51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 91st General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will our guests in the galleries please rise? Our prayer today will be given by Senator Geo-Karis. Senator Geo-Karis.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

(Prayer by Senator Geo-Karis)

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

#### SENATOR SIEBEN:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Sieben)

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

We have some requests for taping of the procedures today. WLS-TV, Chicago; WMAQ-TV, Chicago; and WCIA. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Reading of the Journal.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Journals of Wednesday, May 12th; Thursday, May 13th; Friday, May 14th; Monday, May 17th; Tuesday, May 18th; Wednesday, May 19th; and Thursday, May 20th, 1999.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Myers.

#### SENATOR MYERS:

Mr. President, I move that the Journals just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Myers moves to approve the Journals just read. There being no objection, so ordered. Senator Myers.

### SENATOR MYERS:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Friday, May 21st, in the year 1999, be postponed, pending

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

arrival of the printed Journal.

#### 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. Messages from the House. SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

Senate Bill 1017, with House Amendments 3 and 5.

Passed the House, as amended, May 21st, 1999.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

We have a request from the Associated Press to take still photos. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. As long as we're quiet for a few minutes, I'd like to make a couple of -- one announcement: that if you have motions to file or a conference committee, please file them as soon as possible. We anticipate a Rules Committee hearing sometime around 5 o'clock, and time is getting late. The sooner you file your motions and conference committees, the sooner we can get out of here. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

WCIS-Channel (sic) (WICS) 20 requests permission to videotape. Is there any objection? Hearing none, permission's granted. May I have your attention, please. We are going to the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence, House Bills, at the bottom of page 12. House Bill 452. Senator Mahar. Read the motion, Mr. Secretary. Senator Mahar.

### SENATOR MAHAR:

I would move that we nonconcur for the purpose of putting this into a conference committee. Oh, I'm sorry. I refuse to recede from Amendments No. 1, 2 and 3 so that we may put this

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

House Bill 452 in a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Mahar moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 and -- to House Bill 452 and he asks that a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. WFLD-TV, Fox News, from Chicago, requests permission to videotape. Any objection? Hearing none, permission is granted. If you'll please look at your today's Calendar on page 13, top of the page. House Bill 2518. Senator Rauschenberger. Senator Rauschenberger. 2518. Please make your motion.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Move not to -- I'd like to move nonconcurrence on House amendment -- I move to recede -- I -- I move to refuse to recede to House amendment on -- or on to the -- I move to refuse that. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger moves to -- that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2518 and that a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 2793. Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I would like to move to refuse to recede.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Rauschenberger moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendments {sic} 1 in House Bill 2793 and that a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Lauzen.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Please look on page 11. Secretary's Desk, Concurrence on Senate Bills. Senate Bill 43. Senator Lauzen. Read the motion, Mr. Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to nonconcur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 43.

The motion, by Senator Lauzen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen moves to nonconcur in House Amendment 2 in Senate Bill 43. Is there any discussion? All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Committee Reports.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Referred to the Committee on Executive — the Motion to Concur with House Amendments 3 and 5 to Senate Bill 1017, Conference Committee Report 1 to Senate Bill 1014; to the Committee on Local Government — Motions to Concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 827 and House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 933; to the Committee on Revenue — Conference Committee Report 1 to Senate Bill 338; and to the Committee on State Government Operations — the Motions — or, a Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 876.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Klemm, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR KLEMM:

For the purposes of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Will you state your purpose?

#### SENATOR KLEMM:

The Senate -- the Senate -- the -- the Senate Executive

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Committee will be meeting in one hour, at 5:45, in Room 212. Senate Executive Committee, 5:45, in Room 212. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senate Executive Committee will meet at 5:45 p.m., tonight, in the room known as Room 212. Introduction of Bills.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1242, offered by Senator Rea.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

There any other announcements? Hearing none, we will be in recess until the call of the Chair. Remember, there's an Executive Committee meeting at 5:45 in Room 212. 5:45? Yes, that's what I said. 5:45 in Room 212.

#### (SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senate will come to order. Committee Reports.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Klemm, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Bill 1014, the First Conference Committee Report, Be Approved for Consideration; and Senate Bill 1017, Motion to Concur with House Amendments 3 and 5, Be Approved for Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

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 refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendments to a bill of the following

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

title, to wit:

House Bill 134, with Senate Amendments 2 and 3.

We have like Messages on House Bill 542, with Senate Amendment 1; House Bill 557, with Senate Amendment 1; House Bill 658, with Senate Amendments 1 and 2; House Bill 1278, with Senate Amendment 2; House Bill 1413, with Senate Amendment 1; House Bill 1670, with Senate Amendments 1 and 2; House Bill 427, with Senate Amendment 1; and House Bill 2166, with Senate Amendments 1 and 2.

All nonconcurred in by the House, May 24th, 1999.

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

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

Senate Bill 1015, with House Amendments 1 and 3.

Passed the House, as amended, May 24th, 1999.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Let me, if I might, have the attention of the Body. It's our intent to go to page 2 of Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Secretary's Desk, House Bills, and the motions are motions to refuse to recede. We will -- that is not final action, as you know, so it'll be a very quick action. So let's start, if we might, top of page 2 of the Supplemental Calendar. House Bill 134. Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen, on House Bill 134. Mr. Secretary, please. Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to refuse to recede on Senate -- Senate Amendments No. 2 and No. 3 to House Bill 134, as amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator -- Lauzen moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 134 and that a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Welch, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Well, I wanted to ask a question on that bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

We were -- I thought we were going to have some debate on that because I'm not sure that we wanted to vote for those two -- to take off those two amendments.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

I -- I'm -- this is not final action, Senator. This is -- this is simply a procedural motion and historically has not had debate on -- on motions to refuse to recede. Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

I think what we just did was change the tax break we're giving to veterans, and I'm not sure that we didn't reduce the tax break we are giving to veterans by doing what Senator Lauzen just did. And I'm not sure that we want to be on record doing that.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Well, Senator Welch, the motion was -- was asked, a vote was taken, and the Secretary will so inform the House. House Bill 427. Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

I would like to refuse to -- to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 on House Bill 427 and I ask for a conference committee.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Fawell moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 427 and that a House -- that a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. And the motion

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 542. Senator Burzynski. Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 542.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Burzynski moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 542 and that a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 557. Senator Viverito. Senator Viverito?

#### SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I -- Senate refuse to recede.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Viverito has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 557 and that a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 658. Senator Karpiel. Senator Karpiel.

### SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President. I would like to -- I refuse to recede from Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 658 and ask that a conference committee be appointed.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Karpiel has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendments No. 1 and 2 to House Bill 658 and a conference committee be appointed. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 1278. Senator Bowles. Senator Bowles.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

#### SENATOR BOWLES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I would like to move to nonconcur -- I'm sorry...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator, refuse...

SENATOR BOWLES:

Move to recede.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

That is correct.

#### SENATOR BOWLES:

I'm sorry. From Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1278 and I'd ask for the appointment of a -- move to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Bowles has moved to...

#### SENATOR BOWLES:

Refuse to recede.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

...refuse to recede from House -- from Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1278 and a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 1413. Senator Peterson. Senator Peterson.

### SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I refuse to recede from Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1413 and ask for a conference committee. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Peterson has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1413 and a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 1670. Senator Cronin. Senator Cronin, please. Senator Cronin. Senator Cronin has...

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

#### SENATOR CRONIN:

I -- forgive me. Mr. President, I move to refuse to recede from Senate Amendments No. 1 and 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator -- Senator Cronin moves to refuse to recede from Senate Amendments No. 1 and 2 to House Bill 1670 and a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. The Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 2166. Senator Robert Madigan. Senator Madigan.

#### SENATOR R. MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move that the Senate refuse to recede on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2166.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Madigan has moved the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendments No. 1 and 2 to House Bill 2166 and a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Top of page... We'll be going to final action. Top of page 3 of your Supplemental Calendar. Conference Committee Reports. Senate Bill 1014. 1014. Senator Watson. Mr. Secretary, do you have on file a conference committee report on Senate Bill 1014?

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Yes, Mr. President. First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1014.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This piece of legislation comes to us from the Treasurer, Judy Baar Topinka, and it establishes a College Savings Fund -- or, a Pool. And there are

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

currently sixteen states that have this program, and what it does is enables people of Illinois to participate in a federal tax benefit that other states, such as the other sixteen, have for the people that they -- within their -- within their state. The -all the thrift organizations sat down. There was some problems and concerns that the banks, both community banks and the Illinois Bankers, and the savings and loan people, Illinois Student Assistance Commission, credit unions, all sat down with Treasurer Topinka and we worked out this particular agreement. conference committee report was signed by all five of the Senate conferees and four of the five in the House. What this does allows for people to invest with the Treasurer's Office, through a local banking facility in their community, if that bank wishes to participate, and that money then would go into a pool and could be utilized for tuition, fees, cost of books, supplies, equipment, some room and board, and it would also be available for these following schools: public and private colleges, junior colleges, graduate colleges, vocational institutions and others. So it's an excellent program that will be provided by our Treasurer for the people of Illinois, and it is agreed to by all those interested parties.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

I've got a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Welch.

### SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Watson, you said that this will cover community colleges and others. Who are these others? Would that include beauty shops, if somebody wants to go to a beauty shop or a barber school or...?

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. This is final action, Ladies and Gentlemen. Either the conference committees be soft or they go off the Floor. We're going to stick -- we've got a busy evening, a lot of work to do. We're going to insist on that. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

All right. Thank you. Vocational institutions as described in the Higher Education Act and eligible for Department of Education student aid programs. And I understand that that does not necessarily include beauty schools. If they come under the federal Act, that — answer to that question could — would be yes, but they are not eligible under the federal Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Are the Community Bankers still in opposition to this bill, or are they...?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, the Community Bankers, the Illinois Bankers and litany of all the various thrift organizations out there sat down with the Treasurer and worked out this language. And they are in agreement and support the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Tom Walsh.

SENATOR T. WALSH:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator.

SENATOR T. WALSH:

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Senator Watson, how does this differ from the legislation that you passed last year with the Illinois Student Assistance Commission?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, that was the pre-paid tuition program. This is considerably different from that. This — this will involve more potential services to offer to the students, such as room and board. This is going to have a federal tax benefit. In other words, as the investment comes in and then when it ultimately goes out, it will go out at the student's tax rate, the individual's tax rate. So that will be a considerable savings to those who have invested.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Tom Walsh.

### SENATOR T. WALSH:

With the -- the -- the bill that you passed last year, that could only be used for tuition and that was, like, a pre-paid tuition program, as I -- as I recall, and it was a limited program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, that is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Tom Walsh.

#### SENATOR T. WALSH:

Is the Illinois Student Assistance Commission in support of this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, the Illinois Student Assistance Commission was at the table as this was being discussed, and they do support the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there further discussion? Senator Watson, to close.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Just ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1014. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, no Members voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to House {sic} Bill 1014, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. All right. Under Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, is Senate Bill 1015. With leave of the Body, Senator Donahue will handle that bill. Senator Donahue.

### SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I would move that we concur in House Amendments 1 and 3...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

No, no, no, no...

#### SENATOR DONAHUE:

I'm sorry. I would...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

We'll take that out of the record for this evening. Senator Smith, for what purpose do you arise? Senator Smith. Senator Obama, for what purpose do you arise, sir? ...right. Page 3 of the Calendar, on Supplemental Calendar No. 1, is Senate Bill 1017.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Mr. -- on Secretary's Desk, Concurrence. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 3 and 5 to Senate Bill 1017.

The motion, by Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Well...

SENATOR SMITH:

I beg to respectfully request a caucus of the Democrats in Senator...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator?

SENATOR SMITH:

... Emil Jones' Office, immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

And -- and the time? The time of the...

SENATOR SMITH:

Immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The time of the caucus. Please give us a time on the caucus.

SENATOR SMITH:

Will you give us one hour, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Thirty minutes?

SENATOR SMITH:

One hour.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Thirty minutes.

SENATOR SMITH:

Just one hour.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Thirty minutes.

SENATOR SMITH:

One...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 9 o'clock.

#### (SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senate will come to order. WGN-TV would like to request permission to videotape. Is -- is leave granted? Leave is granted. The Senate will come to order. On your Supplemental Calendar, page 3, is Senate Bill 1017. Mr. Secretary, please read the motion.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 3 and 5 to Senate Bill 1017.

The motion, by Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

### SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill deals with both racing and riverboat. I think this bill has been

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

before us several times. I know in the last, almost, seven years, we've had a combination of subjects similar to what's in 1017. I would hope that we would be like the racing industry and the gaming industry, and I think that we've come closer to agreement in the total industry on 1017 than we have on anything that's been before us in the last seven years, as far as the industry's As you know, there is one dormant license that is concerned. trying to be activated at a different location. This would also Puts -- the recapture money, it takes care of allow dockside. that problem. It changes the taxing rates. And for the part, I think the total industry is pretty much in agreement as to what the bill would do for the gaming industry in the State of Illinois. In essence, after this dormant boat is back operation, it should generate about a hundred million dollars for the educational system of the State of Illinois. We've discussed this bill many times. We discussed it in committee, and I think maybe the best thing to do is to entertain your questions and see if we can provide satisfactory answers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Senator Shaw.

### SENATOR SHAW:

Thank you, Mr. President. I've been in this Body a long time, almost eighteen years, and I've never seen anything like this. But I -- will the sponsor yield for a couple of questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Shaw.

### SENATOR SHAW:

Let me ask you, Senator Weaver, how much -- how much money is this going to cost the taxpayers of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

### SENATOR WEAVER:

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Somewhere between sixty and seventy million dollars, but that's more than made up for by the hundred million dollars that would go into the educational fund. So there's a net gain, probably thirty million, plus hopefully the racing industry will bring in more money with a greater handle, and the dockside provision should bring in more money in the other nine licenses throughout the State. So it's kind of hard to estimate, Senator Shaw.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Shaw.

#### SENATOR SHAW:

Does that include the sixty-five million dollars in -- in real estate taxes that we are paying for Duchossois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

That's all included.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Shaw.

### SENATOR SHAW:

Can you name me some other citizen that we have done this for at the rate that we are doing this for a -- a -- a millionaire, that's -- a person that's already a millionaire? Can you name me some other case where that we've forgiven people for that -- that much money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

### SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, I think we've tried to help all businesses in this State. I -- comes to mind Sears and Roebuck, Motorola. Other industries, job-creating industries, we've tried to be helpful.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Senator Shaw.

#### SENATOR SHAW:

One other question. On the -- is anything about racing dates for Arlington in this bill? And if it is, are we extending the number of dates that he's receiving opposed to other tracks?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Shaw.

SENATOR SHAW:

I didn't -- I didn't hear him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

The answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Shaw.

### SENATOR SHAW:

Well, to the bill: Let me tell you, I've been here a long time, same as you, Senator Weaver, and I -- I believe that the people of Illinois sent us down here from individual districts and they sent us down here to represent them. And most of us don't come from these rich districts, as up in Rosemont and up at Arlington, and maybe your district. And I know you are an honorable man. I think you was duped into carrying this bill. But -- but the fact of the matter is that citizens -- poor citizens of Illinois, like in my district, the south suburbs of Chicago - Robbins, Illinois - this is the same Body that -- that repealed the -- Retail Rate Law to put a -- make a poor town poorer. We didn't want to see Robbins exist, but we have the

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

audacity, here tonight, to give the millionaires of this State the I -- this is unconscionable. And then -- the taxpayers' money. we're talking about we're going to create some jobs. Jobs for who? He don't need no job if we keep going to the State coffers and giving him sixty-five million dollars, paying his property tax. He don't need a job, and those other people that we are talking about in terms of jobs, many of the people can't get to Rosemont. Here's a community -- and I don't have anything against Rosemont, but here's a community have about twenty-seven hundred people, and we're going to give that community a riverboat. First place, the original legislation, we talked about need, a community that is underprivileged or deprived. Now, I know the argument going how do I know it's going to Rosemont. Let me tell you this: Those of us who are elected in this Body, we didn't come out of the dust closet to get here, and we understand this process. Also in this bill, you are removing -- you're making the Gaming Board, those people that are sitting there will just be capons for rest of the duration of their tenure. And I think it's unfair to the Game -- Gaming Board that you should make capons out of 'em. The other part of this is that when you look at underprivileged communities, that we haven't done anything for them. done this for senior citizens. We haven't done this for many of the major problems that confront the people of this State. And we sit here tonight and we want to tell the people and go back home to our respective districts and tell the people that we have done a good job for them, but -- on both sides of the aisle. no way that I feel as though that you can go back to your respective district, whether you're a Democrat or a Republican, and tell the people that I gave Duchossois sixty-five million dollars and I gave him another -- some...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator...

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

#### SENATOR SHAW:

I'll bring it to an end...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator, would you bring your remarks to a close, please?

#### SENATOR SHAW:

Yes. I gave some other group another hundred million dollars. Let me tell you: A lot of you are not going to be back in. When the people wake up in -- back in our respective districts, they're going to make sure that we don't return here. I ask for a No vote

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

Senator Weaver, I -- I have a quick question and -- and then would like to speak to the bill. The question relates to a provision that I understand that omits the current prohibition against owning more than ten percent of the second and subsequent licenses. Could -- could you tell me why that current prohibition is removed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver. ... Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, I think there's several reasons. It allows existing boats to buy in possibly -- the possibility of buying into the dormant boat. There is interlocking ownership in some of these boats throughout the Midwest, and it was thought by those who negotiated this bill that this was a good feature of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

my impression, I guess, is that that's a Well, the -troubling feature of the bill, because I'm assuming that originally - and you and Senator Shaw were here when the -- the initial gaming bill was passed; I was not - that part of the function of this limit was to ensure that, in fact, we did not create a monopoly in what is already a controlled and regulated industry, that we were going to spread it around a little bit so that we did not just have one or two or three controlling interests controlling gaming throughout the State. And so, I quess I'm --I'm a little troubled about this particular Let me speak to the bill, and I'll be very brief because I know that there are a lot of lights blinking and I did not originally intend to speak on this bill. Ι amnot philosophically very keen on gaming as an economic development strategy. That's just my philosophy. I -- I tend to think that we are shuffling resources around, oftentimes from people who can least afford it. I think oftentimes it tends to be regressive. But we made a decision in this State a while back that we were going to go ahead and allow gaming, as well as the Lottery, done deal. And as a consequence, I'm somewhat sympathetic to communities like -- like Rock Island that want I understand why they would want it. They're having a tough time competing in other states. But what does disturb me deeply, in looking at this bill, is the fact that we are giving away, at least initially, sixty-five million dollars in tax breaks to people who I think we would all acknowledge are pretty fortunate and doing pretty well, and that if normally they were before us, would argue in favor of the free market and would argue that we don't need government intervention and we shouldn't get subsidies; and, if we were talking about welfare reform or if we

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

were talking about programs for the poor or programs for the elderly, they would be opposed to these kinds of tax breaks. And I'll also say that, during this Session, sitting in Public Health and Welfare, as the Democratic Chair, I watched us, again and again, reject and refuse the requests of people in deep need in this State - personal attendants who are caring for the disabled and are making the minimum wage, and we told them, "You know what? We can't give a -- a raise. We've got a tight budget here." We had bills that would raise Medicaid eligibility for Said we couldn't do it. senior citizens. Sixteen million dollars. Couldn't find it in the budget. We had a bill that would have shifted the median income of eligibility for subsidized day care. Cost, ten million dollars. We couldn't do it. And many of us sitting here today said to people in desperate need that we couldn't provide those kinds of tax breaks or we couldn't provide those kinds of subsidies because we are fiscally responsible. And yet, here we are today -- and I've been observing this process for last three days of people trading their votes, making deals. Half of the people in these conversations can't tell me how one, single individual in their district is going to be helped by this particular legislation. And I think we should be ashamed of ourselves, after saying no to that many people who need some real help in this State, that we are actually willing to go ahead and vote for a piece of legislation that helps people who don't need it. I'd urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

### SENATOR BERMAN:

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

I just want to address one point. It came up to me very recently and I didn't have a chance to share this with the sponsor, but let me explain to you why I'm going to vote No on this bill tonight.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

And I think it's a problem that can be corrected and should be corrected. Every one of us have been confronted with the problem or the perception in Illinois, among all of the public, regarding the "shell game", where we passed a lottery, created a lottery, where we authorized ten riverboat gambling licenses, and we always used the cover that this was going to improve education funding. And for a number of years, through our lack of attention to proper language, there was an increase from the Lottery and from gaming into the School Aid Formula Fund, but we didn't appropriate enough money to equal what the previous year was, and that was what was called a shell game. So education didn't really benefit from our votes in favor of lottery and gaming. There's a gentleman sitting there in the front row in the balcony behind the speaker, behind the President, who sponsored, and many of us cosponsored with him, three years ago, a bill to eliminate the shell game. So we are required, under existing law, to appropriate no less in any given year than was appropriated the previous year. So if there's an increase from the Lottery and from gaming, education benefits. respectfully suggest and point out, and I have a full sheet here, done by our staff, that we have not addressed the same kind of shell game problem in this bill. We have provided for increased revenue from the new -- from the tenth license and from dockside gaming. We expect monies to -- to be increased. They probably will. But that money is required to go to the Racing Equity Fund, And there is no requirement that the General Assembly appropriate the same amount of money that we gave the previous year for school funding. We are inviting a new shell game. That language should be corrected in this bill before we're asked to vote Yes. I urge a No until that correction is made.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in opposition to this -- this bill and this legislation that's before us tonight. I was in the House when this subject first came up about legalized casino gambling in Illinois, and I strongly opposed it at that time. And when I came to the Senate, I worked to try to pass legislation that would call a statewide referendum, giving the people the -- the for opportunity in this State to vote and let us know what they felt about the expansion of gambling in our State and providing additional opportunities for gambling throughout our State. during that time, you know, we put Lottery terminals in just about every community, every retail outlet in this State. We've got off-track betting parlors within easy access of just about every community in our State. And now we have the legalized casino gambling, again within easy access. So I don't think the people, at least in my district and I think in many of your districts, are asking for additional opportunities or more access to legalized gambling in the State, and that's the reason I strongly oppose And I want to say just three things tonight, this legislation. first of all to speak a little bit for those people who have taken a very active interest in opposing this legislation and just state their points very briefly. And I'm not going to read the position papers, 'cause you've all gotten 'em today. But I think to make -- for the record and for people to be aware of this, you know, the Concerned Women of America gave us a position paper today talking about how gambling hurts families. Illinois Family Institute provided a position paper in opposition showing five good reasons to vote against this bill. ILCAAP, the Illinois Church Action on Alcohol Problems, gave numerous points in opposition. Our own Economic and Fiscal Commission did a -- an economic evaluation of this bill, and the net effect of that -and this was just done on the 20th of May, just four days ago.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

The net effect of this legislation is a fourteen-million-dollar loss to the State of Illinois. You can believe those figures or you can disagree with 'em, but that's a pretty careful evaluation of the economic impact of this legislation, results in a net loss of fourteen million dollars. Family Taxpayers' Network strongly opposes this. The National Gaming Impact Study Commission -- the National Gaming Impact Study Commission has recommended putting the brakes on gambling expansion across the country. So there's plenty of opposition to this. Secondly, let me say a little bit about the licensee that we keep talking about in this legislation. The Silver Eagle, East Dubuque, Jo Daviess County, that's the area I've represented since 1992. Quite familiar with the operation of that boat. And the area hotel and resort group that had that boat, they also operated the Galena territory Eagle Ridge, and many of you have stayed up there and visited there. These people are pretty good at running a resort, and they were good hotel operators. But they didn't know a darn thing about operating a riverboat, and they did a lousy job of operating the Silver Eagle. They complained they couldn't make a profit. they made some profit the first few years. Jo Daviess County invested about three million dollars to extend water and sewer out to Fentress Lake to establish the site and the location for docking of this boat. In the first couple of years, the Silver Eagle - small boat, small market - but they made good money. And then when the early attempts to bring dockside to that Okay? area failed, then they started putting less and less marketing dollars into their operation of the Silver Eagle, complaining that they couldn't compete with the Diamond Jo in Dubuque because they didn't have unrestricted access to the Silver Eagle in -- in East And so, shortly after that, they shut the boat down, claiming that they couldn't make a profit, but they had made profit the first couple of years. If you talk to the people

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

involved with the boat up there, the people involved with economic development in East Dubuque, they can cite all kinds of problems with the lack of marketing effort by this group, the licensee involved here, and the way they operated the boat. So what did they do when the Gaming Board threatened to revoke their license and -- and terminate the rights for that boat? They reopened the Halfhearted effort again, a very halfhearted effort, to boat. make that boat successful, and then they shut it down again, claiming they couldn't make a profit. So twice this licensee has failed to be successful in operating that boat. So now what are they asking for? We're -- in this legislation, we're going to give them, a failed licensed operator, we're going to give the right to relocate. Okay? Do they have to go through any kind of scrutiny, any kind of evaluation? No. The language on -- the language on page 103 says that the Gaming Board shall grant the application -- "...shall grant the application and approval upon receipt by the licensee of approval from the new municipality or county, as the case may be, in which the licensee wishes to relocate pursuant to Section 7...." Now, why should we be rewarding a failed licensee and letting them pick their own spot and saying that the State Gaming Board has to approve that? That doesn't make any sense to me. In fact, it looks to me like that is very, very special legislation. And then my final point, and that's on page 82, when you look at the definition of a riverboat. We are now going to call riverboats in Illinois permanently moored barges. Just look at page 82. That's the definition. added to the definition of a riverboat. Permanently moored barges. And I guarantee you that allowing unrestricted access to casino gambling on permanently moored barges goes a lot farther than we need to to compete with the boats on the other side of the river who have to cruise a hundred times a year, who have to have a captain and crew and a riverboat. So we are taking a quantum

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

leap way beyond what we need to do to compete with our neighbors. By allowing unrestricted access to casino gambling on permanently moored barges, in my view, that is essentially establishing the end of riverboat gambling and the beginning of land-based casino gambling in Illinois. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

This is not meant to be an admonishment of any of the previous speakers, but let me just suggest: We have quite a number of speakers yet to go on this issue tonight, and so, as you make your comments, if points have been made, please consider leaving those from your remarks, if you would, please. Senator del Valle.

SENATOR del Valle:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'll try to be brief, but some key points have been made and I think that I need to emphasize a couple of those points. The number one point I want to make is that this bill does represent a major change in gambling policy in the State of Illinois, and it's really a shame that a major change in gambling policy in the State of Illinois comes to us in the form of a bill that appears before us not on the last day of the scheduled Session, but after the last day, after the last day of the scheduled Session, appears before us in the Senate Executive Committee, where we are then limited to hearing two proponents and two opponents. And then the bill -- the bill -- while we're still digesting it, then the bill comes to the Floor an hour later. Major change in policy - and, yes, it is a major change. Those who have said that this is not an expansion, let me tell you that by adding Cook, we are expanding gambling opportunities in the State of Illinois. Your definition of expansion should not limited to the ten licenses. Let's expand the definition of expansion. Let's call it what it is. It is expansion when you throw in Cook. And when you throw in -- and this is the part that really gets me, because I asked about it in committee. How is it

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

that we have a Gaming Board and how is it that the individual, Mr. Duffy, who testified in committee, in response to my question about how is it that even though we have not taken action on this bill, even though the Gaming Board hasn't met to decide anything and to listen to anything, how is it that we have already determined that this license is going to Rosemont? His response to me was: We have an honest process. How the hell do you have an honest process that -- is already determined before the bill is even enacted by the Governor? I don't understand that. How is honest if Waukegan, if Calumet, if other areas of the State, areas that are eligible based on the original definition of the legislation that said that these licenses are to go to riverboat economically depressed areas, how is it -- how is it that end up setting a precedent, if this is enacted into law, in Rosemont, that is not economically allowing an area, like depressed to get a license? And then does that mean that then the other licenses will come in and ask for a change so they can move around from the area that was originally intended to help so that they could do the wonderful things that are happening in East St. Louis? That's what we originally intended. This is a major shift The property tax issue - all the racetracks -away from that. all the racetracks are affected by this - not just Arlington. have a district that is being developed where individuals are affected by development, gentrifying areas. I asked for property tax break for longtime homeowners. Ten years. All Ι could get was a deferral, but we're not going to give a deferral to Arlington. No, we're going to give 'em a credit against their How about doing that back home in our districts property taxes. where we live, where people are being property taxed to death? The minority set-aside language - I'm all for minority ownership. The language is sloppy. The language was hastily put into the bill in order to pick up votes, and the language is flawed. We didn't

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

It's flawed and we're going to pay the price for that because there's an inseverability section in this bill. not here to make one Hispanic or an African-American rich. No, I'm sorry about that. And I know we've got some sitting in the gallery who probably are ready, ready to bring down their investment and become millionaires as a result. That's not what my interest is. I wanted linked development. I wanted some dollars to go into communities, into those suburbs, that are going to be invested in development so those individuals can say, "That's a benefit, a real benefit, from the gambling industry in the State Illinois." But, no, we don't do that. We didn't put linked development into this bill. The impact on State revenues, seventy-two-million-dollar hit to GRF, a fourteen-million-dollar ongoing hit. What are we doing? What are we doing? I think we ought to put the brakes on right now. Let's stop. Let's talk about this some more. Let's -- and I was for the referendum, Senator Sieben. I was. Too bad we didn't give people a chance to speak, but maybe it's because the people in the industry were afraid of what the people would say. But given that we didn't give 'em a chance to speak, let's give ourselves a chance to do something that is right; for -- in order for us to do that, we need time, and that's what I ask for tonight. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Petka.

### SENATOR PETKA:

I move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Petka has moved the previous question. There are ten additional speakers. Further discussion? Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Let me just say that, as I was sitting here, I was thinking back to a few years back when we

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

passed the bill originally creating the ten riverboat licenses, and that night we talked about economic development and bringing these replicas of the old riverboats that plied the Mississippi River to towns throughout the State of Illinois. projected great economic development in these towns that were having a great deal of trouble with economic development. Joliet was falling apart. It -- it's economy was going down the tubes. Moline and Rock Island was in bad shape. East St. Louis certainly was in bad shape. And all of these towns stood to gain by the creation of the riverboat licenses. I don't come here, after having voted for that, being one who is against any expansion of I --I tend to disagree with some of the previous speakers. I think Cook County should have a license. They could even have a casino, as far as I'm concerned. But I think that the -- the question that we have to ask is why it's going where it's going. Is that really economic development, or are we just cutting a deal that started out being dockside gambling for -- to keep a few boats going? We wanted a -- the tenth license to generate revenue. We've got that, but now we've come to some kind of -- of secret agreement that it's going up to Rosemont. get it there, another person, who wanted it up in Arlington agreed to give up his contention that he deserved it in exchange for a piece of the pie. And to get a few more votes, had a few more racetracks saying, "Well, if Arlington's -- if their racetrack's going to get something, what about Don't we deserve a little bit?" And in order to fund racetrack? all of these pieces of this pie, we've given and given and given from the general Treasury, from other funds. As Senator Berman said, we took money out of the Education Fund to help fund these tax breaks and these so-called incentives to get people to vote for the bill. We also took money out of a fund that -- it was pointed out to me. There's a downstate park and conservation

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

district fund. This money is -- is going to help subsidize real estate tax credits for the rich, and let me read you what towns also are losing here - these towns have money that comes from the off-track betting parlors that they're going lose: Bloomington, Bradley, Carbondale, Champaign, Danville, Effingham, Oakbrook Terrace, Peoria, Peru, Quincy, Richmond, Markham, Rockford and Springfield. You're all losing money. You may get it back, subject to the whim of the Legislature reappropriating money, but there's no guarantee of that. What we have here akin to a runaway train. This legislation started out just being a small riverboat bill for one town. It's gotten bigger People were afraid to say no. They were afraid to put on the brakes. You know, in looking at this bill, I'm reminded of a movie several years ago that starred Michael Douglas; it was And in that movie, he played a character called Wall Street. called Gordon Gekko. And the famous quote that Gordon Gekko had in that movie, when he was explaining about the stock market to everybody, is he said, "Greed is good." And apparently that the mantra of those who have been supporting this bill and pushing it, because this bill doesn't do much for the entire State of Illinois. It does a lot for very few, and I don't think that's the purpose of the original riverboat gambling bill and I know that it's not the purpose of us being elected to the State Senate from the great State of Illinois. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Trotter.

### SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I, too, rise in opposition to this bill, but for slightly different reasons as some of my other colleagues have already enumerated. One is the timing issue. This is a very important issue that we need -- to be addressed after we've given it much consideration.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Like some of my other Members here, I do believe that we must do something for the racing industry. They have been the bread and butter of this State for a long time. We must do something to ensure that their lifestyles, that their quality of life, is taken For the boats, we voted on a docking bill once before care of. for the boats. It went nowhere in the House. We need to separate this question again. We need to be looking at the projections that have been made by Economic and Fisc, and that is that there will be a fourteen-million-dollar hit, that there will be GRF -- a 72.6-million-dollar GRF hit in the beginning, during start-up costs. We need to be looking at so many other issues. adamantly opposed to this bill because of the missed opportunities that we're making at this point in time. We have looked at, in the House when the bill went over on Friday, at some of the minority and some of the ownership issues in the revised bill. are now being told that that might be unconstitutional. Still woefully inadequate is the economic linkage to severely economically depressed communities, which was addressed in the original language, and it's still there. It still states that Board shall give favorable consideration in regards to those who present plans which provide for significant economic development a large geographical area. When we look at the supposed area, the beneficiary of this golden cash cow, when we look Rosemont, Des Plaines, Park Ridge, Elk Grove Village, and Morton Grove and you overlay that on the -- on the region of the south suburbs of Dixmoor, Harvey, Burnham, Chicago Heights, Robbins, Calumet Park and Phoenix, and when you overlay that on northern suburbs of Waukegan and North Chicago, the disparity is crystal clear. We, as a General Assembly, are once again failing in our responsibilities and our goals of making sure that all of our citizens have opportunities and self-serving -- and sharing in the wealth of this great State. We are now giving to the

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

and overlooking the needy and that should not be our credo. We have a sad history of misplaced generosity. And for those reasons and for many more that have already been said, we need to be holding this bill right now and voting No with a clear conscience. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Wendell Jones. SENATOR W. JONES:

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, we're here tonight to discuss a 3.8-billion-dollar industry in Illinois. This industry produces forty-nine thousand jobs in this State. Horse racing in Illinois tonight is heading toward the home stretch, and this bill will help them cross the finish line. Arlington International Racecourse provides a hundred twelve million dollars of economic activity for the northwest suburbs. Forty-five hundred jobs are created when Arlington Park is open. Very few are there when Arlington Park is closed. Arlington Park pays four and a half million dollars in real estate taxes. Since it's been closed for the last two years and assessed as vacant property, it's paid two and a half million dollars in taxes as vacant property. This bill will permit Arlington Park to continue to pay real estate taxes to the schools, parks and municipalities in my district. It -- this bill reduces the pari-mutuel tax, which is the highest in the District 15, my elementary district, gets 1.2 million dollars in real estate taxes. Arlington Heights, Illinois, gets one million in real estate taxes. If we go from ten boats in Illinois to ten boats in Illinois, where is the expansion? If you start with ten and end with ten, you still only have ten. Arlington Park once rose from the ashes. I looked outside my house and I saw the black smoke rising from Arlington Park. rose from the ashes, and Dick Duchossois and his group built a one-hundred-eighty-seven-million-dollar beautiful edifice, and at the time it was rebuilt and reopened, there were no casinos in

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Illinois. We must level the playing field. We must give the racing industry a chance to survive or most assuredly it will not cross the finish line. The Village of Arlington Heights has voted nine to nothing to support this legislation. The Northwest Municipal Conference has voted unanimously to support this legislation. All of the chambers of commerce in my area have voted to endorse this legislation. The Woodfield Tourism Bureau has voted to endorse this legislation, and seventy-one Cook County municipalities will gain from this legislation. I ask for a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

### **SENATOR JACOBS:**

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Almost ten years ago, I sat in this same Body when we first started discussing riverboats. And we had our first meeting in Alton on September 6th of 1989, and we didn't know where it was going to take us. There were so many stories out there of what was going to happen. I think one of the projections was that we were going to do four million dollars the first year if -- if these boats were on. And, you know, it's really come a long way, I can't help but wonder what Governor Thompson is thinking up there now, after having signed that bill in February of to where we have went to this point. This Body has passed dockside gaming out a number of times, which would have allowed dockside. So that doesn't appear, to me, to be an issue. What appears to be an issue that is discussed by many people is we are deviating from the norm, that originally when we did this, we did it for depressed areas and depressed riverboat towns - and we did do that, and it did help - and also, to help the education in the State of Illinois, which during the inception, we have raised almost one billion dollars for education through this riverboat

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

legislation. Horse racing - that's someone else's bailiwick, -- and I don't even pretend to -- to know all the ins and outs, except to know that when Arlington is closed, we lose some Now, you can argue whether we lose any handle or anything else, whether it goes elsewhere, but the fact of the matter is, there are employees that are involved there. We have given lots of breaks for business, and we have done it on a -- on a daily basis in this Body. One of the previous speakers said, in effect, that one of the boat owners went under because they failed to market. Well, let me tell you what really the fact of the matter amounts to. We, in Rock Island - and I include myself because it's important, it's part of our district - and the Casino Rock Island had really done a great job for the City of Rock Island, not only for the city but for the people of Rock Island. Before dockside, that boat had Iowa went fifty-four-percent share of the market. Today, they are sitting at seven-percent share of the market. They have continued to put money into it in marketing, but you can't -- you can't bring back something that is situated in such an unfair competitive position and that's what portion of the bill that I need. I'm standing here before you today, and I will tell you that if we don't do something -- we -- we hear about the delay, and, Senator Weaver, I would be remiss if I didn't ask you this. We have discussed the possibility of waiting. Are we going to have one bite of the apple, or do we get an opportunity to look at this bill again? Because on June 1st, without dockside, we will have eight licenses operating in Illinois, not nine. Can you answer that question for me, sir?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

### SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, it's pretty hard to make a business judgment for someone

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

that I'm not associated with, Senator. I don't know what the situation might be down a few months, but riverboats, racing, everyone is involved. Everyone is on hard times. If we're going to depend and legalize gaming in Illinois, we — we should give them a fair chance to participate, pay taxes, pay their employees. It just goes on and on. We've — we've debated this. We've worked with the various groups for seven years. I have personally and I know you have. But when you get ninety-nine percent of the industry in agreement on a single bill, this hasn't happened for seven years, and it happened this spring and it's before us. We have to make that judgment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jacobs.

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, the reason I ask is because there are those on our side of the aisle that feel that if we don't do this now and we hold out for a few things, we'll do it in the fall. I'm here to tell you, that does not help our boat. But more importantly, if this bill were to be defeated this evening - and I hope it's not - would -- do you plan on putting this on a motion to reconsider and -- and bring it back yet this Session, before the end of the Session?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, I've -- I've played that game for years. We've seen a bill that was so-called agreed to and then we end up with eighteen different amendments. And so half the group gets off and the -- the other half are still for it but there's not enough votes to -- to pass the bill, unless we can get a majority of the people affected by this legislation agreed. And this -- and this is the closest I've ever seen a gaming bill, whether it be riverboats or

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

horse racing, in agreement with the majority of the players, ninety percent of the players, ninety-nine percent of the players. So, I've offered to turn this sponsorship over to anybody that wants it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

#### **SENATOR JACOBS:**

...and then I'll be brief. The only reason that I ask that question is there are those on this side of the aisle that have said, "Well, you know, we need a couple things to tweak this," but nobody is really talking about changing anything major. It's just the minor things, which I feel can perhaps be done in a trailer bill. But that being said, let me just state that I have never, on this Floor, begged anyone for a vote - never in my life - and I never thought I would ever have to, but I'm here now, today, to beg this Body to support Senate Bill 1017, if for no other reason than to save my boat in Rock Island. I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

#### SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. You know, I -- I really love this game. I mean, it's -- it's a pleasure to watch people speak and -- on the same bill, because sometimes you wonder what exactly the bill does and then you look at your analysis to see if you're reading the right bill. Let me start out by saying: Gambling is illegal in the State of Illinois. It's illegal. Can't gamble. Go play cards, even in our offices...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Molaro, just a minute. Members of the press, now we gave you leave, but we cannot have the noise. Okay? Please. Senator Molaro.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

#### SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Gambling is illegal. You cannot gamble in Illinois. All these pools that we play, if you go out there and play crap games in your backyard or you wind up playing cards, you can be arrested. If you're a bookmaker, you can be arrested. It's illegal in this State. So, what we decided to do, maybe fifty or sixty years ago, the only reason we made it legal on certain occasions is so we, as the State, can make money. That's the only reason it's legal. No other reason. So, we want to make money. Ten years ago, talked about this gaming. Why did we do it? So the State could make some more money. So we wound up forming a partnership with the racetracks thirty, forty years ago. They run it. They own it. We'll wind up going with the profits. We regulated 'em so much, we only have about four or five tracks. That's all we have in this State. And we go up and we say "Here's the rules, here's the regulations, here's what you must abide Well, about ten years ago, we introduced gaming to the by." State. Riverboat casino gambling. We give ten licenses. We form another partnership. Our partners in the horse racing industry after a year or two go, "Wait a second, guys. This gaming is killing us." They turn to us, their partners, and they say, "Let's craft a bill or let's get some rule changes." We tell 'em, "Can't do it." The gaming industry goes and you get these riverboats. All of a sudden, Indiana and Iowa come. Here comes They come up with all kinds of rule changes that competition. hurts our partners, the riverboat owners. The riverboat owners to us and say, "Hey, partner, we're out here getting killed. We're losing some money. We got some ideas." Okay, put it in a Well, year after year after year they come up with a bill. bill. And year after year after year we can't get an agreement. boat's north, the south-siders don't like it. If it's south, the north-siders don't like it. Then we have the people in between who

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

are against gambling. I don't even know what that means. against gaming." "I'm against gambling." Well, welcome to seventy-five percent of the public. I'm against -- this isn't a bill -- this isn't a litmus test on whether you're against gaming or not against gaming. These bills are here to how better do we allow our partners to make money. We made 'em our partners. didn't have to make 'em partners. We decided to do that. We told 'em, "Go out and make the capital contributions, go out put up your money. We'll be your partners." We're not supposed to be here to hamstring 'em. We're supposed to be here to help 'em make money for the State of Illinois, without expanding, without making it worse for the public. We're over here to try to get some new rules. Every business sits down quarterly and goes over it, says, "Now we've got the Internet, we've got increased competition. What do we do now to make it better to allow us to make money?" That's all this bill does. And, now, let's talk about the bill. Is it a good bill? I -- can there ever be a good bill on gaming? What's a -- what's a good bill mean? Does that mean we get thirty-four votes instead of thirty, sixty-seven instead of sixty-two, instead of fifty-eight. Does that make it a better bill because we've done something in a back room to get somebody else on or not get somebody else on? We've created this process by not going and changing rules month after month like any business does. We wait nine or ten years. We've got these guys going crazy. We've got 'em hopping from one foot to the other, trying to make every deal they can. That's why it gets loaded up. We, as a General Assembly, have caused this process. So now when we look and we say what kind of bill can we come up with, if we're going to wait for a perfect bill, we'll wait till the next millennium before we get a perfect bill. None exists on this None. It all depends on whose ox is getting gored as to whether or not you're for or against the bill. That's all this

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

is. We're not going to have thirty votes, so some of you fellas and ladies out there, your area's not going to get what it should get. So here's what I say: Look what it does for your area, look what it does for the State, and you vote Yes or you vote No. There is no perfect bill. If we wait and we do something else tomorrow, there's going to be a few more people happy but a few more people unhappy. Here's the bill. You vote Yes or No. We made these people our partners. Let's give 'em a chance to compete in the changing world. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. First I'd like to say that I have tremendous amount of respect for the sponsor, Senator Weaver. certain that Senator Weaver was not tricked or duped into carrying And I don't know if the media hasn't noticed this legislation. this or if it's just my imagination, but I noticed that most speakers on this bill have been Democrat and very few of my Republican friends and allies have said a word. I said here last week that you can't tell the Democrats from the Republicans around here these days, and again tonight at 10:10, we have the same situation. Perhaps it is a tribute to President Pate Philip. are indeed a strong man, my friend. If I was a Republican, maybe I'd fear you myself. But I have to ask myself, when all of these conservative Republicans, when Senator Obama was talking about a few dollars for some poor child or poor family, I can hear you now, getting up, making your conservative speech, saying it's the welfare queen, the welfare mother, the poor, little criminal black child back in Chicago, don't deserve any help. But then you sit on your hands real quiet, because you don't want the wrath of the President of the Senate to come down upon you. I can't help but look around this room and say the only good thing about what's

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

happening tonight is that the children aren't here. We don't have the high schoolers and the grammar schoolers in the gallery. Instead, we have the professionals, we have the lobbyists, we have the heavy -- the heavyweights. Now, I'm not against this bill for some reasons that some of my colleagues have stated. going to be a hypocrite. We all know that if this was in certain people's district, they'd be all over the bill like white on rice, but because it's not in their district, well, it's such a terrible Well that's -- that's the hypocrisy, I guess, of the system. But I do have to say a couple of things, and I'll be brief, Mr. President. I voted for dockside because I believe should have the right to get off the boat before they And I support Senator Jacobs and Senator Clayborne their money. in what they're trying to do for their communities. I also support Mr. Duchossois. The Arlington Million is one of the greatest races in the world. I've lost a dollar or two on it, I might -- might add. But why give him sixty-five million when you could give him thirty-five million? He'd be happy. And then you could take care of some of the programs that we've tried to push, like violence prevention, try to get people a better education and keep children off the streets. I also am a fan of the horse racing industry, but I -- I -- I have to ask myself: We're going to do something for the tracks and -- and the horsemen, but what There's nothing in here that gives bigger about the gambler? payoffs to the little people. It should be in here. Finally, just have to question -- I have to ask myself: Where -- where are the Ronald Reagan Republicans? Where -- where are the George Will Republicans in this Chamber? Where are your family values tonight?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, will be brief. ...Ladies and Gentlemen, I -- a part of Rosemont is in my district. represent part of Rosemont, and I am just as proud of that city, as every city that I represent, as you all are of your districts and the municipalities that you represent. But for some reason, for some strange reason, Rosemont has been singled out. There's a mantra going out there that's Rosemont, this big monstrosity called Rosemont. It's going to gobble up the world. That's all you talk about, is Rosemont and then some rich guy in some other suburbs. That's all you talk about. I looked at this bill. wonder how many of us have really read it or just looked through it. See how many times you -- you read Rosemont. A hundred and eleven pages of two amendments. How many times you see Rosemont in this legislation? I didn't find one. But there goes Rosemont. They're trying to gobble up the world again. Like to ask the sponsor a few questions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Dudycz.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Senator Weaver, is there anything in this bill that would prohibit the -- this tenth license to go anywhere else in the State of Illinois other than Rosemont?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

No, there isn't. It's up to the license holder and the Gaming Board where the -- where the location is granted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Dudycz.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Let me -- let me clarify this. Does this -- anything in this bill that would require that this license go to Rosemont?

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Okay. Arlington Park - with the legislation, how much revenue is expected to be generated for the State from this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

When they get fully operative, hundred and twelve million dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

How much are we getting now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Nothing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

And finally, for legislative intent, Senator Weaver, in House amendment, is this amendment a minority set-aside?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

No, it is not a set-aside. It is merely one of several license conditions licensees must meet like financial integrity,

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

prospective income, capitalization, liability insurance. Also, it was voluntarily requested by the licensee in question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Dudycz.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. To our friends that are opposed to gambling in Illinois: If we're going to eliminate gambling, let's eliminate it. Let's not be hypocrites. eliminate it. Completely. But if you're going to say, you know, we can't move this license from one part of the State to the other 'cause it's going to be an expanding of gambling, let's see what we have currently. Well, we have the Lottery, since 1974, which has generated last year in sales one billion five hundred and seventy-six million dollars, according to Illinois State Lottery. And the State collected since 1974, in our coffers, over nine billion dollars. We have bingo. Remember bingo? We passed it in this House -- in the Senate. It's for religious, charitable, labor, fraternal, educational, veteran, youth, athletic and senior citizen organizations. And the bingo tax in 1998, for the State of Illinois, was six million four hundred and seventy-six thousand dollars. Where does that money go? Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, that goes to the Common School Fund and to the Mental Health Fund. Charitable games - remember Las Vegas nights that Let's go on. many of us have in our city, in Chicago, in our -- which also include blackjack, craps, poker, keno and the roulette wheel. That's not gambling, is it? Well, I'm sorry, but it is. You go to these -- you go to these religious, charitable, educational, veterans, fraternal and labor organizations that are having these casino Las Vegas nights -- last year they had two hundred and seventeen throughout the State of Illinois, and they generated, for our State, two hundred thousand dollars. That's all. But they had 'em and they generated money for their educational and their

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

That's gambling, Ladies and Gentlemen. And what charitable work. about the pull tabs that these same organizations have? The pull tabs and the jar games - last year they generated over seven million dollars for the State. And then -- and then, finally, my favorite: the video poker machines, these things that are supposed to be only for amusement purposes. Ask your police chiefs throughout your municipalities. They're gambling in those machines, Ladies and Gentlemen. In the -- in the bars in your in your communities, they're gambling on 'em. And your law enforcement agencies are confiscating those machines, people. And you know what? The next day they open up arresting and they're gambling. You want to talk about addictive gambling? Let's eliminate the video poker machines, completely, for the State of Illinois. Or regulate 'em. Regulate 'em. gambling oppose -- the gambling foes oppose this bill -- you know, when -- I was in the Executive Committee when the -- we were -- we allowed two proponents and two opponents to speak on behalf of their side. Well, the two proponents were naturally members of the industry or those who wish to -- to push to promote gaming. And the two opponents. Who were the two opponents that all these opponents of gambling decided to represent them in Executive Committee? Well, let's see, the first one was representing a maritime union from the Empress Casino. He was opposed to -dockside 'cause it's going to take some of his jobs away of his And the second one representing the opponents was a membership. representative from Elgin municipality, because the boat that they fear, if it is brought into Cook County - and, again, if it brought into Rosemont - is fifteen miles away from Elgin, and what they fear is the competition. So, let's not be hypocrites. we're going to oppose gambling, let's eliminate it completely. But then we better put a big fence around the State of Illinois, because our people, our constituents, your relatives, your

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

neighbors are going to be going to Lake Geneva. They're going to be going to Wisconsin. They're going to be going to Indiana. And they're going to be putting their dollars there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Viverito.

#### SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to be very brief. really wasn't going to stand on this, but I feel strongly that -and I'm rising in favor of this particular bill, simply because I do feel strongly that the economic development from it is obvious to me. Rosemont with all the magnificent hotels, Arlington with its magnificent racetrack, and many of the people that stay in those particular hotels are really foreigners. They're from They're from the Orient. And a lot of those people will Europe. gamble whether we like it or not. I'm not much of a gambling man. I like to play a little poker on occasion, and I go to the boat once in a while, but I do feel wherever you're going to have a boat, you should have a boat that the people are going to come and they're going to spend money. And obviously, they're already in Rosemont and they're going to spend money and they've got money to As I said, a lot of them are from Europe and all over the spend. world. There are seventy-one municipalities that are going to benefit from this. Calumet is going to get almost four hundred thousand dollars a year, based on a thirty-million-dollar projection, which probably Rosemont won't have any problems in generating. I'm not for the personality. I'm for the economic development. Senator -- Senator Shaw is going to receive almost a quarter of a million dollars in Dolton. Cicero is going to receive almost five hundred thousand dollars. My little town of Burbank is going to receive almost three hundred thousand dollars. In every one of those particular areas out on the southeast side, southwest side, wherever you live, northwest side, wherever,

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

there's poverty areas and this is going to generate money and relief for all of us. Am I for gambling? Not really. But for economic development? Absolutely. Do I -- would like to see a minority boat someday, and they -- if that's what they want, I think it's only fair that they be given something. But maybe it's Cicero and -- Cicero and Stickney. They ought to put it on the -on the channel over there. We've got two racetracks in our area. Sportsman's and Hawthorne. And we're having race cars over there. So if you're going to put more of 'em, let's put it in Cicero and let's put it in Stickney. I don't want to see it go to Calumet. Because why? Maybe there won't be enough people out in Calumet, there's a lot of west-siders, Spanish, blacks, whites and everything in Stickney and in Cicero. So, you know, I'll start lobbying for that in the future. But I'm here to support you, Senator Weaver. I think you've got a good bill and I'm one hundred in -- favor of it, and I hope that you're going to give consideration to your areas that need that money. There's a lot of people here that need that money, and Rosemont will generate those millions of dollars. Very few areas can generate what they Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rose Friday when we were debating the Illinois FIRST program, and I think I chided some of you, saying that that was not a tough vote. Well, tonight's vote, let me tell you, is a tough vote. It's a close call, and I've spent a lot of time meeting with a lot of people, friends on both sides of this issue, in my district and from with -- outside of my district. In the past I've sponsored, and been the cosponsor with Senator Sieben, of the statewide referenda bill on gaming. I favor local referenda when it comes

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

gaming, too. I've sponsored the last four years a bill to put a compulsive gambler on the State's Gaming Board. And I voted No, just a week ago, on dockside gaming, because I'm not a big fan of dockside and twenty-four-hour-a-day-type operations. But now here's this package from the House of Representatives assembled across the Rotunda and it's here, and what do we do with it? It's all lumped together. When I was Governor Edgar's Chief of Staff, I learned a lot about the negative sides of gambling when he and I faced the wrath of Mayor Daley, when Mayor Daley, wanted to put a land-based casino, four football fields tall, in the -- in the And I supported our former colleague, U.S. City of Chicago. that Senator Peter Fitzgerald, in his quest we competitively bid some of these licenses. So, I'm not a big fan of gambling. I don't play poker. I don't play in the currency exchange types of games around here, and I think that gambling generally is not a good form of economic development. But it's and as Senator Molaro pointed out, somebody long before I became a Member of the Legislature made these people our partners. One of the real trepidations for me, as to where I come down on this, is where I filled out my legislative candidate sheets when I What did I say on gambling? campaigned for this job. checked that I was "no" for dockside gaming. And I voted No week ago, but I also said that I supported riverboats in Cook County on a proportional share with the rest of the State, should Cook County desire one. And I also said that I supported the transfer of a riverboat license, the Silver Eagle from Galena. I also said on my surveys that I certainly support the men and women, the forty-some thousand people in Illinois, who are agriculture-related when it comes to horse racing, and, as Senator Jones pointed out, I support, for a lot of reasons, the reopening of the jewel of racing in Illinois, Arlington Park. So I take this sheet and I weigh: Where do I come down? Do I mislead

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

constituents on four issues, or do I mislead 'em on one, the House of Representatives, in this process, decides they're going to dump it all in one bill for we rank-and-file Members. I rise in support of this bill for reasons that I'd like to explain to some of my constituents in the gallery, my friends and you, my colleagues. And I think I'm infamous for reading a lot of material. They kid me in my caucus, Democrats, that I read all the time during caucus, and I read everything. Read the Methodist piece that must have been handed out in church yesterday. looked at the losers, looked at the winners. I agree with the Methodists on the losers' side, although I do notice that the Methodists conveniently left out that a winner might be a hundred million dollars for the schoolchildren of Illinois or several million dollars for higher education and athletic facilities that is so close to and dear to my friend, Senator Weaver, over here. You know, and I read these stories and I read where we are, but I come down on the side of my questionnaire, I guess, and that it's four versus one. But my thought process - and a gentleman from Naperville about an hour ago told me, "Well, maybe dockside's worth more on that sheet, Senator Dillard, than the four that you say you are in favor of, and I understand your quandary." So I went back and even did some more reading, and I just think that if the Gaming Board is going to slate, and, as Senator Dudycz pointed out, there's no guarantee that it's Rosemont, but if it's Rosemont, to me, that makes probably the best sense, as Senator Viverito just pointed out. Tourism, there's no other area of Illinois, because of its close association with O'Hare Airport, European that would allow foreigners foreigners being Australian foreigners, Arabs, Jews, foreigners, anybody from around the world, including other states - to drop their money in Illinois. And, to me, that makes sense. And, as other including Senator Viverito pointed out - I represent part of the

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

south suburbs of Cook County - Rosemont's going to share the wealth. They are going to distribute this, and I received letters from many mayors in south suburban Cook County saying that they were going to take money. And Cook County, itself, John Stroger is in support of this bill, because the County of Cook is going to take two percent of the take. So Rosemont is -- is spreading the wealth, and many of those areas are depressed areas that will receive some economic benefit from this. It's also clear that this boat, the license from Galena -- some of the people who lobbied me were confused. It's very clear in this bill that they will have to come back again to be able to allow another license to -- to move to Cook County. So I'm comfortable with that. former Senator -- Senate President Phil Rock was really always a great one for reading the law. He'd always say to us, "Jeez, forbid anybody would read the law." Well, I've read the law, the original Gaming Act, that everybody loves to say this was for Well, this is what it says: depressed areas, depressed areas. The Gaming Board may - it doesn't say shall - it says, favorable consideration to economically depressed areas of the State,..." But here, after a comma, comes something very, very important that I believe that if the Gaming Board decides on Rosemont, follows right with the original preamble of the original Riverboat Gaming {sic} (Gambling) Act in the State of Illinois. It says the Board shall also give favorable consideration "to applicants presenting plans which provide for significant economic development" to a large geographical area. Now, next to McLean County in the State of Illinois, the largest geographical area that I know in one county is the County of Cook, especially they're going to spread many hundreds of thousands, millions, of dollars to poor, economically depressed suburbs, especially in south suburban Cook County. Now, going back to Rosemont, we're talking two thousand jobs in an area that

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

has the infrastructure ready for 'em, and Mayor Stephens, should he get this, I know has pledged that twenty percent of those jobs would be minority and female. Many would be low-skilled -workers, but many would be union trade jobs, as well. And I just think Rosemont, to me, makes sense. I think it is crazy to have this extra license in Galena or somewhere out in Jo Daviess County. It is crazy for us to have this on the books, authorization on the books, and let this thing lay dormant, when sixty percent of those people who go to Indiana - Illinoisans take their money and go to Indiana - sixty percent of the people on those boats in Indiana are Illinoisans, and they are giving their Indiana, which, to me, makes absolutely no sense. Senator Wendell Jones talked about, and I've read a lot from a lot of different mayors, the City of Harvey, Illinois, but Wendell Jones pointed out very well, on behalf of his constituents out in Arlington, what a good economic engine is, aside from the fact that it's the golden jewel of racing, Arlington Park, and what that means in terms of the forty-five hundred employees and the hundred-and-twelve-million-dollar economic engine that Arlington Park is. But gaming has a lot of benefits that go beyond just the As I said, this bill will generate glistening Arlington Park. over a hundred million dollars for schools and for higher education, but the industry itself funds forty-nine thousand jobs in the State of Illinois - four billion dollars a year. So when we're talking about giving some tax relief, you got to keep this that we are talking about a four-billion-dollar base. in mind: This is certainly more than just, I think, Mr. Duchossois or involves forty-nine thousand jobs. Stephens. Ιt the racehorse industry involves a lot of breeders, stallion owners, farmers, hay and -- and straw producers, barn and fence builders, veterinarians, pharmaceutical companies, tack manufacturers and suppliers, bloodstock agents, sales employees. The list goes on

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

and on and on. So it's not about one man or one mayor. It's about forty-nine thousand people whose jobs are dependent upon this particular industry. And I guess one of the things that -having sponsored the infamous bill dealing with the fair dealing and liquor, that bothers me a little bit about this Session: We tend to have focused this Session on certain individuals who have made it in life, who have a good status, who employ a people in Illinois. And one of the things I wish this Body and this General Assembly would get away from is criticizing people who have made an honest living, who employ tens of thousands of people for many years in this State. Mr. Duchossois industrialist. He owns two major manufacturing companies, but he's also a philanthropist. And Senator Obama rose on this bill, Mr. Duchossois gave twenty-one million dollars to the but University of Chicago Cancer Hospital in your district, of his own money, in memory of his wife, and, in the letter that I refer to that Wendell Jones was using to speak off of, he is a frequent major philanthropist in the northwest suburbs, as well. But Τ don't know where our Legislature has gone wrong when we criticize ad nauseam people in the State of Illinois who have provided jobs decades, good jobs with good companies, to our people, and they deserve, sometimes, some relief as well. And I think it's very misleading to view this as some type of -- of tax giveaway. Illinois presently has the highest pari-mutuel wagering tax in the United States at 3.9 percent. The average pari-mutuel wagering And the successive tax rate has, quite tax is 1.9 percent. frankly, made it very difficult for Illinois racing to keep and exceed the standards that we would like 'em to have for this industry in Illinois. So I think the -- the permission of gaming legislation to transfer this license to Cook County will mean an influx of dollars to -- to get this industry going again. And I guess just to close, I clearly believe that this is not an

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

expansion, in theory, of gaming. I base that upon a things, including the Chicago Tribune editorial recently that says, "pass a gaming repair bill", where they clearly believe it's not an expansion of gaming. There's no new boats here. There's no telephone wagering. There's no slot machines at racetracks. There's no video gaming through our State Lottery, and I think it is time to get on, repair this industry, which is the result of about fifty thousand jobs in our State. And it's not expanded gaming. I believe it's better gaming, and like the Tribune said, it's a repair job so that we can have economic development, tourism, and benefit the Common School Fund and our institutions of higher education at the same time, and I urge your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Emil Jones.

#### SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, when you sit here and you listen to all the debate on this issue, and sometime I wonder, in listening to that debate, whether I was hearing correctly debate that took place a few days ago, two or three weeks ago, on such critical issues as relate to the people of the State of Illinois. And listening to one of the previous speakers, who introduced a bill to abolish affirmative action, stand on this Senate Floor and talk about how we don't need this, worrying about the reverse discrimination as related to white males, in the Exec Committee, and sometimes I wonder if I really hear everything correctly. So, Senator Weaver, would you yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Jones.

#### SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator Weaver, when I questioned the witness in the Executive Committee this afternoon, I asked the question of Mr. Ed Duffy, a

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

good friend, long-valued friend, a question about your set-aside language, and he said, "Yes, this is our set-aside language." Then I hear on the Floor you reading something into the record. But could you tell me what any license {sic} (licensee) that relocate its home dock pursuant to this Section shall attain a level of at least twenty percent minority person and female ownership - what does that mean? Are we setting aside a -- a -- that portion and how -- and how did you arrive at that particular figure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

First, Senator Jones, this language came from the House. It's not my language. The questions that were asked about the set-asides were -- merely apply to the one relocated license. All the other licenses are bound by the existing language that will be enforced by the Gaming Board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR WEAVER:

It's a condition...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

I'm sorry. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

...for this licensee, not all license holders.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Well, for the record, how did you arrive at that twenty percent and at sixteen percent and four? How did you arrive at that particular figure that you set aside in this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Senator Weaver.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

This was requested by various Members in the House, and it was a voluntary request by the licensee, as well. He said, "Okay, if that's the wishes of the House, I'll abide by it."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones.

#### SENATOR E. JONES:

Well, to the bill and to the language: Not that I am opposed to something, but one of the things you have to be very careful in a -- the process when you have other people trying to do something for you and when they are not familiar with the law, or the -- or past court decisions, the language that is in this bill is drafted improperly. If it had said simply and as -- as I suggested to you, we shall do -- we'll try to set a goal and attain these figures and also did some disparity studies to buttress this language, then it could withstand a challenge in court. question the wisdom of those who drafted this legislation that passed the House and pulled the wool over some of the House Members in trying to give them something that does -- that could not withstand the court test that will probably follow. And the reason why I point that out to you, because individuals on this Floor who looked at our current State Minority and Female Business Act, and they are so concerned about that in this bill but had the audacity to vote for it in committee and vote against it on the Floor. It just doesn't make sense, the inconsistencies, but actually to the real bill: For weeks after Governor Ryan introduced his twelve-billion-dollar infrastructure program calling for various licensing increases and taxes -- taxes increases to deal with the issue of infrastructure transportation and bridges that was long overdue in the State of Illinois, we've met -- the other Leaders and myself met with the

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Governor and tried to deal with the critical issue as to how we're going to fund this package. This caucus came up with its proposal to fight for reduction in that license registration fee, which was a hundred percent; fought like heck to see that our elderly citizens on the Circuit Breaker that they -- so that they would be held harmless from paying this increase. Along with that, this past Friday, about a hundred and forty other taxes and fees passed this Body and that was, for some, a tough vote, but something that we felt should be done. During those negotiations, I said the business entities should kick in more. Let's give up some of this corporate welfare and help pay for this massive So the bill passed. We could not get that done. supported it. And along come this big tanker from the other Chamber, flawed in its drafting of trying to pretend you're giving someone something when you know and I know that the courts have already ruled you cannot have set-asides as such. corrective language needed to take place to -- so that that piece of the law will be correct and you would not have to go through a court challenge. But along come this bill, providing about sixty-five million dollars in tax breaks for the wealthy -Duchossois, Arlington Racetrack and the racing industry - General Revenue dollars that could have helped fund Illinois FIRST. bad public policy to do that. It's not in the best interests of most people of the State of Illinois, and -- and, Senator Jones, I was here when Arlington burnt down. It was rebuilt, but like most welfare programs, State of Illinois stepped in and gave more breaks to Duchossois so that this could be accomplished. dipped into the public trough again and got more money. was not done by himself alone. And I'm not against Arlington Racetrack. I'm not against Rosemont. If we were genuinely sincere about really doing something as relate to gaming, if we were really genuinely sincere about keeping Illinois dollars

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Illinois, then the Gaming Board or the licensee would look to the south suburbs, because eighty percent of those people who gamble go to either Hammond or Gary, Indiana. And I'm not against Rosemont, but I know you have the -- the Victorian Queen in Elgin. I know you have the -- the Hollywood Casino in Aurora, but all you're going to do with more than fifty percent of the dollars just recycle, because it's just fifteen miles away, and people say, "Why in the heck do we go there when we can go to Rosemont," if that is the location. And I looked at all the Ec numbers as it relate to the revenue that's going to be generated, but many of you here who stood and fought against the average receiving the tax break, are willing to sit here and say, we're going to give the multimillionaires of this State a major tax break. We're going to pay their property tax. We're going to give all them their breaks, but you would not fight for the -- for the individuals you just stuck it to this past Friday. Poor public policy. You should be ashamed of yourselves. I'm not against gaming. I'm not against it, 'cause people are going to do I have no problem with that particular piece. And when it. individuals talk about all the communities and what dollars they can get, I would suggest very strongly that you look at the local -- the municipalities and villages agreement that the You should look at it very carefully, 'cause the money doesn't go directly to your community. The association decides as to how much you're going to get. And when you look at this bill, you look at it very carefully, 'cause we just got the bill when they voted on it in the House this past -- late Friday evening. When you really look at that bill, you look what -- at what Senator Berman talks about. You talk about education. you're putting money in the front door to be pulled out through the back door. So when you talk about taxpayers, when you go home when we adjourn this Session, you tell those individuals that you

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

raised all those fees on, that you raised all those taxes on, you had to do that, because we had to give the wealthy of this State a major tax break to the tune of sixty-five million dollars. That's the issue before us. And that's the issue that we got to come to a resolve on. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver, to close.

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. There's just a couple things I'd like to say in closing. More than eighty percent of the horse racing incentives go to tracks and horsemen throughout Illinois, other than Arlington. So it's not fair to -- to claim that all the incentives are going to Arlington Racetrack. There are a great many organizations supporting this legislation. The Illinois Education Association, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, Chicago Sun-Times, the Illinois Racing News, just want to reiterate that in -- after Tribune. implementation of this dormant license, there'll be another hundred million dollars that can be appropriated to education, both elementary and secondary and higher education. I think we've had a good discussion of many of the concerns of the Membership. I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 3 and 5 to Senate Bill 1017. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 30 Ayes, 29 Nays, no Members voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 3 and 5 to Senate Bill 1017, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise, sir?
SENATOR E. JONES:

A verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones has requested verification of the affirmative roll call. Will the Members please be in their seats? Would the... Secretary will read the affirmative votes. Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY HARRY:

The following voted in the affirmative: Bowles, Clayborne, Cronin, Cullerton, DeLeo, Dillard, Dudycz, Fawell, Geo-Karis, Jacobs, Wendell Jones, Karpiel, Klemm, Lightford, Robert Madigan, Maitland, Molaro, Munoz, Myers, O'Daniel, Parker, Peterson, Petka. Rea, Viverito, Larry Walsh, Tom Walsh, Watson, Weaver and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

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

SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator O'Malley.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator O'Malley. Senator O'Malley is not on.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator Bowles. Sometime -- you know, I've been here so long my -- I can't tell the green from the red. Senator Bowles. Evelyn Bowles.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Bowles on the Floor? Is Senator Bowles on the Floor? Senator Bowles on the Floor? Strike his -- strike her name, Mr. Secretary. On a verified roll call, there are 29 Ayes, 29 Nays, no Members voting Present. The Senate -- having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, the bill is declared lost. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

51st Legislative Day

May 24, 1999

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

I'd like to put it on Postponed Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The bill will be on Postponed Consideration. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Geo-Karis moves that the Senate stand adjourned until the hour of 1 p.m., Tuesday, May 25th. 1 p.m., Tuesday, May 25th. Senate is adjourned.

REPORT	[:	TIFI	.DAY
PAGE:	00	)1	

STATE OF ILLINOIS 91ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY

#### SENATE

99/10/05 12:11:59

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

#### MAY 24, 1999

HB-0134	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	6
HB-0427	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	7
HB-0452	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	2
HB-0542	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	8
HB-0557	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	8
HB-0658	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	8
HB-1278	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	8
HB-1413	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	9
HB-1670	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	9
HB-2166	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	10
HB-2518	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	3
HB-2793	REFUSE TO	RECEDE	PAGE	3
SB-0043	NON-CONCU	RRENCE	PAGE	4
SB-1014	CONFERENCE	3	PAGE	10
SB-1017	POSTPONED	CONSIDERATION	PAGE	61
SB-1017	CONCURRENC	CE	PAGE	14
SB-1017	CONCURRENC	CE	PAGE	16
SB-1242	FIRST REAL	DING	PAGE	5

#### SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-SENATOR GEO-KARIS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE-SENATOR SIEBEN	PAGE	1
JOURNALS-APPROVED	PAGE	1
JOURNAL-POSTPONED	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	4
SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	5
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	5
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	5
SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	16
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	61