the Clerk and Recorders Association for this bill. They did express some concerns. Are they now in full support of you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

Yes, they are. And they signed a witness slip in front of the committee.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Myers.

SENATOR MYERS:

Could you please explain to me the process by which this seventeen-year-old or eighteen-year-old young person does indicate their party affiliation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

They have to certify to it. I -- let me read to you. They certify in writing to the election authority, and that's how they do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Myers.

SENATOR MYERS:

I believe that answers my question. Thank you and good luck. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Madigan, to close.

SENATOR L. MADIGAN:

I'd like to thank my colleagues in the Senate for this fine opportunity at initiation, and I would urge your favorable vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 387 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ...all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are voting Yes, 2 voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 387, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Congratulations, Senator Madigan. Senate Bill 391. Senator Dillard? Out of the record. Senate Bill 394. Senator Parker? Out of the record. Senate Bill 400. Senator Philip?

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 400.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 400, as amended, is a recommendation from the supervising judge in DuPage County of the juvenile court. What this does is amend the Juvenile Court Act. It permits, as a condition of probation, and requires the person on probation to remove a gang tattoo. And our -- our courts, quite frankly, have been doing this for about three years. It's worked out very well, and what happened was somebody filed a suit saying you have no authority to remove these tattoos. It's not in the statutes. The Appellate Court, quite frankly, did exactly the right thing, because there was no provision to do this. Now this allows them to do it. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 400 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 400, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 402. Senator O'Malley. Pat O'Malley on the Floor? Out of Senate Bill 411. Senator Maitland. Out of the the record. record. Senate Bill 418. Senator Robert Madigan. Out of the record. 419. Out of the record. And 420 out of the record.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senate Bill 421. Senator Walsh. Tom Walsh. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 421.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Tom Walsh.

SENATOR T. WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 421 addresses a discrepancy in the -- in the Procurement Code. Currently a publicly traded company that has a large number of shareholders may provide its federal 10k in place of -- disclosure required of other bidders. The current law recognized that requiring detailed information from hundreds of shareholders for every bid could discourage a public company from Consequently, an alternative method of disclosure was prescribed that satisfied the intent of the Code but relieved qualifying publicly traded companies from the administrative burden. The Code inadvertently excluded similarly situated private companies that have a large number of shareholders from the same burden. Senate Bill 421 corrects that discrepancy. There is no opposition to this bill and it's been approved by the Procurement Review Board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you. I just want to rise and compliment Senator Walsh. This was a bill that we -- this is a process -- bill that we worked on through the process all last year and came to consensus with the House on. Representative Schoenberg has seen it. It's a good provision. It's a technical correction to the bill that I

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

worked on a year and a half ago. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? Any other discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 421 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 421, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Go ahead. State your point.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Please let the record show that I would have voted Yes for Senate Bill 400, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Very good.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The record will show reflect -- so reflect. Senate Bill 436. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 458. Syverson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 465. Senator Berman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 473. Senator Donahue. Laura Donahue, would you like to have your bill called, ma'am? Out of the record. Senate Bill 475. Senator Burzynski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 480. Senator O'Malley. Pat O'Malley, on Senate Bill 480. Out of the record. Senate Bill 481. Out of the record. Senate Bill 496. Senator Rauschenberger. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- 517. Senator

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 541. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 544. Senator Syverson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 547. Senator Lauzen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 564. Senator Clayborne. James Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- or, 567. Senator Rea. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 567 amends the (General) Not For Profit Corporation Act of 1986. It provides that a statement of correction may not alter a corporation's article of incorporation with respect to the purpose, and provides that amended articles of incorporation may omit information concerning the initial directors, registered agent, and registered office. This — this bill came out of committee on an Agreed Bill List, and I know of no opposition. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 567 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ...all voted who wish? ...all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 567, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- 579. Senator Tom Walsh. Tom Walsh on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 624. Senator Tom Walsh. Out of the record. Moving on to page 16. Top of page 16. Senate Bill 644.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Munoz. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 644.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Munoz.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 644 amends the Code of Corrections relating to blood testing. Under the current law, blood testing only exists for sex offenders. The amendment expands the existing program to include serious violent crimes. Initially it was for all forcible felonies, but the State Police were concerned about the cost of testing for all forcible felonies. So it has been narrowed to first degree murder, second degree murder, kidnapping, aggravated kidnapping, home invasion, vehicular invasion, vehicular hijacking and aggravated vehicular hijacking. The purpose is to expand the database — ...President, I'm sorry. I'm going to have to hold this. They just informed me that the amendment didn't clear. I apologize for that, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Very good. That's quite all right. That's quite all right. That's not a problem. We take it out of the record. Senate Bill 650. Senator Larry Walsh. Out of the record. Senate Bill 656. Senator Rauschenberger. Out of the record. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. It's Senate Bill 656.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 656.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Lady -- Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 656 creates a special exception to the rule to the law that -- that does not permit a restaurant serving alcohol within a thousand yards of a school. These -- the establishment for over sixty years had an exemption under the city ordinances. Through a mistake of their lawyer's filing, that was allowed to lapse. This goes back and corrects it. The City of Chicago is neutral on this. I think the Liquor Commission's in support. The school is in support. It's an agreed bill. And we'll try not to bring a lot more of these, but it's an anomaly that was requested by the owners to restore their right to serve alcohol.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

Would you explain -- okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon. Does anybody want to talk on this bill? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 656 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Yes, 4 voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 656, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 658. Senator Peterson. Out of -- excuse me. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 658.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 658 creates the Orthotics, Prosthetics, and Pedorthics Practice Act to provide for the licensure of orthotists, pedorthists and prosthetists. Orthotists typically deal with custom-fabricated or custom-fitted braces or support designed to provide for alignment or correction. Pedorthists deal with therapeutic footwear, foot orthoses for the use of ankle or below, and modified footwear made for therapeutic purposes. And prostheses is an artificial medical device that is used to replace a missing limb, appendage, or any other external human body part. I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 658 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Yes, no voting No, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 658, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 667. Senator Cronin. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 667.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cronin.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill seeks to allow officers of a corporation to withdraw as individuals from workers' compensation. More specifically, it allows members of a limited liability company — we created limited liability company within the last, oh, I don't know, maybe eight — six/eight years, and we did not amend the Workers' Comp Act to be consistent with those changes. We currently and have always allowed corporate officers to be exempt from the application of the Act. This simply allows officers, members of a limited liability company, and they are defined as corporate officers. This has the support of both management and labor, Trial Lawyers and all other interested parties. There was no known opposition. I ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator, my analysis says that the AFL-CIO is opposed to this bill. You said there is no known opposition. Is -- are they opposed, and if -- if so...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR HENDON:

...do -- could you tell us why?

SENATOR CRONIN:

There was no opposition in committee. I specifically talked to members of the -- the Trial Lawyers and -- and there was no opposition filed. It passed out of committee unanimously and this

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

is the first I've ever heard of the opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Can you tell us how it would affect -- negatively affect organized labor? I'm just trying to get some reason why, because on our screen is that they're -- they're opposed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

My -- I don't think it affects negatively the labor at all.

My guess is -- is that there may be some -- some resistance because of this notion of the agreed bill process, but other than that I -- I don't -- I don't think there's anything in this that they would have a problem with.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I just wanted to ask a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Cronin, is there any agreed bill process anymore? Has there been any meetings of the minds between labor and business on any of these labor bills?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

I have not been engaged in any, but I -- I -- I understand that there may be some discussions with all interested parties regarding balanced billing. But I'm not aware of anything else going on, frankly.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, the reason I asked is that a lot of these bills, as you stated, are being opposed because the agreed bill process has not been followed. And as you know, back before 1993, that was the process that we used here. There would be a -- a meeting between business and labor so that bills that were egregious on either side would not get through the system. And I'm just wondering why that system hasn't been invoked, because this bill might be an agreed bill through that process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? That was a question. Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Yeah. I -- I think you said with respect to bills that would have an egregious impact. I don't think this is such a bill, but I think for the sake of the argument, if the -- if the position is that there's no bill that should go forward without the approval of the agreed bill process, well, then, your objection has some merit. I'll -- one of my colleagues just handed me a piece of paper that says that there was a resolution in 1992 by the AFL-CIO convention. It's a printed resolution that says "oppose agreed bill process". So I -- I imagine there's enough hypocrisy to go around about the agreed bill process here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

I stand in support of the bill. You know, it seems like the owners and officers of a corporation many times never even go out in the factory. It doesn't affect the employees. It has nothing to do with their coverage. And secondly, that the workmen's

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

compensation premiums are paid by the corporation, by the company. Has nothing to do with any State dollars. It takes nothing away from employees. Just seems to me that if they have the option of not being out there, why subject themselves to those additional costs, that they could use those dollars to help further the promotion of their company and benefits for their employees, instead of just for themselves. Gives them very little coverage. I don't think it hurts anybody, and I do ask for your support on the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Cronin, you wish to close?

SENATOR CRONIN:

I ask for your favorable consideration. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 667 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 46 voting Yes, 10 voting No, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 667, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 675. Senator Halvorson. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 675.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 675 is simply a measure to provide local authorities with an

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

option to provide drug forfeiture funds to park districts for at-risk children. This legislation in no way mandates that seized from drug dealers must be used for recreational programs. It only allows the local municipalities to have the option to use the funds for recreational programs for our youth at risk. I'm just going to give you a couple major points. We did -- when we did amend it to be permissive, the majority of our chief of police and our sheriffs became neutral, because they understood that there's not a mayor or a village board around that is going to go against their chief if the chief says this is where I want the money to go. This is because in one of the towns in my district, in Lansing, Illinois, there was a drug forfeiture of over five million dollars. That was more money than they knew how to spend. And they could have used that money for our youth at risk. Statistically it says that the most prominent time for crime is between the hours of three and seven. So if we could provide some money if -- at the option of the municipality for our youth at risk, we'd be doing a great service. It's -- I -- I just want to reiterate it's very doubtful that a mayor would go against their chief, being this is so permissive, if the chief says, "I need all the money to stay with the -- in the police department." But I'll answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Looks like there's several. Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise in opposition to this legislation. When this bill was heard in committee, unfortunately, because of inclement weather, I was unable to voice my opinion at that time. I've had an opportunity to speak to police chiefs within my district who contacted me on this and — and some other pieces of legislation. Their — their opposition to this legislation, even though, as the Senator

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

correctly pointed out, it being permissive, is that what we are talking about here are using funds that have been taken as a result of a forfeiture of assets from drug dealers. The critical component here, though, is that we have undercover agents who are putting their lives on the line, dealing with some of the worst elements of society, and when those funds are finally seized, the original intent of this Act was to permit these funds to basically be reused so that we could go after other drug pushers and drug By diverting funds in this manner, we are basically running against the policy that we had initiated and launched connection with the use of drug forfeiture funds. And as the chiefs who talked to me correctly pointed out, this pool of money, rather than being used to remove drug pushers from the streets, can be used as a political slush fund. In my opinion, it's -it's the wrong message to send when we're trying to remove drugs from -- from the streets of -- of our State. I do believe that the -- there are other ways of funding those programs other than taking the hard-earned efforts of drug enforcement units that put their lives on the line in dealing with these undercover rabble. And so I would ask all those individuals who agree with me to -to oppose this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Just a point of personal privilege. It's not regarding this bill. I just -- for the record, on Senate Bill 667, I should have been a Yes vote, as opposed to the No. I hit the wrong button.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Okay. The record will so reflect. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I merely want to correct a vote that I made. 667. I intended to vote No. They have a Yes, but I did

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

No, please. I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Okay. The record will reflect your wishes, ma'am. Senator Dudycz, further discussion?

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President. Will the Senator yield for a few questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Yes. The Senator will yield.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Halvorson, I'm a little disturbed by what I heard from Senator Petka. He mentioned about -- or -- or you mentioned that you want to take the funds, take 'em from the law enforcement purposes and give 'em to the park district or municipal recreational programs. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Senator, that's not completely correct. What this does is it gives the municipalities an option. It's completely permissive, and basically it's for drug -- when they get the drug -- like Lansing got over five million dollars. They did not know what else to spend it on. It -- it's not going to probably affect every drug seizure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, isn't Lansing under the umbrella of the Metropolitan Enforcement Group also?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Not any longer. They voted to disband that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Exactly my point. If -- they voted to disband the MEG group because of lack of funds. Couldn't Lansing have provided the Metropolitan Enforcement Group with the necessary funds so they can continue, rather than give it to the recreational programs or the park district? I think this is a bad idea. I think that the -- the -- the drug forfeiture money should stay in law enforcement, and if there's one municipality that is covered, for example, like by the -- by the MEG group, which happens -- is -- is disbanding because they don't have the -- the funds, maybe they should have given them the money so they could continue with these undercover operations and keep law enforcement strong.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I stand in strong support of this legislation. Listening to some of the conversations that are heard and being a former mayor of a city of twenty-five thousand, I look at the possibility that we may have a three-million-dollar forfeiture. What in the hell am I going to do with three million dollars? You can only go so far with so much, and it appears to me that if we use some of these dollars in parks and recreation activities, et cetera, which, to me, may very well be a preventative from those kids getting on drugs, that we are keeping with the intent of the law, which is to ensure that we keep our kids and our -- our streets safe from the drug pushers. And I think it's a very good idea and it's permissive, and I don't know what all the excitement's about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I reluctantly rise in opposition, because I think it is a good idea. I think many of these programs are valid law enforcement type programs for at-risk youth. think the problem -- and the reason we let it out of committee, the sponsor did make it permissive, but the problem is we thought about the five-million-dollar situation or the three-million-dollar situation where most of the seizures are substantially less than that, and I think we had hoped that that might remove the opposition of the chiefs, but it -- it obviously has not. And I think the concern is for many of the departments, you have much smaller scarce resources from these seizures and there is a fear that the money could be diverted under this bill to other than legitimate law enforcement purposes. So, for that reason, I reluctantly oppose the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

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

Yes. Sponsor, yes, will yield.

SENATOR OBAMA:

I stand in strong support of this bill for many of the reasons that Senator Jacobs already mentioned. I -- all of us are concerned with prevention measures. We talk about prevention measures, and yet when it comes to actually putting resources into prevention at the local level where the local municipality has made a decision about it, we seem suddenly hesitant and concerned about putting our money where our mouth is. I think this is a good way of doing it. It's permissive. It allows localities to make these decisions, where we generally think that that's the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

best place to make those decisions. And I would urge that we all take a step back and -- and -- and think about whether or not we are willing to prevent crime and -- and not simply try to lock people up. And I think this is a good strategy for doing it. I think Senator Halvorson's put together a good bill. I'd urge all of us to go ahead and support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I, too, rise in support of this legislation. And I'm certain that everyone in this Chamber who watches how we vote and what we sponsor know that I'm just tough on crime as just about anybody in here. It just amazes me that we aren't broad-minded enough to know that They don't have to do it. It's not mandatory. permissive. if, in your municipality, you see that you can spend some money, a dollar today to save a hundred dollars tomorrow by keeping some young people in something positive so they won't end up in the criminal justice system, it makes all the sense in the world. And as Senator Obama put it, we always talk about prevention and -and in the Governor's speech I heard about kids first and -- and Governor Ryan, and even Governor Edgar on his way out was talking about being smart on crime, instead of just tough on crime. it -- it just -- it bewilders me when -- when -- when my colleagues, who I know mean well, just get up and throw prevention totally out of the window. A lot of these seizures are very, very I live and represent one of the most crime-ridden districts in the State of Illinois. I live with it every day, and, believe me, prevention -- an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We need to deal with some prevention. permissive. Please allow it to go forward. It doesn't mandate anything.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

you, Mr. President. I rise in support of Thank the I think it's a good piece of permissive legislation that should go forth. And I can sit -- I can stand here and tell you as a mayor myself and looking at the park districts that are in my city, if we don't protect the park districts and the children who are in those parks, certainly that's where the drug dealers are many times and that's where some of these forfeitures come from. And I think that we should look -- take a good look at this legislation and support this legislation. My police chief is not opposed to this type of legislation, because we know park goes, the -- usually the city is gone. The cities are located -- the parks are located in the cities, and if protect the parks, certainly we're not protecting the city. And the drug dealers, on the other hand, some of the money should go into those recreation programs that the drug dealers -- the drug dealers are aiming at the children in the park. So why don't we create some positive program, and what this legislation will do if it's so desired by the mayors, or the chief executive, city managers or -- and so forth, that -- they have to make that decision. We're not making it here in the Legislature for them. The only thing that we are doing is giving the city mayors and managers another tool to help prevent crime, along with the police In my -- in my city, the -- we -- the park district dissolved their police department. We no longer have a park district police unit in the park. So my city police, we picked up the slack. But if the police chiefs -- if the police chiefs want to give some of the money, or the mayor, or the village board want to give some of the money to the park, they should be permitted to do so. But crime is a major problem, Ladies and Gentlemen, all

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

over this State. You should support this legislation. You're not mandating anything. The only thing that you're doing is trying to help the children of this State, and I urge an Aye vote for... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I will support this bill, but I do think that it is important for us to consider tightening the language to make sure that the expenditure of the funds allowed for by the municipality will be for programs that are targeting drug crimes and drug prevention activities. I think it's really important. We have seen abuse of this fund in the past. one municipality that paid for conference fees for police officers and their wives. And we've seen the State Police, for example, over the years, use this fund for purposes other than drug crime prevention or drug-related activities. And so I think that by adding and allowing the flexibility that this bill allows, we will be able to bring some of those funds back into the areas, into the municipalities, where some of this activity was generated to begin with, to use to fight drug crimes and to prevent drug abuse in these areas. And so it's a step in the right direction, but I do think that the other seizing agencies like the State's attorney and the State Police and the other agencies, including the Attorney General's Office, should also look at this and consider how they can creatively use these funds, because I think there's a lot that could be done, rather than having these funds sit there, or having these funds used to pay conference fees and to pay for uniforms and this type of thing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

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

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

In our analysis it says that the Illinois Municipal League opposes this bill. Could you tell me why the Municipal League would oppose this bill if they get so much leeway with this money? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you for bringing that up. I do not know. I don't have them as an opponent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Does everybody else have that on their computer screen under background? I mean, I'm not just -- got the wrong bill or something, which would not be unlikely on my computer, which is always off a bill. You all have it? Did -- did, in committee, they file a slip opposing it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Halvorson. Excuse me.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Senator, no, they didn't. But I just got word that the amendment making it permissive took away any opposition that they could have had.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? If not, Senator Halvorson, you may close.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I want to thank everybody for bringing up some major concerns. I want to reiterate that in the bill it states, part of it saying, and in

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

the case of a municipality, for park district or municipal recreation programs, it must be used for youth at risk. I want to reiterate it is permissive, it's optional. It just gives them another option to use these big drug forfeiture funds. This is a major initiative of the park districts. I know we all believe in our park districts. They've got a lot to offer. This is a very positive way to approach our youth at risk and to use some of this money. We all know and we've heard many times over and over, a dollar of prevention serves as probably seven dollars of — of crime prevention. So I think that there's something that really needs to be said for — for using these extra monies for this use. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 675 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 27 voting Yes, 22 voting No, no -- 8 voting Present. Senate Bill 675, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to put that on Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Postponed Consideration. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Matter of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Do state your...

SENATOR JACOBS:

Sitting on the Democratic side of the aisle is a good friend of mine, who also was my first opponent when I ran for the State Senate, who is now your State Fair Director, and I'd like to have

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

everyone say hello to Bud Ford and give him a big hand. Bud PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Bud, welcome to the Senate. Personally, we'd rather have you down there sitting on our side of the aisle, but as long as you're here we're glad you're here. ...Bill 685. Senator Trotter. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 685.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 685 requires the Department of Public Health to establish and promote a Prostate Cancer Screening Program. It also establishes criteria for those persons who shall be part of that program, requiring that the administrative costs of the Department of Public Health shall not exceed ten percent of the funds allocated to the program. Requires any entity funded by the program to collect data and maintain records that are determined by the Department to be necessary to facilitate the Department's ability to monitor and to evaluate the effectiveness of the entities in the program. Last year we passed a -- a public education awareness bill and it was very successful. We are just trying to expand this program this year, and there's no opposition to the bill and I'd like to see its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator Trotter, does this bill have anything to do with your most recent injury?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 685 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 685, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 732. Senator Dudycz. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 732.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 732 reenacts the child amended, pornography statute, that was declared as unconstitutional because of the single subject rule. The actual amendment contained changes such as including depicting by computer as a means to commit child pornography. This passed out of both houses overwhelmingly, if not unanimously. And it's just a -- because of the single subject rule, was declared unconstitutional. This language reinstates the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

questionable language.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I had raised a question in committee. Just wanted to clarify that we've done a little research on this. The Library Association is neutral on the bill. They're — they don't object to the bill. The bill, when it was first passed, did delete a affirmative defense for librarians, but it turns out that that was rarely used, and, in fact, there is actually another affirmative defense in a different section of the statute that is afforded the librarians. So for that reason, there's obviously no opposition from them, and not from me either. So, urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? Any other discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 732 pass. All those in favor, vote Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who Aye. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 732, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill Out of the record. Senate Bill 752. Senator Parker. Out of the record. Senate Bill 756. Senator Cronin. Out of the Senate Bill 757. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. record. Senate Bill 773. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Bill 777. Senator Lauzen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 784. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 786. Senator Parker. Out of the record. Senate Bill 799. Senator Peterson. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 799.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 799 changes the definition of "sales finance company" to include within the Illinois Income Tax Act certain corporations or persons primarily engaged in the business of purchasing or making loans upon the security of customer receivables, now retail installment contracts, retail charge agreements, or the outstanding balances under such agreements. The Department of Revenue supports this bill. I ask for your support on Senate Bill 799.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any questions? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 799 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 799, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 801. Senator Robert Madigan. Bob Madigan on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 815. Senator Tom Walsh. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 815.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Tom Walsh.

SENATOR T. WALSH:

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

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

815 provides banking corporations organized under the Banking Act or with special State banking charters, they are subject of the Banking Act. Requires federal restrictions deposit insurance only for a State bank which accepts deposits or authorized to accept deposits and similar out-of-state depository banks which merge with Illinois banks and establish or maintain an Illinois branch. It amends provisions relating to bank mergers, conversions and mergers with a trust company, mergers of mid-tier bank holding companies and State banks. Deletes requirement that the merger agreement identify the amount of resulting entity's reserve for operating expenses. clean-up language. I don't know of any opposition, and would appreciate a...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 815 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 815, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 823. Senator O'Malley. Senator O'Malley on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 825. Senator Madigan. Bob Madigan? Out of the record. Senate Bill 840. Senator Clayborne. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 840.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senate Bill 840 is designed to Thank you, Mr. President. allow school districts to incur additional indebtedness even though the amount of the additional indebtedness causes the school district to exceed the statutory debt limitations. This requires the State Board of Education, when issuing an entitlement -- well, I mean -- actually it's been amended. It requires the Capital certify the amount for the school Board to construction to match the grant that is given by the State Board of Education. This came about because in my district I have schools that need the construction grants, but -- however, because of the indebtedness, they're not able to apply for the grant. to make sure that these school districts receive the funds for capital needs, this increases the indebtedness. And to make sure that there is some limitation, the Capital Development Board will certify the amount that has to be approved by referendum by the voters in that particular school district. I ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 840 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 840, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 844. Senator Trotter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 845. Senator O'Malley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 847. Senator del Valle. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 847.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 847 changes the description of residential property from that owned, operated and managed by a public housing agency to residential property owned, operated or managed by a public housing agency or leased by a public housing agency as part of a scattered site or mixed-income development.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 847 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 847, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 850. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 850.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 850 requires hospitals to comply with domestic violence standards as established by the Department of Public Health. Illinois Hospital Association is — is in favor of this legislation. The standards would include staff training and voluntary assessment of victims. There are no known opponents, and I ask for your Aye vote.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 850 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 850, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Bill 851. Senator Maitland. John Maitland on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 854. Senator Bob Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 855, Senator Maitland, is out of the record. And Senate Bill 856. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 868. Senator Dudycz. Out of the record. 876. Senator Rauschenberger. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 876.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is, again, one of the clean-up provisions that we worked on last -- last Session and across the summer with the departments, with Jeff Schoenberg, who also worked on the Procurement Code. This particular one permits the Toll Road Authority to lease property for longer than the ten years that's currently in the new Procurement Code. They want to enter into long-term leases, particularly for the operators of the Oasis restaurants up in the northwest area on the toll road. I'd appreciate support and favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Is there any discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Rauschenberger, we have leases -- or bid contracts for places like Starved Rock Lodge and Rend Lake. Are they going to be covered under this? Will those be up to twenty-five years instead of ten years?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Welch, no. This particular exception only applies to facilities that are controlled by nonappropriated funds, or that are funded with nonappropriated funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? Is there any other discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 876 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 876, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 877. Senator Rauschenberger. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 877.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Hard to believe, but in the construction of the Procurement Code last year, we made some drafting errors. In the Code, we exempted State employees who were below a salary threshold from a conflict of interest question, so that an IDOT employee that was a road constructor or someone working in Department of Human Services wouldn't be subject to the conflict provisions. We inadvertently failed to do that for employees of the Capital Development Board or employees of the Illinois Toll Road. So this simply establishes the same exemption threshold, not to be countered for conflict of interest, for Illinois State -- for Toll Road Authority employees and for employees of Capital Development Board, to make sure that it's consistent in the statute.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 877 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 877, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 892. Senator Silverstein. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 892.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill provides that a taxing

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

body may elect to -- a special process server to serve notice of tax sales for delinquent property. The bill is basically designed to streamline the process. The individual must be approved by the court and must file an affidavit to prove that there was valid service. I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 892 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Yes, no -- no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 892, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 893. Senator Peterson. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 893.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 893 amends the Illinois income tax to eliminate the throwback rule from the sales factor in the apportionment of interstate business income. Many states do not impose a throwback rule so as not to unfairly burden their business community. Specifically, states in close proximity to Illinois, including Iowa and Indiana and Michigan, utilize a single sales factor that does not include a throwback. Small business companies that, because of their limited operations, are usually not taxable in other states will be the main beneficiary of this legislation. I ask for your

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

support of Senate Bill 893.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Just reading the analysis. I wasn't in the committee. Department of Revenue said that they were opposed to the bill. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Yes.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Did they say how much money the State would lose in its collection of this tax now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

They did not say, but the Economic and Fiscal Commission said because both -- there will be both increase and a decrease in the amount of revenue from the income tax receipts, that they couldn't determine what the cost to the State would be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

So there's a disagreement between the Economic and Fiscal Commission and the Department of Revenue, because they -- the analysis says that the Department of Revenue said that much of the State's current corporate income tax base could virtually

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

disappear. So that's kind of a strong, you know, phrase, and I just thought I'd ask before we voted on this as to whether or not we're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars, are we talking about a wash. Do we have any -- any idea?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

It's not known, and as I said, the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission said, because there's going to be increases and decreases, they couldn't estimate the amount. And of course, the Department of Revenue doesn't come up with an amount either. They — they just say it may be virtually eliminated, but they come up with no amount. So we have a disagreement here between the two agencies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have the greatest respect for the sponsor, and so -- I -- I do have to ask: Are there circumstances where it's possible that a corporation in Illinois would not pay on a hundred percent of their income by this throwback provision? I've seen examples where -- I mean, it's -- it's possible depending on where the -- where the business is conducted and I don't have my notes in front of me, but where business -- a distribution business could avoid paying tax -- their fair share of the tax on up to eighty percent of their income. Can you explain to the Body if there are examples under this legislation where a company in Illinois would not be obligated to pay its fair share, a hundred percent, of their income?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Well, first of all, this legislation only addresses sales that are to jurisdictions that do not tax. So if a company in Illinois sells outside of Illinois to a company that doesn't tax and that's ten percent of their sales, on the throwback that ten percent would come back to Illinois, they would pay tax on it. Under this bill, they wouldn't pay tax on it. So it would be a tax break to that company. And this, as I mentioned before, would benefit more of our smaller businesses in Illinois than the larger businesses who already have the single sales factor legislation that we passed last year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I do -- I do agree with the sponsor that -- that this does help the smaller businesses. In the hypothetical example that you used, it was ten percent to that. Is it possible that it could be as high as eighty percent or even a hundred percent in some cases, in a hypothetical, and then a company would avoid paying its fair share of the income tax?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

That's right, Senator. Hypothetically, if a hundred percent of the sales were to a state or an entity like the United States Government that did not charge a tax, that company would not pay a tax on that material that they sold outside the State. That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to say that we had this bill up in a larger form last year. It was attached to the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

single factor sales tax bill. And at that time, in the committee, we had an estimate that the cost of the total bill would be about a hundred and eighty million dollars. When this provision was vetoed out by the Governor, the resulting cost to the State was seventy-three million dollars out of State revenue and thirteen out of local revenue. So it seems to me while the Economic and Fiscal Commission hasn't been able to determine the amount, it seems to me that by subtraction you still come up with about a hundred-million-dollar cost to the State. There have also been estimates of about thirty to forty million dollars. not a cheap item. And I'd like to point out that in the Revenue Committee we had -- we passed out a couple of other tax credit bills that are going to cost tens of millions of dollars. the Governor's plan, which hasn't really been brought forward yet, which will cost us money. So we have a lot of bills out there that are tax credits for a corporation. And it seems to me that we should try to get all of these together to see just how much money we're talking about before we deplete the surplus that we had built up last year. So I would urge the Members to vote Present.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Having thought the single sales tax factor was a very good bill, and having voted for it, and I think it is a good bill, I do have one question, though. What is to keep - especially being from a border community - what is to keep me from being a resident

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

of Illinois, East Moline, Illinois, buying something in Illinois and saying, "Deliver it over to the parking lot over in Bettendorf, Iowa, right across the river, and then I'll bring it back." Is -- what's there to protect us from that happening?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

That would only be applicable if they don't include that in their corporate income tax.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I'm sorry. I didn't hear that last part of it, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Only be applicable if they included it in their corporate income tax.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I quess...

SENATOR PETERSON:

So -- so anybody can do sales and not, you know, report it. I mean, that's illegal, but if -- if they do, it would be recorded in their -- in their corporate income tax they would file in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

But would it be legal for them to sell it to me and deliver it to Iowa and then not show up in their corporate tax and for me,

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

then, to bring it back to Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

If they pay a tax in Iowa, they pay a tax in Iowa. It's in those states that there is no tax, and I believe there is a tax in Iowa.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, Senator Peterson, to close.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. We've debated this bill. I do agree there is a cost. Senator Welch talked about a hundred and fifty million, forty million. The Department of Revenue doesn't have an amount. Economic and Fiscal says there's going to be some losers and some winners. The other states that are going to single sales factor are using this to -- to help stimulate business. I would ask for your support of this bill. I think it's good for the State of Illinois, and in the long run, will pay off in more jobs and a better economy for our citizens. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 893 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 42 voting Yes, 10 voting No, 6 voting Present. Senate Bill 893, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 910. Senator Trotter. Donne Trotter on the Floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 929. Senator Obama. Please read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 929.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. This bill simply extends the existing enterprise zone statute to permit an enterprise zone to be extended for an additional ten years. Currently, it's twenty years. This would permit after certification by the State of Illinois through the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, that the enterprise zone be extended to thirty years. I know of no opposition. It passed unanimously out of committee, and I'd ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

It did not pass unanimously out of committee. There were a couple No votes. At any rate, I rise in objection to this bill. I just don't think the wholesale extension of a program that consists of tax abatements and incentives is good public policy unless it's been well documented as to why it is we're going to do that. As you know, when we provide abatements and incentives, those of us that don't have access to the program pay increased taxes to make up for that. If after twenty years an enterprise zone has been successful, then I believe the pump has been primed and it should end. If after twenty years it hasn't been successful, then it probably ought to end and we ought to have

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

another approach. I would offer, as an alternative to this that we treat enterprise zone extensions the same as we treat TIF district extensions. And if there is a compelling reason, they should come to us with significant documentation as to why we want to do that and vote on them as an individual case. So I would urge a No vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

I just wanted to apologize. I -- Senator Radogno is, in fact, correct. The -- there were -- there was opposition in the committee. There were no slips presented and that's actually what I meant to say, that there were no slips in opposition to the -to the bill. This is essentially an initiative by the City of And I agree with Senator Radogno that, in fact, on all these issues, that we should ensure accountability. Essentially, we have an accountability mechanism to some degree already because this -- these -- each individual enterprise zone does get certified by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. it doesn't go through the Legislature in that fashion, but there is administrative accountability and review of these -- these As I indicated to Senator Radogno, I'd be more than happy to work with her in terms of -- if she feels that the existing mechanisms for accountability aren't sufficient. I'd be more than happy to work with her in terms of tightening those up, because I agree that we don't want any tax break, whether it's enterprise zone, TIF or some of the others that we're voting on today, to be -- to be out there just willy-nilly and -- and potentially wasting taxpayer money. My impression, and I think this is confirmed by most observers, is that the enterprise zones that are currently in existence have been properly utilized. They have been effective in terms of creating jobs in the district. I know the City of

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Chicago has used this as a major development tool. And so my estimation is that at this point, this is not a process that has been abused in any fashion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you. I notice that, in another instance, we have extended it in a limited instance, Vermilion County, and I would suggest if the City of Chicago has compelling reasons to extend theirs, that they present those to us and we do it in that same fashion. So I would still vote, in terms of the wholesale expansion, No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I also rise in -- in concerned opposition. I think the sponsor is well intended, but to wholesale extend these for ten years without any kind of review, I think flies in the face of reason. the privilege this morning of being in the Commerce and Industry Commission {sic} (Committee) and listening to Senator Clayborne present a bill requiring accountability for tax exemptions and for tax breaks that we give businesses. This bill flies in the face and says, without discussion, without proof, even though a mechanism exists for you to come one at a time and prove up your -- your special exemptions, that we're going to automatically extend all of these for ten additional years. I -- I really think it's a bad precedent to set. The next bill that'll come down is allowing all TIF districts to extend automatically ten years. glad that these are successful in the City of Chicago. I think the City of Chicago needs to come down and make the case for 'em. I don't think we ought to give them blank authorization to extend

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

these without review.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Obama, how many enterprise zones are in the City and can you tell me where they are located at?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

I certainly may if you can hold on one second. At the moment, there are six enterprise zones in the City of Chicago. And locations -- I don't have the exact addresses here, but I do have a map that I could provide you. There -- there's some scattered throughout the City. There's some on the south side, some on the west side, some on the northwest side as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Obama to close.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Just a couple of points to address Senator Rauschenberger's point. Certainly I'm in favor of corporate accountability. I was a cosponsor on the bill that Senator Clayborne presented this morning that, I understand, died in committee. I think what I'd like to see, I guess, is some consistency in terms of how we think about these corporate -- or, these -- these accountability issues with respect to these various tax credits. My impression is that, generally, we probably do need to do an overarching study of how successful all these tax credits have been. And as I said, I would be more than happy to support that process. On the other

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

hand, to single out a tax credit that is geared primarily for encouraging industry and job creation in low-income districts and, yet, not impose those same kinds of accountability demands on the various tax credit bills that, as Senator Welch so aptly put, we've been passing throughout the revenue -- throughout this revenue Session, I think is a mistake. What I would urge would be that we go ahead and -- and pass this bill. Again I know of organized opposition to it. The administration and the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs has done a good job in terms of There have been no indications reviewing these proposals. whatsoever of abuse. If we want to go more broadly to the issue of how well various tax credits are being used, then I think that's something we should be doing. But I don't -- but I think that this particular bill simply extends a set of -- of -- of credits in a program that's been successful, by the way, not just in the City of Chicago, but throughout the State. I'd urge a favorable vote from all of you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 929 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 Yes, 10 voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 929, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 939. Senator Maitland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 993. Senator Mahar. Out of the record. Senate Bill 995. Senator Weaver. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 995.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This would be a salary adjustment for regional superintendents of schools statewide. As you know, there's about forty-five. They have not received any pay adjustments for four years. This would -- and also they are paid according to the population of their For example, from forty-eight thousand to nine -ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine, the salary is now seventy thousand. It would go up to seventy-eight thousand. In the other classifications, it goes from seventy-four thousand to eighty-one five, and seventy-six thousand to eighty-three five. Still, with these adjustments, most of the superintendents in these regions are probably being underpaid by at least five thousand dollars if you look at the salaries of the local school superintendents. Also, in the one amendment, the Pension Laws Commission has changed the pension contributions made by that portion of the salary paid by the State. That's basically what it does. If anyone has any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. Pay raise bills, I guess, are those that are absolutely essential around here, but I would like to make some points with respect to this bill. This bill is a little departure from previous practice with respect to the regional superintendents. Yes, indeed, they will get a seven-thousand-five-hundred-dollar increase for this year and every year thereafter, but I suspect, more than that, they will get a four-percent pension contribution paid for by the State of the nine percent that is currently paid to them that they have to

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

pay themselves. They want to say that the four-percent pension benefit is the same as being paid for by the State of Illinois through the Illinois State Board of Education. I would like to point out to you that that four-percent pension contribution that is currently being paid by the State was negotiated under a collective bargaining contract with respect to the Illinois State Board of Education, and it was in lieu of a pay increase. they want to establish a COLA, a 2.9-percent CPI or COLA, to their pay bill beginning July 1st, of the year 2000 and perpetually thereafter. So what, in essence, you are attempting to do here is that - and you should have the figures - is that the annualized income just for the pay raise in addition to the superintendents, and ninety-five percent of what they made is being paid to their assistants, you're talking about almost nine hundred and twenty thousand dollars in annualized. And if you take in the pension benefit and you amortize that entire proposition over the next four years, you're adding about six million five hundred thousand dollars to the budget. Other than that, it's just simply a pay raise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jones. Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Mr. President, will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Does this bill include suburban Cook County as a separate entity?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

If -- if the population is in the range, I presume it would be

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

a million and over, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. Several years ago, we had a hundred and two of these. We're down to forty-three now. So I think we're moving in the right direction. So I would support this legislation. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise in support of this legislation. You know, as Senator Jones said, we reduced the number. We increased their responsibility. And, you know, I think if we're going to have capable people doing this — most of the — the programs and — and school districts that they administer, the superintendents and all receive more money than they do. I think if — if we're going to keep these people and assign more responsibility to 'em, then if we're going to have capable people, we have to pay 'em. And I support this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Larry Walsh.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Walsh.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

Senator Weaver, would this pay increase take effect of the superintendent of schools that were just elected in the November election?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

For those whose terms begin after August the second of this year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Larry Walsh.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

Well, I thought it was -- I thought it was law, and I don't know, but I'm just questioning, do we not have to set salaries of -- of -- of elected officials a hundred and eighty days before the election?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

I don't know, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Larry Walsh.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

My thoughts were that they have to be done before elections and not before terms of offices starting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

I think, in many cases statewide, that if the pay raise is granted before they take office -- how about the City aldermen in Chicago. Aldermen all over the -- county officials. I don't know that -- I hadn't -- I'm not familiar with a hundred and eighty days provision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Larry Walsh.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

Well, I -- I think -- I think, this Body and -- and -- and the House of Representatives, language was passed -- or law was passed that told -- set the standard that everybody, maybe because of the

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

way pay raises were granted aldermen in Chicago, I don't know, but I thought that they set the standard that all pay raises for any elected official had to be discussed and put into effect a certain number of days, and I thought that that was a hundred and eighty days, prior to the election.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Walsh. I didn't -- I didn't know if that was a question.

SENATOR L. WALSH:

Well, it could have been, but my point being -- my point being, I -- I certainly would hate to see us pass on legislation if we -- if we don't know exactly who's going to be affected by it in promoting this. And I know that last year or a year ago we just -- we did something with regards to clerks and recorders on a stipend that did not go into effect till these people get elected again in the year 2000. So it's just a point of information.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

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

I -- I rise in support of this legislation. I might just suggest as a way out of all of this, Senator, that -- that if we do get this thing passed out of here, we could change the date, if there is a conflict, in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Weaver, to close.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think I've got some clarification on the hundred and eighty days: That's where the governing body sets their own salaries. These folks are considered State employees and we are setting their salaries. That's why they come back to us for salary adjustments. I might like to say, this is a

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

one time increase of about seventy-five hundred dollars, and from thousand and two {sic} (2000), then they get a so-called COLA of not more than 2.9 percent. So I don't think the fiscal implication is that great. And the -- the Pension Laws Commission didn't feel that the effect on -- on TRS was going to be detrimental at all. So I -- I think these folks deserve -- a pay adjustment. They haven't had any increase for four years. And we're the ones that set their salaries. So I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 995 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. 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 41 voting Yes, 10 voting No, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 995, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

Point of announcement, Mr. President. The -- Public Health will meet immediately upon adjournment. We have a number of bills to get done. So if everyone can get there, we can try to get out at a reasonable hour.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The Senate Appropriation Committee recessed on Tuesday evening. We're going reconvene tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. in Room 212. I'd encourage all the Members to be as prompt as possible. We're going to hear amendments and then move the bills to the Floor, so that we can get home for the weekend.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Subcommittee on State Government of the Executive Committee will meet immediately upon adjournment in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Madam Secretary, Message from the House.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 39, 77, 90, 382, 440, 604, 886, 1153, 1510, 1774, 1832 and 2281.

Passed the House, March 18th, 1999.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Resolutions.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 67, offered by Senator Clayborne and all Members.

It is a death resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Consent Calendar. ...going to read into the record House Bills 1st Reading. Just for your information, the Senate will convene tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. This is not an adjournment, but we're just -- for your information, 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, the Senate will convene. The Secretary will now read House Bills 1st Reading.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 21, offered by Senator Demuzio.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

House Bill 62, offered by Senator Dudycz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 89, offered by Senator Clayborne.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 129, offered by Senator DeLeo.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 152, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 231, offered by Senator Dillard {sic} (Cullerton).

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 236, offered by Senator Shaw.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 254, offered by Senator Robert Madigan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 287, offered by Senator Donahue.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 323, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 325, offered by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 371, offered by Senator O'Malley.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 402, offered by Senator Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 525, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 526, offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 573, offered by Senator O'Malley.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 574, offered by Senator O'Malley.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

House Bill 720, offered by Senators Dudycz, Munoz and Shadid.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 727, offered by Senator Clayborne.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 790, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 795, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 819, offered by Senator O'Malley.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 841, offered by Senator Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1063, offered by Senators Dudycz and Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1102, offered by Senator Parker.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1197, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1278, offered by Senator Bowles.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1293, offered by Senator Cronin.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1298, offered by Senator Karpiel.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1399, offered by Senator del Valle.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1416, offered by Senator O'Malley.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1438, offered by Senator Munoz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1693, offered by Senator Burzynski.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

House Bill 1694, offered by Senator Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1713, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1722, offered by Senator Cronin.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1757, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1806, offered by Senators Clayborne and Shadid.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1845, offered by Senator Wendell Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1868, offered by Senator Shadid.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1871, offered by Senator Shadid.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1964, offered by Senator Berman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2005, offered by Senator Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2019, offered by Senator Shadid.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2166, offered by Senator Robert Madigan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2196, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2347, offered by Senator Sieben.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2349, offered by Senator Munoz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2381, offered by Senator Karpiel.

22nd Legislative Day

March 18, 1999

House Bill 2580, offered by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2630, offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2631, offered by Senator Noland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2642, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2699, offered by Senator Madigan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2767, offered by Senator Maitland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2784, offered by Senator O'Daniel.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, have there been any motions filed?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Yes, Mr. President. Senator Hendon has filed a motion with respect to Senate Resolution 30. And Senator Dillard has filed a motion with respect to Senate Bill 929.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, the Chair requests that these motions be printed on the Calendar. So ordered. There any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Klemm moves that the Senate stand adjourned until the hour of 10 a.m., Friday, March 19th. 10 o'clock in the morning.

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS
PAGE: 001 91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

99/04/29 12:28:09

MARCH 18, 1999

HB-0021	TPGT	PEADING	PAGE	139
HB-0062			PAGE	140
HB-0089	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0129	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0152			PAGE	140
HB-0231			PAGE	140
HB-0236	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0254	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0287			PAGE	
HB-0323			PAGE	
HB-0325			PAGE	
HB-0371	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0402			PAGE	140
HB-0525			PAGE	
HB-0526			PAGE	
HB-0573	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0574	FIRST	READING	PAGE	140
HB-0720			PAGE	
			DAGE	4114
HB-0727			PAGE	
HB-0790			PAGE	
HB-0795	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-0819	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-0841			PAGE	141
HB-1063			PAGE	141
HB-1102	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-1197	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-1278			PAGE	
HB-1293			PAGE	
HB-1298	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-1399	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-1416	FIRST	READING	PAGE	141
HB-1438			PAGE	
_			PAGE	
HB-1693				
HB-1694			PAGE	
HB-1713	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-1722	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-1757	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-1806			PAGE	142
HB-1845	EIDOT	DEADING	PAGE	142
HB-1868			PAGE	142
HB-1871	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-1964	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-2005	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-2019	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-2166	PIDOT	DEADING	PAGE	142
HB-2196			PAGE	142
HB-2347	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-2349	FIRST	READING	PAGE	142
HB-2381			PAGE	142
				143
HB-2580			PAGE	
HB-2630			PAGE	143
HB-2631	FIRST	READING	PAGE	143
HB-2642	FIRST	READING	PAGE	143
HB-2699			PAGE	143
HB-2767			PAGE	143
HB-2784			PAGE	143
SB-0017			PAGE	30
SB-0019	THIRD	READING	PAGE	31
SB-0023	SECONI	READING	PAGE	
_		READING	PAGE	3 4
				4
_		READING	PAGE	
SB-0038			PAGE	33
SB-0039			PAGE	33
SB-0043	THIRD	READING	PAGE	34

. .

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS 99/04/29 PAGE: 002 91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY 12:28:09

SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MARCH 18, 1999

以下UUTAS	THIRD READING	PAGE	35
_	THIRD READING	PAGE	36
SB-0070	RECALLED	PAGE	37
SB-0079	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	THIRD READING	PAGE	37
SB-0084	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0085	THIRD READING	PAGE	38
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	41
	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
SB-0110	THIRD READING	PAGE	43
SR_0111	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
			44
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-0121	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	47
SB-0122	THIRD READING	PAGE	47
	THIRD READING	PAGE	47
	THIRD READING	PAGE	48
SB-0127	THIRD READING	PAGE	48
SB-0128	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
SB-0128		PAGE	54
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0178	THIRD READING	PAGE	50
	THIRD READING	PAGE	51
			54
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	_
	THIRD READING	PAGE	55
SB-0233	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
	RECALLED	PAGE	57
	THIRD READING		
28-0521	THIRD READING	PAGE	57
SB-0259	THIRD READING	PAGE	58
SB-0283	THIRD READING	PAGE	60
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-0306	THIRD READING	PAGE	61
SB-0307	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	ģ
_	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
SB-0372	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
SB-0374	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
- :	THIRD READING	PAGE	73
_			
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-0387	THIRD READING	PAGE	75
SB-0395	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	THIRD READING	PAGE	89
SB-0400	OTHER	PAGE	92
SB-0421	THIRD READING	PAGE	91
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0469	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0477	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
SB-0507	SECOND READING	PAGE	14
	SECOND READING	PAGE	14
	SECOND READING	PAGE	15
	THIRD READING	PAGE	93
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
	THIRD READING	PAGE	93
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	94
SB-0648	SECOND READING	PAGE	17
SB-0656	THIRD READING	PAGE	94
	THIRD READING	PAGE	95
35-0090	DHIUMAN UNLING	LAGE	30

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS 99/04/29
PAGE: 003 91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY 12:28:09 SENATE

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MARCH 18, 1999

SB-0666 SECOND READING	PAGE	17
SB-0667 THIRD READING	PAGE	96
SB-0667 OTHER	PAGE	102
SB-0675 THIRD READING	PAGE	100
SB-0685 THIRD READING	PAGE	111
SB-0728 SECOND READING	PAGE	18
SB-0732 THIRD READING	PAGE	112
SB-0735 SECOND READING	PAGE	18
SB-0737 SECOND READING	PAGE	18
SB-0739 SECOND READING	PAGE	19
SB-0764 SECOND READING	PAGE	19
SB-0799 THIRD READING	PAGE	_
SB-0800 SECOND READING	PAGE	
SB-0815 THIRD READING	PAGE	114
SB-0824 SECOND READING	PAGE	20
SB-0826 SECOND READING	PAGE	21
SB-0827 SECOND READING	PAGE	21
SB-0840 THIRD READING	PAGE	115
SB-0847 THIRD READING	PAGE	116
SB-0850 THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-0876 THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-0877 THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-0892 THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-0893 THIRD READING	PAGE	121
SB-0929 THIRD READING	PAGE	127
SB-0929 MOTION FILED	PAGE	-
SB-0933 SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-0935 SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-0936 SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-0937 SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-0941 SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0956 SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0958 SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0966 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
SB-0967 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
SB-0980 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
SB-0987 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
SB-0995 THIRD READING	PAGE	132
SB-1010 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
SB-1059 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
SB-1070 SECOND READING	PAGE	26
SB-1073 SECOND READING	PAGE	26
SB-1128 SECOND READING	PAGE	26
SB-1133 SECOND READING	PAGE	27
SB-1136 SECOND READING	PAGE	27
SB-1141 SECOND READING	PAGE	27
SB-1150 SECOND READING	PAGE	28
SB-1150 SECOND READING	PAGE	28
SB-1151 SECOND READING SB-1155 SECOND READING		28
	PAGE	
SB-1168 SECOND READING	PAGE	29
SB-1171 SECOND READING	PAGE	29
SB-1184 SECOND READING	PAGE	29
SB-1189 SECOND READING	PAGE	29
SB-1202 SECOND READING	PAGE	30
SR-0030 MOTION FILED	PAGE	143
SR-0066 RESOLUTION OFFERED		3
SR-0067 RESOLUTION OFFERED		139
SJR-0025 RESOLUTION OFFERED		3
SJR-0026 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS 99/04/29 PAGE: 004 91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY 12:28:09

SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MARCH 18, 1999

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-RABBI BARRY MARKS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE-SENATOR SIEBEN	PAGE	1
JOURNALS-POSTPONTED	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT	PAGE	2
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	2
SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	73
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	139
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	143