26th Legislative Day 3/26/2003

нв0079	First Reading	8
НВ0091	First Reading	8
НВ0186	First Reading	8
нв0263	First Reading	8
нв1194	First Reading	8
нв1456	First Reading	8
нв1530	First Reading	8
HB1532	First Reading	8
HB1640	First Reading	8
HB2246	First Reading	8
HB2350	First Reading	8
HB2354	First Reading	8
HB2446	First Reading	8
НВ2527 НВ2550	First Reading First Reading	8
нв2550 НВ2648	First Reading	8 9
HB2841	First Reading	9
HB2842	First Reading	9
HB2843	First Reading	9
HB2844	First Reading	9
нв2997	First Reading	9
HB3053	First Reading	9
HB3134	First Reading	9
HB3197	First Reading	9
нв3506	First Reading	9
нв3507	First Reading	9
нв3552	First Reading	9
SB0001	Third Reading	42
SB0018	Third Reading	44
SB0022	Third Reading	51
SB0033	Motion Filed	212
SB0034	Motion Filed	212
SB0039	Motion Filed	212
SB0042	Motion Filed	212
SB0046	Third Reading	56
SB0052	Second Reading	10
SB0061	Third Reading	67
SB0073	Second Reading	10
SB0075	Third Reading	68
SB0090	Third Reading	73
SB0093	Second Reading	10
SB0118	Third Reading	85
SB0125	Third Reading	86
SB0130	Third Reading	90
SB0167	Other	100
SB0167	Third Reading	93
SB0207	Third Reading	101
SB0211 SB0240	Third Reading Third Reading	102 104
SB0240 SB0242	Third Reading Third Reading	104
SB0242 SB0252	Third Reading Third Reading	104
SB0252 SB0265	Third Reading Third Reading	105
SB0272	Third Reading	107
SB0272 SB0291	Third Reading Third Reading	111
SB0291 SB0306	Third Reading Third Reading	111
SB0300 SB0330	Third Reading	116
SB0330 SB0332	Third Reading	209
	111114 110441119	207

26th Legislative Day		3/26/2003
SB0361	Third Reading	117
SB0390	Third Reading	129
SB0410	Third Reading	137
SB0424 SB0568	Third Reading Third Reading	139 145
SB0500	Third Reading	153
SB0610	Second Reading	12
SB0632	Second Reading	12
SB0633	Third Reading	153
SB0689	Third Reading	155
SB0701	Second Reading	13
SB0704	Motion Filed	212
SB0705	Motion Filed	212
SB0708	Motion Filed	212
SB0716	Motion Filed	212
SB0717 SB0721	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB0721 SB0722	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB0730	Motion Filed	212
SB0731	Motion Filed	212
SB0753	Motion Filed	212
SB0754	Motion Filed	212
SB0760	Motion Filed	212
SB0761	Motion Filed	212
SB0762	Motion Filed	212
SB0766	Motion Filed	212
SB0767	Motion Filed	212
SB0780 SB0781	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB0789	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB0799	Motion Filed	212
SB0799	Motion Filed	212
SB0803	Motion Filed	212
SB0808	Third Reading	158
SB0834	Motion Filed	212
SB0835	Motion Filed	212
SB0840	Motion Filed	212
SB0848	Motion Filed	212
SB0849	Motion Filed	212
SB0850 SB0851	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB0855	Motion Filed	212
SB0856	Motion Filed	212
SB0883	Recalled	163
SB0886	Third Reading	163
SB0890	Third Reading	164
SB0890	Out Of Record	167
SB0897	Third Reading	167
SB0901	Third Reading	167
SB0940	Motion Filed	212
SB0942 SB0952	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB0952 SB0953	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB0959	Motion Filed	212
SB0959 SB0960	Motion Filed	212
SB0961	Motion Filed	212
SB0964	Motion Filed	212
SB0965	Motion Filed	212

26th Legislative	Day	3/26/2003
SB0968	Motion Filed	212
SB0970	Motion Filed	212
SB0972	Motion Filed	212
SB0975	Motion Filed	212
SB0979	Motion Filed	212
SB0981	Motion Filed	212
SB0982	Motion Filed	212
SB0983	Motion Filed	212
SB0987	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB0988 SB0991	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB0991	Motion Filed	212
SB0998	Motion Filed	212
SB1002	Motion Filed	212
SB1004	Motion Filed	212
SB1008	Motion Filed	212
SB1011	Motion Filed	212
SB1015	Motion Filed	212
SB1016	Motion Filed	212
SB1017	Motion Filed	212
SB1020	Motion Filed	212
SB1022 SB1036	Motion Filed Second Reading	212 13
SB1030 SB1044	Third Reading	169
SB1011	Third Reading	172
SB1074	Second Reading	13
SB1127	Second Reading	14
SB1149	Third Reading	175
SB1204	Third Reading	176
SB1215	Second Reading	15
SB1216	Second Reading	15
SB1217 SB1218	Second Reading Second Reading	15 16
SB1210 SB1219	Second Reading	16
SB1219	Second Reading	16
SB1221	Second Reading	16
SB1222	Second Reading	16
SB1223	Second Reading	17
SB1224	Second Reading	17
SB1225	Second Reading	17
SB1226	Second Reading	17
SB1227	Second Reading	17 18
SB1228 SB1229	Second Reading Second Reading	18
SB1229 SB1230	Second Reading	18
SB1230	Second Reading	18
SB1232	Second Reading	18
SB1233	Second Reading	19
SB1234	Second Reading	19
SB1235	Second Reading	19
SB1236	Second Reading	19
SB1237	Second Reading	20
SB1238	Second Reading	20
SB1239 SB1240	Second Reading Second Reading	20 20
SB1240 SB1241	Second Reading	20
SB1242	Second Reading	21
SB1243	Second Reading	21

26th Legislative	Day	3/26/2003
SB1244	Second Reading	21
SB1245	Second Reading	21
SB1246	Second Reading	21
SB1247	Second Reading	22
SB1248	Second Reading	22
SB1249	Second Reading	22
SB1250	Second Reading	22
SB1251	Second Reading	23
SB1252	Second Reading	23
SB1253	Second Reading	23
SB1254	Second Reading	23
SB1255	Second Reading	23
SB1256 SB1257	Second Reading	24 24
SB1257 SB1258	Second Reading Second Reading	24
SB1250	Second Reading	24
SB1260	Second Reading	24
SB1261	Second Reading	25
SB1262	Second Reading	25
SB1263	Second Reading	25
SB1264	Second Reading	25
SB1265	Second Reading	25
SB1266	Second Reading	26
SB1267	Second Reading	26
SB1268	Second Reading	26
SB1269	Second Reading	26
SB1270	Second Reading	26
SB1271 SB1272	Second Reading	27 27
SB1272 SB1273	Second Reading Second Reading	27
SB1273 SB1274	Second Reading Second Reading	28
SB1274 SB1275	Second Reading	28
SB1276	Second Reading	28
SB1277	Second Reading	28
SB1278	Second Reading	29
SB1279	Second Reading	29
SB1280	Second Reading	29
SB1281	Second Reading	30
SB1282	Second Reading	30
SB1283	Second Reading	30
SB1284	Second Reading	30
SB1285 SB1286	Second Reading	30 31
SB1287	Second Reading Second Reading	31
SB1287	Second Reading	31
SB1289	Second Reading	31
SB1290	Second Reading	31
SB1291	Second Reading	32
SB1292	Second Reading	32
SB1293	Second Reading	32
SB1294	Second Reading	32
SB1295	Second Reading	32
SB1296	Second Reading	33
SB1297	Second Reading	33
SB1298	Second Reading	33
SB1299 SB1300	Second Reading	33 34
SB1300 SB1301	Second Reading Second Reading	34
SDIST	pecolia reautily	34

26th Legislative	Day	3/26/2003
SB1302	Second Reading	34
SB1303	Second Reading	34
SB1304	Second Reading	34
SB1305	Second Reading	35
SB1306	Second Reading	35
SB1307	Second Reading	35
SB1308	Second Reading	35
SB1309	Second Reading	35
SB1310	Second Reading	36
SB1311	Second Reading	36
SB1312	Second Reading	36
SB1313	Second Reading	36
SB1314	Second Reading	36
SB1315	Second Reading	36
SB1316	Second Reading	37
SB1317	Second Reading	37
SB1318	Second Reading	37
SB1319	Second Reading	37
SB1330	Third Reading	180
SB1336	Third Reading	181
SB1342	Third Reading	182
SB1360	Second Reading	38
SB1364	Third Reading	183 184
SB1373 SB1378	Third Reading Second Reading	38
SB1379	Second Reading Second Reading	39
SB1399	Second Reading	39
SB1403	Third Reading	185
SB1408	Third Reading	186
SB1412	Third Reading	186
SB1415	Third Reading	187
SB1431	Third Reading	197
SB1466	Third Reading	199
SB1500	Third Reading	199
SB1523	Third Reading	201
SB1546	Third Reading	202
SB1549	Motion Filed	212
SB1550	Motion Filed	212
SB1551	Motion Filed	212
SB1554	Motion Filed	212
SB1555	Motion Filed	212
SB1556	Motion Filed	212
SB1563	Motion Filed	212 212
SB1564 SB1565	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1566	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1573	Second Reading	40
SB1576	Second Reading	40
SB1576	Motion Filed	212
SB1597	Motion Filed	212
SB1601	Third Reading	203
SB1613	Motion Filed	212
SB1614	Motion Filed	212
SB1615	Motion Filed	212
SB1616	Motion Filed	212
SB1618	Motion Filed	212
SB1619	Motion Filed	212
SB1623	Motion Filed	212

26th Legislative	Day	3/26/2003
SB1624	Motion Filed	212
SB1625	Motion Filed	212
SB1628	Motion Filed	212
SB1629	Motion Filed	212
SB1630	Motion Filed	212
SB1633	Motion Filed	212
SB1635 SB1636	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB1637	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1642	Motion Filed	212
SB1643	Motion Filed	212
SB1651	Motion Filed	212
SB1652	Motion Filed	212
SB1659	Motion Filed	212
SB1660	Motion Filed	212
SB1662	Motion Filed	212
SB1663	Motion Filed	212
SB1664	Motion Filed	212
SB1665	Motion Filed	212
SB1670 SB1671	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB1672	Motion Filed	212
SB1673	Motion Filed	212
SB1674	Motion Filed	212
SB1678	Motion Filed	212
SB1679	Motion Filed	212
SB1682	Motion Filed	212
SB1683	Motion Filed	212
SB1686	Motion Filed	212
SB1687	Motion Filed	212
SB1688	Motion Filed	212
SB1695 SB1696	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB1697	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1698	Motion Filed	212
SB1702	Motion Filed	212
SB1703	Motion Filed	212
SB1706	Motion Filed	212
SB1707	Motion Filed	212
SB1708	Motion Filed	212
SB1709	Motion Filed	212
SB1710	Motion Filed	212
SB1711	Motion Filed	212 212
SB1714 SB1715	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1716	Motion Filed	212
SB1717	Motion Filed	212
SB1718	Motion Filed	212
SB1719	Motion Filed	212
SB1720	Motion Filed	212
SB1721	Motion Filed	212
SB1722	Motion Filed	212
SB1723	Motion Filed	212
SB1726	Motion Filed	212
SB1727	Motion Filed	212
SB1731	Motion Filed	212
SB1732	Motion Filed	212
SB1739	Motion Filed	212

26th Legislative Day	7	3/26/2003
SB1758	Second Reading	41
SB1759	Second Reading	41
SB1784	Second Reading	41
SB1851	Second Reading	41
SB1892	Motion Filed	212
SB1895	Motion Filed	212
SB1896	Motion Filed	212
SB1900	Motion Filed	212
SB1910	Motion Filed	212
SB1917	Motion Filed	212
SB1922	Motion Filed	212
SB1925	Motion Filed	212
SB1927	Motion Filed	212
SB1929	Motion Filed	212
SB1939	Motion Filed	212
SB1940 SB1941	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212 212
SB1941 SB1942	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1942 SB1947	Motion Filed Motion Filed	212
SB1947 SB1948	Motion Filed	212
SB1940 SB1961	Second Reading	42
SB1964	Motion Filed	212
SB1965	Motion Filed	212
SB1966	Motion Filed	212
SB1967	Motion Filed	212
SB1968	Motion Filed	212
SB1969	Motion Filed	212
SB1970	Motion Filed	213
SB1981	Motion Filed	213
SB1985	Motion Filed	213
SB1986	Motion Filed	213
SB1987	Motion Filed	213
SB2004	Motion Filed	213
SB2005	Motion Filed	213
SB2006	Motion Filed	213
SB2007	Motion Filed	213
SB2008	Motion Filed	213
SB2009	Motion Filed Resolution Offered	213
SR0099	Resolution Offered	/
Senate to Order-Pres	eident Jones	1
Prayer-Pastor Brando	<del>-</del>	1
Pledge of Allegiance		1
Journals-Postponed		1
Introduction of Gues		2
	s Illinois County Fair	2
Queen		
Messages from the Ho Introduction of Gues		7 11
Remarks by Ms. May C		11
Introduction of Gues	<del>-</del>	$\frac{11}{44}$
Remarks by Napervill		44
Committee Reports	Contrat Coucii	210
Adjournment		213
)		213

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### PRESIDENT JONES:

Regular Session of the 93rd General Assembly will please come order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor Brandon Boyd, Loami Christian Church, Loami, Illinois. Pastor Boyd.

## PASTOR BRANDON BOYD:

(Prayer by Pastor Brandon Boyd)

### PRESIDENT JONES:

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

### SENATOR LINK:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Link.)

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Reading and Approval of the Journal. Senator Woolard. SENATOR WOOLARD:

Mr. President, I move that the reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, March 19th; Thursday, March 20th; Friday, March 21st; Monday, March 24th; and Tuesday, March 25th, in the year 2003, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

# PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Woolard moves to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Senator Risinger, what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR RISINGER:

For a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Risinger, before you begin, I'd like to extend some media... The following members of the media seek leave to photograph or videotape the proceedings: Squire Photography. No objection, so ordered. Together with the parents of -- the guests in the gallery who are here today. If there's no objection, leave is granted. Senator Risinger.

### SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. In case you haven't noticed, there's a lot of blue jackets in the Capitol today. This is the Agriculture

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Legislative Day, and I have with me a young man who is the State President of the FFA. This man has held a lot of leadership positions. He was the Chapter Parliamentarian. He's been his Chapter President. He's been the Section Treasurer, the Section President. And this year he is the State President of the FFA and will travel some twenty-five to thirty thousand miles around this State touting the agriculture of -- of this great State. Would the Senate please help welcome this young man to our great Body? Thank you.

### PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our -- will our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized by the Senate? Senator John Jones, I'd like to invite you and your guests to come to the Podium.

## SENATOR J. JONES:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, if I could have your attention, please, for just a moment. President of the Senate, Emil Jones, I appreciate the opportunity to -- to be here this morning and introduce a very special guest. I have with me today the -- the Richland County Fair Queen and now the Miss Illinois (County) Fair Queen, who is from Olney, Illinois, the home of the white squirrels, and -- Jamie Bolander. She's a graduate of Eastern Illinois University, with a bachelor's degree. She's now working on her master's degree at Eastern. And so would you give a warm welcome to Jamie here in the Senate Chambers, and she'd like to say a couple words.

## 2003 MISS ILLINOIS COUNTY FAIR QUEEN JAMIE BOLANDER:

(Remarks by 2003 Miss Illinois County Fair Queen Jamie Bolander)

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Hunter, what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR HUNTER:

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

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

### SENATOR HUNTER:

My point is, I'd like to introduce - Ladies, will you please rise - the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority of Illinois. They're here hosting their -- their annual legislative breakfast

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

and legislative update, and we welcome these ladies here. They are major, major forces in the African-American community as relates to women and education. Thank you very much.

### PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be welcomed by the Illinois Senate? Senator Wendell Jones, what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR W. JONES:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

### PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

### SENATOR W. JONES:

I have with me this morning two Honorary Pages from Inverness, Illinois, Will and Bob Thomas. And their mother, Judy, is in the President's Gallery. Let's give 'em a warm welcome.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Our guests in the gallery please rise. Senator Woolard, what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR WOOLARD:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

# PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

### SENATOR WOOLARD:

I have two members of the FFA in attendance with us on the Floor today, Nick Santamaria and Melissa Bramlett. I'd like to say that these folks didn't just come over for a -- a few hours. These people traveled about as far as you can travel in this State. One is from Pope County, Ms. Bramlett, and Mr. Santamaria is from Alexander County, and they're very excited to be a part of this process today. I'd like for you to join in welcoming them to the State Senate Chamber.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests please rise and be welcomed by the Senate? Senator Clayborne, what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Mr. President, I rise for a point of personal privilege. PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point, Senator.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President. To my left I have Terrance Ward, who is the Boys and Girls Club Student of the Year at the Jackie Joyner-Kerrsee Boys and Girls Club. And behind them, as well, I have Mrs. Cannon and Ricky Lewis, who are also from the Jackie Joyner Girls Boys and Club {sic}, and I'd like for them to be welcomed by the Senate.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests please stand and be recognized by the Senate? Senator Shadid, what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR SHADID:

Yeah. Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

#### PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

## SENATOR SHADID:

I have a young man with me here visiting us. His name is Liridon Rrushaj, from Pekin, Illinois. He's -- he's with the Pekin Boys and Girls Club. And Liridon, has been selected as the Youth of the Year for the State of Illinois who represents over eighty thousand Boys and Girl -- Girl Club members in the State of Illinois. Would you please welcome him to our Chamber? PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guest stand and be recognized -- be welcomed by the Senate? Senator Radogno, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RADOGNO:

I rise on a point of personal privilege.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

## SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you. I'd like to introduce a young lady that's joining us today, Ms. Laurel Schuster. She's an eighth grader at Maple School in Northbrook and she's spending some time with us to learn about the legislative process, and I'd like for us to welcome her.

# PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our -- will our guest please rise and be welcomed by the Senate? Senator Jones, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR J. JONES:

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

## SENATOR J. JONES:

In the gallery up here, I have one of my -- my Mt. Vernon Township High School agriculture teacher and seven of his students with him today. John Kabat and his students. Would you please rise? And welcome to Springfield.

### PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests -- in the gallery please rise and be welcomed to -- to Springfield? Senator Lauzen, what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

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

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I would like to introduce to you the new Director of the Department of Revenue. A fellow named Brian Hamer is with us today to see what goes on in the State Senate. So Brian Hamer -- I'd -- I'd like to welcome Brian Hamer to the Senate.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Director, welcome to the Illinois Senate Floor. Senator Bomke, what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR BOMKE:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State -- state your point.

## SENATOR BOMKE:

In the gallery today I have -- we have with us, behind the Republican side of the aisle, the Boys and Girls Club of Springfield Youth of the Year, YOY Kiara Hickman. With her is Jody Hammond.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized by the Senate? Senator Demuzio, what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR DEMUZIO:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you. On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

## SENATOR DEMUZIO:

To the Director of the -- the new Director of the Department of Revenue, who's not yet confirmed, I'd like for him to -- when he -- to know that when he comes in the -- the main door to the south, that to the right is the Republican side and to the left is the Democratic side. I think he got confused this morning.

### PRESIDENT JONES:

I believe your point is well taken. Senator Ronen, what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR RONEN:

A point of personal privilege. I also would like to direct my remarks to the -- the almost new Director of Revenue, who used to -- Brian Hamer, is a wonderful young man, and he used to live in my district and obviously he's moved to Senator Lauzen's district. And I just want to say it's been -- it's been great having you in our district and we -- we do look forward to working with you in the Department. Thank you.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Syverson, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, want to introduce a special guest. We have with us Jayvon Martin who is also one of the exemplary leaders of the Boys and Girls Club in the Rockford area.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Pardon me a minute, Senator. Let's tone it down. Proceed. Sorry.

## SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. As I mentioned, we have Jayvon Martin with us, and he is one of the exemplary leaders of the Boys and Girls Club in the Rockford area, an outstanding youth who is a -- a real role model to many in the Rockford area, and I want to have the Body welcome him with us today, Jayvon.

# PRESIDENT JONES:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Will our guest please rise and be welcomed by the Illinois Senate? Senator Shadid, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR SHADID:

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point. State your point.

## SENATOR SHADID:

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, a young man named Deondrae Mack, who is the Youth of the -- who has been chosen the Youth of the Year from the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Peoria, Incorporated, is here. Also with him is Julie Huls, Holly Mehawich and Christian Lee, who represent the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Peoria. Thank you.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Let's give our guests a well -- warm welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Garrett, of Lake, what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would also like to recognize the Youth of the Year, Tommie Hayes, from Lake County Boys and Girls Club. Please give Tommie a warm welcome to Springfield.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guest please rise and be welcomed by the Illinois Senate? Madam Secretary, Resolutions.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution No. 99, offered by Senator Hunter and all Members.

It's a death resolution.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Resolutions Consent... Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. Ryan, Clerk -- pardon me, Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

House Bills 136, 371, 1150, 2267, 2273, 2331, 3071, 3086, 3231, 3405, 3455, 3628.

Passed the House, March 25, 2003.

I have a like Message with respect to House Bills 414, 539, 2316, 2587, 2863, 3001, 3024, 3127, 3141 and 3411.

Passed the House, March 25, 2003.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 79, offered by Senator Clayborne.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 91, offered by Senator Rutherford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 186, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 263, offered by Senator DeLeo.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1194, offered by Senators Jacobs and Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1456, offered by Senator Harmon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1530, offered by Senator Hunter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1532, offered by Senator Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1640, offered by Senators Jacobs and Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2246, offered by Senator Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2350, offered by Senator Meeks.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2354, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2446, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2527, offered by Senator Munoz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2550, offered by Senator Lightford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

House Bill 2648, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- pardon me, 2841, offered by Senators John Sullivan and Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2842, offered by Senator Righter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2843, offered by Senators John Sullivan and Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2844, offered by Senators John Sullivan and Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2997, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3053, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3134, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3197, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3506, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3507, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3552, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Senator Hunter, what purpose do you rise?

# SENATOR HUNTER:

I rise of personal privilege, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

## SENATOR HUNTER:

I'd like to invite the Members of the AKA Sorority to join us on the Floor and that -- and I would ask that -- your president to speak to us please, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

We will acknowledge the request.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you.

# PRESIDENT JONES:

On page 2 of the Calendar in -- on the Order of 2nd Reading, Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 10. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 13. Senator Demuzio. Senate Bill 14. Senator John Sullivan. Senator John Sullivan. Senate Bill 14. Senate Bill 24. Senator Miguel del Valle. Senate Bill 52. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 52. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 52.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

## PRESIDENT JONES:

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 67. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 71. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 73. Senator Halvorson. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 73.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Labor and Commerce adopted Committee Amendments 1 and 3.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Have there been any Floor amendments filed for approval? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

## PRESIDENT JONES:

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 77. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 93. Senator Walsh. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 93.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

## PRESIDENT JONES:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 99. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 101. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 102. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 109. Senator Watson. Senate Bill 114. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill 127. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 132. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 151. Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 224. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 263. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 309. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 315. Senator Viverito. Senator Luechtefeld, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

A point of personal privilege.

### PRESIDENT JONES:

State your point.

## SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

If the Senate would give me the attention to the President's gallery over here, we have a young group from a school in my district, Marissa High School. They have an outstanding FFA group. They're there with their teacher today. Would appreciate it if the Senate would give them a warm welcome. Would you please rise?

## PRESIDENT JONES:

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized by the Senate? Senator Hunter, will you please come to the Podium with your guests?

### SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, at this time I'd like to introduce to you... Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'd like to introduce to you Mrs. May Carter, the Illinois Coordinator -- Illinois Connections Coordinator of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. Mrs. Carter. MS. MAY CARTER:

(Remarks by Ms. May Carter)

## SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the order of page 3 -page {sic} 315. Senator Viverito. 315. 324. Senator
Schoenberg. 334. Senator Clayborne. 374. Senator Hunter.
383. Senator Viverito. 397. Senator Schoenberg. 329.
Clayborne. 430. Clayborne. Page 4. ...79, top of page 4, has

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Clayborne. a fiscal note. 481. 498. Senator Halvorson. 501. Senator Halvorson. 517. Senator Schoenberg. Senator Schoenberg. 524. Senator -- 521. You know, Ladies and 552. Senator Obama. Schoenberg. Gentlemen, we're not making a lot of progress here today. the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, 567. Senator Halvorson. 580. Senator DeLeo. 588. Senator Clayborne. Top of page 5. 599. Senator Lauzen. Senator Martinez. Clayborne. Lauzen. Lightford. 605. Senator Radogno. On the Order of --609, has a -- a Housing note, whatever that is. A fiscal note, 610. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, page 5, middle of page 5, 610. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 610.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Agriculture and Conservation adopted Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments approved for consideration from the Floor? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 615. Senator DeLeo. 623. Senator Sieben. (6)24. Senator Sieben. 624. 629. Senator Walsh. 632. Senator Halvorson. On the Order of Senate Bills, 2nd Reading Senate Bill 632. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 632.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Labor and Commerce adopted Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments approved for consideration from the Floor? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Page 6. Turn to page 6. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. 680. Senator Sandoval. 681. Ronen. 682. Lightford. 684. Senator Crotty. On the Order of Senate Bills

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

2nd Reading, bottom of page 6, is Senate Bill 701. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 701.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. All right. With leave of the Body, it has now been determined that we are going to attempt to move the appropriation bills. So, with leave of the Body, we'll return back to the Order of 2nd -- Senate Bills 2nd Reading, on page 5, at the bottom. 655. Senator Radogno. Senator Radogno, we went back to 655. 656. (6)57. (6)58. Any of these? Next case. 666. Senator Syverson. Senator Syverson on the Floor? Well, we didn't make any progress with that so we'll turn back to page 7. It wasn't because we didn't try. Top of page 7, Ladies and Gentlemen. 812. Senator Sandoval. 891 has a fiscal note. 892. Senator Lauzen. 909. 910. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 915. Leave of the Body, Senator Welch will handle that. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 915...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Oh. I'm sorry. It's a fiscal note. Take it out of the record. 1033. Senator Silverstein. 1036. Senator Collins. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1036. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1036.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1045. Senator Schoenberg. 1049 has a fiscal note. 1064. Crotty. 1070, fiscal note. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, bottom of page 7, Senate Bill 1074. Madam Secretary, read the bill. ...of the Body, we have

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Silverstein to handle that. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1074.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1103. Senator Jacobs. 1119. Senator Roskam. All right. Senator Roskam. 1120. 1125. Senator Sieben. 1127. Senator Silverstein. Bottom of page 7 is Senate Bill 1127. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1127.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. All right. Senator Collins, for what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR COLLINS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

## SENATOR COLLINS:

I would like to introduce to my colleagues Felicia McClinton. She's the Boys and Girls Club Youth of the Year. She's a senior at Englewood High School in Chicago, in my district. Felicia McClinton.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Will our guest -- congratulations. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, I rise on a point of personal privilege.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

State your point.

## SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, I would ask the -- this distinguished Senate to welcome Savannah Sims of Bethalto, a student at Civic Memorial High School. They -- and Tiesha Hillman {sic} (Tillman), a student at Alton High School. They are Youth of the Year for the Bethalto Boys and Girls Club and for the Alton Boys and Girls Club. They are in the President's Gallery. If you would stand, ladies, and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Welcome to Springfield. All right. Top of page 8. 1134. Senator Cullerton. 1151. Page 8. 1152. 1157. Senator Righter. 1195. Munoz. 1207 has a fiscal note, as well as (120)8. 1212. Senator Walsh. 1213. Senator Halvorson. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, page 8, is -- leave of the Body to have Senator Welch to handle 1215 for Senator Jones. Leave is granted. Madam Secretary, Senate Bills 2nd Reading. 1215. Read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1215.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1216. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1216.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1217. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1217.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1218.

Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1218.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1219.

Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1219.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. 1220. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1220.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1221.
Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1221.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1221. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Madam Secretary, read the bill. I'm sorry. 1222.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1222.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1223. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1223.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1224. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1224.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, bottom of page 8, is 1225. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1225.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom of page 8 is Senate Bill 1226, on the Order of 2nd Reading. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1226.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1227. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1227.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. 3rd Reading. Turn to page 9. Senator Welch, we're going right down the line. All right. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1228. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1228.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 1229. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1229.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1230. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1230.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1231. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1231.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1232. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

26th Legislative Day 3/26/2003

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1232.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1233. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1233.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1234. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1234.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is -- Senate Bill 1235. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1235.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1236. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1236.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1237. Madam Secretary, on the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, please read the bill. 1237. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1237.

2nd Reading of the bill.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

No committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1238. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1238.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1239. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1239.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1240. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1234 -- pardon me, 1240.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1241. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

1241.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Yes. Senate Bill 1241.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1242. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1242.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1243. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1243.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1244. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1244.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading, bottom of page 9.

Senate Bill 1245. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1245.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1246. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

26th Legislative Day 3/26/2003

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1246.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1247. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1247.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom of page 9, Senate Bills 2nd Reading.

Senate Bill 1248. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1248.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1249. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1249.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1250. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1250.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1251. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1251.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Page 10. Senator Welch, same request all the way down? Page 10? On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1252. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1252.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1253. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1253.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1254. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1254.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1255. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1255.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1256, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1256.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1257. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1257.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1258. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1258.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1259. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1259.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1260. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1260.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1261. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1261.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1262. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1262.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1263. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1264. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1264.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1265. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1265.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1266. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1266.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1267. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1267.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1268. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1268.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1269. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1269.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills -- 1270. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1270.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1271. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1271.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom of page 10, Senate Bill 1272. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1272.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. On the bottom of page 10, Senate Bill 1273. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1273.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, turn the page. On page 11. Senator Obama, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR OBAMA:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we have an honored guest here, the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Madam Dorothy Brown. I just want to give a warm Senate welcome to her.

26th Legislative Day

SECRETARY HAWKER:

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Welcome, Dorothy Brown. Top of page 11, Madam Secretary, was Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1274. Read the bill.

Senate Bill 1274.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1275. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1275.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1276. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1276.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1277. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1277.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1278. Madam Secretary, read the bill. 1278. All right. With -- Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1277, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1277.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1278, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1278.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senator Haine, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

## SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have here on the Senate Floor, Assistant State's Attorney of Madison County, Kyle Napp, and Assistant State's Attorney Jennifer Vucich, of Madison County. They've taken time out to join us because they're with the Women's Club of Madison County. They spend their hours and days doing the right thing. Truth is their business, and I ask the Senate to give them a warm welcome. They help protect the people of my county.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Ladies -- welcome to Springfield. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1279. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1279.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. 1280. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1280.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1281,

Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1281.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1282, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1282.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1283, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1283.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1284, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1284.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom -- I'm sorry. Middle of page 11, Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1285. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1285.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. 1286, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1286.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1287. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1287.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1288. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1288.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1289. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1289.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1290. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1290.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1291. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1291.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1292. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1292.

2nd Reading of the bill. Pardon me.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1293, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1293.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1294, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1294.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1295. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1295.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom of page 11. 1296. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1296.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Top of page 12, Ladies and Gentlemen. Page 12. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1297. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1297.

2nd Reading of...

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1298. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1298.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1299. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1299.

2nd Reading -- I mean -- pardon me.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1300. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1300.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1301. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1301.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1302. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1302.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1303, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1303.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1304, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1304.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1305, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1305.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1306, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1306.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1307. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1307.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1308. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1308.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1309. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1309.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1310. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1310.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1311, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1311.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1312, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1312.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1313, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1313.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1314, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1314.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1315, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1315.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 1316.

Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1316.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1317. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1317.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Bottom of page 12. Senate Bill 1318. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1318.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1319. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1319.

2nd Reading of the bill. Pardon me.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, top of page 13.

Senator Dillard. Senator Dillard, on page 13, 1329. 1335.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Schoenberg. 1358. Senator Harmon. 1359. Senator Harmon. 1360. Senator Maloney. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1360. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1360.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments approved from the Floor?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Maloney.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm sorry. Senator Maloney. Ladies and Gentlemen. Senator Maloney.

#### SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment is a result of the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the University of Illinois officials coming to agreement on terms within the bill. It limits bargaining units at each campus of the University of Illinois to just tenured and tenure-track faculty at each campus.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Maloney has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1360. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Floor Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1361. Senator Lauzen. Senator Lauzen, have you heard that -- that -- that statement, you know, he who -- the slightest hesitation, I would have passed you by? Okay. 1377. Senator Clayborne. Senator Clayborne on the Floor? All right. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate -- Senate Bill 1377, Madam Secretary. 1377. Read the bill. All right. Now we want to take it out of the record. On the next bill is 1378. Senator Clayborne wishes to have that called. Madam Secretary, 1378. Read the bill.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1378.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. 3rd Reading. Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

I have a group down that I'd like to introduce. I'm just not sure where they are, Mr. President. Can I get right back to you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

1379. Senator Cullerton. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading Senate Bill 1379. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1379.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Environment and Energy adopted Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Have there been any amendments approved from the Floor? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. 1399. Senator Welch. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1399. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1399.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1404 {sic} and 1416 have fiscal notes. Senate Bill 1430. Senator Obama. 1474 has a fiscal note, Senator Collins. 1476. Senator Sullivan. Senator Sullivan on the Floor? 1509. Senator Walsh. 1511 has a fiscal note. 1516. Senator Walsh. 1524 {sic}. Senator J. Jones. Top

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

of page 14. Senator Halvorson. 1574 {sic}. 1573. Senator Ronen. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, top of page 14, Senate Bill 1573. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1573.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1576. Senator Link. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1576. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1576.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1586. Senator Obama. Senator Obama on the Floor? Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce Mr. Kenan Peters who is from the City of Chicago in my district, yet he is one of the Future Farmers...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me, Senator Maloney. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we take our conferences off the Floor? I cannot hear the Senator. Senator Maloney.

#### SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce Mr. Kenan Peters, who is from my district in the City of Chicago, yet he is one of the Future Farmers of America and attends the very prestigious Chicago School for the Agricultural Sciences. I'd like the Senate to please welcome him. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Welcome to the Senate. 1649. Senator Wojcik. 1677. Senator Cullerton. 750 -- 1754 has a fiscal note. 1758.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Schoenberg. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1758. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1759. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1759. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1759.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1763 has a fiscal note. 1768. Senator Lauzen. Senate Bill 1770. Senator Halvorson. 1784. Senator Link. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1784. Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1784.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1851. Leave to have Senator Welch...leave? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1851. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1851.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1856. Senator Ronen. Senator Ronen on the Floor? Senator Ronen? 1856? 1857. 1864 has a fiscal note. 1880. Senator Link. Page 15, Ladies and

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Gentlemen. Senator Harmon, 1881 has a fiscal note. 1885 {sic} does. So, 1961. Senator Schoenberg. ...the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1961. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1961.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any amendments from the Floor? 3rd Reading. 1885 has a fiscal note that's been filed, Senator. 1883, my Calendar, it's been marked through. 1883 has a fiscal note that's been filed. 2000. Obama. That has a fiscal note. We are now prepared to go to the Order of 3rd Reading. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to the Order of 3rd Reading. Final passage. Page 15, Ladies and -- Gentlemen, is Senate Bill 1. Senator Jones, do you wish to have -- on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones, Emil Jones.

### SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1, as amended, is the continuing approp for elementary and secondary education in Illinois. With this bill, education becomes an entitlement. The amendment will deal with the serious issue facing many school districts across the State. It deals with the twenty-third and twenty-fourth payment. Had that been included last year, we would not be faced with that problem this year. But that's what the bill does. It is a continuing approp for education - same way we do pensions, same way we do for intergovernmental transfers. A continuing approp. Education would become an -- an entitlement for all children throughout the State of Illinois, and I ask for a favorable vote.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Senator Jones, does this impact the '03 -- '03 contribution?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yes, it does, Senator Watson. The amendment that we placed on in committee changed from '04 to '03.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Well, then, I would -- I would rise in support and hope that we would all, on this side of the aisle, support this particular piece of legislation. This -- what this does is, actually, we live up to the commitment that we've made to education for this particular fiscal year and we will make that -- make that twenty-two-million-dollar concern that's out there right now for public schools; this will make a commitment that that, indeed, will be coming to our schools. And I think this is a responsible piece of legislation and will be good for our local school districts, and I urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? It not, Senator Jones may close.

SENATOR E. JONES:

I just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1, having received the required constitutional majority, is

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

declared passed. Senate Bill... Senator Roskam, for what... On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 3. Senator Halvorson. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 8. Senator Obama. 18. Senator Clayborne. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a -- some special guests with us today and Senator Roskam is -- is recognized to recognize our guests.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the indulgence of the Body very much. I have before me the -- or, you have before you the 2002-2003 IHSA Class AA Girls Basketball Champions, the North {sic} (Naperville) Central Lady Hawks {sic} (Redhawks). They had an undefeated season, 35 to 0. I won't tell you who they defeated so they won't feel bad in Senator Cronin's district, but they -- they're really, I think, an example to us all of excellence and -- the way they performed and exceeded expectations. And I'd like to introduce to you briefly for a couple remarks their Head Coach, Andy Nussbaum. COACH ANDY NUSSBAUM:

(Remarks by Coach Andy Nussbaum)

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Coach, and congratulations, ladies. And could we just give 'em one more round of applause?

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll go back to the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator -- Senator Jones, on Senate Bill 20? Beg your pardon, Senator Jones. I -- I skipped over, inadvertently, Senate Bill 18. With leave of the Body, we'll return to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 18. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 18.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Clayborne.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 18 is the tax -- amnesty program that is supported by the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Department of Revenue and other entities. Basically, this program would run from October -- it would run from October {sic} 1st of 2003 through November 15th of 2003, and it would cover the taxable period ending June 30th, 1983, and prior to July 1st, 1982 {sic}. And the significance of those dates are that no one who didn't participate in the program prior are eligible to participate in the program at this point in time. There's an estimate collection of about two hundred and thirty million dollars that would obviously help with our -- our cash flow problems and the deficit that we're -- we're experiencing. I'm -- I'm open for any questions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator Clayborne, I -- I don't know whether you said this or not, but how much money do you anticipate will come in by enacting the amnesty plan?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Clayborne.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I believe the -- the estimates are conservative, but the Department of Revenue has estimated about two hundred and thirty million dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator, are these dollars that we wouldn't collect anyway?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Clayborne.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Some of them are dollars that we probably -- are having problems collecting and some of them would be accelerated payments. Instead of going through the entire court process,

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

this would encourage people to come forth right away and make their payments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. So, in other words, the -- the two-hundred-and-some-odd-million-dollar figure that you threw out, only a small percentage of that is probably -- well, let me put it this way: A very large percentage of that are dollars that would come in anyway and -- and I believe those estimates are probably on the high side. I don't remember 'em being that high when we talked about it in committee, but -- but perhaps they were. But I think that, you know, we have to be aware that this is just an acceleration of dollars received. And in light of all the new spending bills that passed out of here yesterday, perhaps we would have been better off holding those bills rather than accelerating this, because this money will come in and -- in a more timely fashion anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, you and I are both fathers of young children, and we have birthday cakes and all kinds of fun parties that are around our houses. And you know what the program is when one of your boys or -- goes in and takes the icing off the cake. They go in and they -- they -- they get in there early, and they -- they scrape the icing off the cake, and you and I agree that that's a bad thing to do. Isn't it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I guess we're relegated to cake here. Senator Clayborne. SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Unfortunately, in my house, if it's their cake, then I allow them to scrape it off.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Roskam.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, Senator, all kidding aside. What we're really doing with this bill is we're -- we're -- we're scraping the icing off the cake. I mean, the Department of Revenue came in and their testimony, which was uncontroverted - there was no witness that -- that said anything to the contrary in the discussion of this bill in committee, no witness said anything to the contrary; even, I think, your remarks on the Floor were not to the contrary - but just for the benefit of the Membership, Department of Revenue, in their -- their letter to the Chairman of the Executive Committee, said, in part - in relevant part the vast majority of the revenue will be an acceleration of the tax the Department would ultimately collect. So I think it's important that we don't kid ourselves here. This is not money that is somehow new money that is springing forth that is not going to be available to the State of Illinois. literally scraping the icing off the cake for this year's revenue problems and I don't think is wise. I think it sends a bad signal that tax cheats ultimately benefit, and the bottom line is the State doesn't do better financially. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd rise in strong support of We just had a total mischaracterization of this whole idea for a tax amnesty. The reason these taxes aren't paid is because the taxpayer is contesting whether they owe the tax or not. What we're doing with this bill is saying that we'll forgo the arguments on whether it's owed or not and we'll give you the break of taking away your requirement to pay interest and any penalty for not filing the return. We'll concede that part in a negotiated settlement if you pay the You know, I -- I was contacted by one company that principal. said if this bill passes, they'll come in with fifteen million dollars immediately for back taxes that they've been contesting. If we don't pass it, they're going to continue to contest this. And what does the contest do to us? Well, we have to pay for the lawyers who handle these cases. We have to wait for who

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

knows how long. The company may go out of business. But here is a break for business. And I'm surprised that our Members on the other side of the aisle are opposing a break for business. This is kind of unusual. This helps the State. It helps many businesses to set their bottom line, get back on their feet, and it's a good bill and we should be all supporting it. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Silverstein. SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill. As Senator Roskam did point out, I did receive a letter from the Department of Revenue, but according to Department of Revenue, Senate Bill 18 will produce approximately a hundred and twenty million to two hundred and thirty million dollars. Something we do not have today. And I think it's important that we take this -- that we -- we pass this bill. We're looking for as much revenue as we can, and I would support and wish we have an Aye vote on this side. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Roskam, for a second time. SENATOR ROSKAM:

I regret rising for a second time, Mr. President, but just to clarify one of the previous speakers. This -- this notion of who's going to benefit under this bill - the bill exempts, I think wisely, actually, people who are subject to a civil lawsuit. So to say that -- that a -- a taxpayer, a company, is -- is going to give up fighting, they don't benefit under this bill. There -- there -- there's nothing in this bill that -- that is directed to the observation that Senator Welch makes. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator -- I'm sorry. Senator Welch for a second time. Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH:

Well, Senator, how do you think you end up in a court? You don't agree before you get there. The preliminary negotiations fail and then you end up in the courtroom. That's what it's going to derail. That's my point. You're not going to get to

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the -- to the courthouse because this will prevent you from taking that step.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Clayborne may close.

#### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, and -- and those who have spoken I do want to say - and I'm not an economic out on this bill. major, Senator Burzynski or -- or -- or Senator Roskam - but, obviously, the two hundred and thirty million dollars that we can collect today is obviously probably much -- worth much more money than collecting the two hundred and thirty million dollars three, four years down the line. So just from an -- economics point of view - Economics 101 - the money -- the value of the money today is probably worth much more. The other thing, too, we talk about tax cheats. Obviously this is not addressed to -to help tax cheats, because the last time we had a program like this was twenty years ago. So it's not like we're doing this every five years. The incentive, as -- as was discussed, is to waive penalties and interest and allow people who otherwise would contest and would string it out and probably who would negotiate what their liability is accused of being, would negotiate that down to a much lower -- lower amount. So, with this, we are allowing people to come forward who have issues, who may want to challenge it, to forgo that and -- and to pay this. I would urge an Aye vote. This is good for the cash flow of the State of Illinois. This is money that will come into the State, that potentially will go to the Common School Fund, as well as it will also go to your local municipalities who could also -- will benefit from this funding. I urge an Aye vote. Thank you.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 18 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 31, the Nays are 25, none voting Present. Senate Bill 18, having received the required constitutional majority, is

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

declared passed. Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Request -- thank you, Mr. President. We'd request a verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Ladies and Gentlemen, Senator Burzynski has requested a verification of those Members who voted in the affirmative. I would ask the Clerk to call -- I would ask the Secretary to call each -- each name that voted in the affirmative. Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, del Valle, Demuzio, Geo-Karis, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Jacobs, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Munoz, Obama, Ronen, Sandoval, Shadid, Silverstein, John Sullivan, Trotter, Walsh, Welch, Woolard and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski, do you question the presence of any Member that voted in the affirmative? Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yes, sir. Senator Garrett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Garrett on the Floor?

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Oh, excuse me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Are we -- Senator Burzynski are we verifying the Yeses or the Noes? Senator Burzynski, are -- do you have any other requests?

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

No more questions. Thank you, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Verified roll call, the Ayes are 31, the Nays are 25, none voting Present. Senate Bill 18, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 20. Senator Jones. 20. 22. Senator Woolard. On the Order of

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 22. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 22.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 22 addresses an issue that I think all of us are very familiar with. There are a lot of life/health safety issues and security issues that are before us today that many school districts rely on the State and other taxing entities to supply the funds necessary to make things happen. bill does is gives them the ability to extend above and beyond And originally we had said that it would take limitations. twenty percent of the voters in that district to make it a front-door referendum from the back-door referendum that's in the bill. We changed that to five percent is all that's necessary now. We believe we've addressed the concerns of those people that had and -- with this. I would certainly appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, this is really a -- you're taking on the tax cap here, aren't you, and you're -- you're putting exceptions in on the tax cap?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

We're -- we're -- we're trying to follow the pattern that was established last year. In fact, Senate Bill 22 is the same number as the Senate Bill 22 last year, and we're addressing an

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

issue that's very, very disturbing to many of us. In health/life safety and security issues, sometimes we don't have the ability to make things happen, and we are addressing that issue and we believe it's something that's important, that —that we make sure that we do address these kinds of critical issues.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

To the bill. You know, this -- this -- if -- if you look back at what the General Assembly has done over the past decade or so, there's a few things that really stand out as hallmark pieces of legislation that we can all be proud of. One of 'em is truth in sentencing, one of 'em is welfare reform, but certainly towards the top of the heap are tax caps. have had a restraining influence on the ferocious growth of -government and the tax burden, particularly in the collar counties. I remember going door to door the first time I ran for office in 1992, and this was after the tax cap was in place, and kind of getting a hallelujah feeling from seniors who were in situations where they we're going to be forced to leave their homes because of the tax burden. Now, I understand the underlying premise of what the Senator is trying to do, and it's a laudable one. But, you know what? These -- these problems can all be addressed simply by referendum. If the problem is great -- remember hearing testimony on this bill in the last General Assembly and I asked the question to the -- to the -- to the proponents of the bill in the Senate Revenue Committee, and I said: As you sit here today, members of the various school organizations, is there anybody whose life or health is in jeopardy today, as you sit here today? And to a person, they all said, "You know, Senator, the answer is no." I would urge a I think that -- that this is the camel -- you -- you No vote. all know the analogies. The analogies are phrases like slippery slope, camel's nose under the tent and so forth. But the tax cap has worked, the tax cap has been a restraining influence, the tax cap has kept seniors in their homes, and I think we will regret the day when we pierce the tax cap because it's not the piercing of the tax cap is not going to end with this bill,

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

believe me. If this -- if this is enacted, it's going to be -- it's going to embolden many other groups to come forward, and ultimately the tax cap will be gutted and we will be very unfortunate indeed. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Cronin.

#### SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill, with all due respect to my colleague, Senator Roskam. Reasonable people definitely can differ on this and I've come to the conclusion that this is a worthy piece of legislation. Now, the tax cap is a monumental piece of legislation. monumental law. It's certainly something, I think, that really changed the course of history in local government in the State of Illinois. No question about it. But I think if you look very closely and dig deep and try to develop a careful understanding of what's happening in the school districts across the State of Illinois, particularly school districts that rely to such a great extent on property taxes, that this very, very narrowly drafted piece of legislation for a very, very narrow purpose of life/health safety of children, I think, on balance, is worth -- is worth what we do to revise the tax cap. know, this particular approach, I think, in many ways, gives management of schools a much greater voice in how they run the school and how they finance the school. Many people could say, "Well, gee, let's just go and -- and do a referendum because that's the will of the majority." And you know what? I firmly in that. However, the practicalities of believe putting together a referendum require the management of the school to take on a coalition agenda, and sometimes the money that they are seeking in a referendum may not be as wisely spent as the money they could use by way of this piece of legislation. So, on balance, I recommend an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Two questions for the sponsor. First of all, I applaud...

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Indicates he will yield. Senator Lauzen. SENATOR LAUZEN:

I applaud the -- the -- the rationale behind the bill. We want all of our kids safe. We all want our kids safe. I don't understand, and perhaps you can explain to the Body, why the schools cannot persuade parents, who love their kids, as much as we love our kids, that it's in everybody's interest to spend the money there. Why don't we have confidence enough in parents, in taxpayers, that you ask us for whatever improvement needs to be done to protect the life and safety of our children, we're going to vote no on that in a referendum? Why don't we just ask the voter, would be my first question. I just have two.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

I -- I understand the question. I understand the intent, and -- and I kind of want to fall back to where Senator Cronin was a few minutes ago. Sometimes when we're trying to deal with critical issues with very limited funds, we can spend those funds effectively making a difference for those funds or we can spend those funds in allowing a vote of the people to be had. We believe that if, in fact, the voters in that particular district request that that vote be taken, we -- we've reduced the number of registered voters that have to sign a card to five percent. And if that comes forward, then it's mandated that that school board does go to referendum, and I believe that addresses the concerns that you have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you -- thank you very much. I -- I understand and I do think that that, from the twenty percent to the five percent, really is a step in the right direction. One of the -- one of the controversies of this whole area was that under this section of the law, swimming pools were built, tracks were built, bleachers around tracks were built, around the life/health safety of our children, and I know that they worked to narrow the definition. Can you assure us here today - and -- and we'll be here tomorrow and, you know, five years from now and ten

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

years from now - can you assure us that they're not going to expand the definition of health and life safety to be that broad? What are you -- how are you guaranteeing in the bill that the definition will stay narrow?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

I -- I think that everyone recognizes that across this State there probably have been mistakes made in a lot of areas. And for us to say that building an Olympic-size swimming pool within the confines of a building and calling it health/life safety is probably an exaggeration. And I would certainly hope that the CDB and the -- and the State Board of Education would collectively and effectively stand with us in ensuring that that's not what we're spending these moneys for. But there is a new item on the agenda today, and I think it's something that we're all very concerned with. It used to be health/life safety and we thought of safety being ensuring that something didn't fall off of the ceiling and hurt one of our children. we're even more concerned. We're concerned about the rowdyism that takes place in the neighborhoods of schools. ensuring that we have the ability to lock up the schools in an effective way from those bad things that might be happening. We're also ensuring that we have the ability in some areas and instances, that we have the security of those children from terrorists or someone that might be intending to bring harm in a -- very magnificent or terrible way. You know, I think that there's a lot of things that we can guarantee as a Legislature, and I can tell you that my legislative intent is not to build tracks or to build new swimming pools for the kids to have a place to exercise or to cooperate in some kind of a newfound recess period. But I will tell you that a -- we have a we have a responsibility to ensure that these kids are taken care of in an adequate fashion and sometimes they don't have the means or ability or moneys to make that happen, and that's what I'm about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Woolard, do you wish to close? Senator Woolard.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

I -- I -- I think that this is an issue that I understand anyone who chooses to vote No. It's one of those things that I understand that tax caps was a good piece of legislation, as was pointed out earlier. But I think that nothing is more important to any of us than ensuring that we have the kind of security around our children, the kind of ability to make a difference for them. And I encourage each and every one of you to vote for the kids and vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 22 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 19, none voting Senate Bill 22, having received the required Present. constitutional declared passed. majority, is Tt's understanding that we are not going to be calling the vehicle bills. It's hard for the Chair to know what vehicles are -what are -- they are and what aren't they. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, page 16, is Senate Bill 46. Senator Sullivan. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Madam Secretary, read Senate Bill -- 46.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 46.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator John Sullivan.

### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senate Bill 46 extends the tax incentive for ethanol-blended gasoline and adds bio-diesel and other biomass fuels to the exemption. It also reduces the partial exemption from the current seventy percent to zero during the course of this legislation. The legislation is supported by the ag industry, manufacturing industry and environmentalists. Welcome to -- be more than happy to answer any questions.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Is there discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Sullivan, who -- can you tell me and just kind of walk through some of us who aren't from ag areas who's going to really benefit under Senate Bill 46? Kind of the whole host of folks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

The ethanol industry is -- has many, many benefits obviously, from the -- the farm and the ag industry. It's a -it's another out -- another market for grain. The ethanol industry has been projected to -- or, estimated that increases the price of a bushel of corn by twenty-five cents a That puts a tremendous amount of money back into the bushel. farmers' pockets. That, in turn, goes through the -- the ag industry as far as the fertilizer/chemical/equipment dealers. So it adds a tremendous amount of income to that industry. also offers many jobs. It's projected that the ethanol industry employs over four thousand individuals, so it's a job creation. And probably and maybe the most important thing environmental benefits of this ethanol. It reduces our reliance on foreign oil, which right now, especially under the problems that the -- that we're facing in the world, especially in the Middle East, if we can reduce our reliance on foreign oil, I think that would be a huge benefit as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, thank you. Which corporations will benefit under this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

My hope is that many corporations would benefit from it. The -- the purpose of this program -- the purpose of the ethanol industry is to increase the use of corn, to reduce our reliance on foreign oil, to help the environment. Obviously, there's corporations out there that are going to benefit by it, but actually the benefit really comes to the consumer at the pumps. This incentive is -- is given -- is passed on to the consumer at the pumps and it actually is a money saving for them, as well. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, are there any particular big corporations that are involved in this business in Illinois? I understand your trickle-down theory, but are there some big ones that are -- that are particularly going to benefit that you're aware of? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Yes. ADM Corporation is in the ethanol business, Williams is also in it, Stepan, are three that I can think of off the top of my head.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

You mentioned, Senator, that one of your goals is to have farmers benefit, and I think that's a laudable goal. How do you guarantee or how do you create an environment where Illinois farmers particularly benefit? In other words, is there any requirement in your bill that the large corporations that are going to be involved in this process would have to buy from Illinois farmers, or they could buy from farmers all over the -- all over the country under your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

As far as the buying of the corn, is that what you were saying, or the ethanol itself?

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Corn.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Sullivan.

#### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

There is no requirement in the bill to -- to use Illinois-grown corn. Is that your question, Senator? No, there is no -- provision in there simply because there's no way to regulate that industry, to regulate the -- the flow of corn into the plants themselves. Corn is corn. And once it gets to the elevator, it's mixed, it's blended and there's no way to keep track. It would be impossible to keep track of Illinois corn, Iowa corn, Missouri corn, et cetera.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Are you telling me in the technology of today there -there is no physical way under your bill that you're going to be
able to make sure that the benefits go to Illinois corn growers
and -- and not to other corn growers? I mean, 'cause what we're
talking about here - and we'll get into this in a couple of
minutes, I think - I mean, is a -- is a subsidy. I mean, we're
making a policy decision here to invest heavily and you're -you're -- you're not able to direct this benefit to Illinois
corn growers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Again, it -- it's impossible. I think it's probably unconstitutional, but I'm not sure on that. You know, the only way to do it, I think, would be to try to identify the corn as it comes into the elevator and that would involve, I don't know, painting the corn, coloring it. I'm not sure. I think it's absolutely impossible to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator -- Senator Roskam. Senator Roskam, there are a number of speakers. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

The -- setting aside the constitutional question, I mean, the larger question -- I mean, the State of Ohio took this up, I mean, just as a -- as a point of fact, and they -- they

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

required the benefits to go to Ohio corn growers. Let's move on, though, and not beat a dead horse. The -- what's the fiscal impact of this, Senator? What do you think the number is that - and -- and what revenues -- what are the revenue funds that are going to be impacted in the State budget?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

#### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Senator, I have two documents here. Fiscal notes. One's from the Department of Revenue, and it said, I'll quote, "Because the incentive on gasohol will be slightly reduced, we believe that this will cover the cost of the new incentives for other biomass fuels, which would make this legislation revenue-neutral."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, that's in direct conflict to the Economic and Fiscal Commission. They estimate -- and they -- I won't bore you with the reasons that they estimate that this is a fairly conservative estimate. But they estimate that this is going to cost forty-four million dollars in Fiscal Year '04 through Fiscal Year '07. Are you aware of the Economic and Fiscal Commission's report, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Yes, Senator, I am. It's estimated as forty-four million dollars, and then eventually graduating down to thirty-five, then eighteen million, and eventually zero, of course, at the end of the -- the step-down process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator -- Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

So when we talk about the fiscal impact, you agree that the fiscal impact is going to be that forty-four million dollars, Senator? And if -- if -- if it's going to be that number - and I think the Economic-Fiscal Commission is a commission that we all respect around here - what's your feeling? Who's -- who's

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

going to take the pinch on that? Where's the forty-four million dollars going to come from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Well, first of all, sometimes you have to spend some money to make some money. And in this instance, the ethanol industry -- it's estimated right now that it generates over four hundred million dollars in the State of Illinois. That's in increased price of a bushel of corn in the production in the farm industry passed on through the chemical, fertilizer, ag industry in general. It also -- and we've talked about the jobs that it generates, over four thousand jobs in the State of Illinois. That's -- that's jobs and that's people working and those are good-paying jobs. So, to answer your question, yes, there is a -- a fiscal impact on the -- on this legislation, but the benefit, in the long run, is tremendous. And again, we've talked about the -- also the -- the environmental, as well as the -- creating jobs right here in Illinois and, of course, using a renewable source.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Roskam, I'll come back. Senator -- Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

Senator Sullivan, I stand in strong support of your piece of legislation and I commend you for putting together all the facets that was needed to put this -- put this together. It's my understanding that because of the ethanol industry here in the State of Illinois, that agricultural, the Illinois farmer, an additional twenty to twenty-five cents per bushel on every bushel of corn they raise is -- is there because of the ethanol industry. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

The use of ethanol in our areas that are not agricultural, up in the collar counties, in -- in -- in Cook County, in Chicago, the highly populated areas, the air that we breathe and those individuals breathe is much cleaner now because of the use of the ethanol in our cars and vehicles. Is that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

#### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

That's also correct, Senator Walsh.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

The ethanol industry has meant so much to the agricultural community here in the State of Illinois. Illinois is the largest producer of ethanol in the country. Our own Illinois farmers are the ones that benefit because of this -- because of this program, a program that was started many years ago that the Members on the other side of the aisle wholly supported and promoted. And many of our -- many of our Illinois farmers reap the benefits of larger prices that then, in turn, they take that money and they spend it on buying machinery, on putting more fertilizer on their fields, using more modern herbicides and insecticides. That end -- the end result is that they grow a more profitable crop. The ethanol industry has done a lot to improve agriculture in the State of Illinois, our number-one And corporate Illinois, Our number-one industry. industry. yes, they have benefited also. They have put people to work because of the ethanol industry. I think this is a good piece of legislation. I think we continue this -- this exemption. Yes, it is going to -- to cost us something in -- in -- in the revenue aspect, but the benefits are going to far outweigh what it's going to cost our treasury. I stand in strong support of this piece of legislation. What it's going to do for our number-one industry in Illinois is going to be tremendous.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

I compliment you, Senator Sullivan, on a good piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

I would like to rise in support of -- of this bill. You know, our -- our economy has certainly been slow over the -- in fact, all of our economy's been slow over the last couple of years, but the farm economy has been slow for a long time. One of the problems we -- we -- we face is the price of the products. This gives another use for that product and hopefully will increase that price and therefore increase the -- the possibility of farmers making a good living, and -- and then other areas around the farming industry make -- make money off of it, too. I think it's a good idea and would hope that we can support this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. It's interesting that this bill came up at this time, for two reasons. we're in the middle of a war in which oil fields are being set on fire and sabotaged, decreasing the amount of oil available to the United States, reducing the supply of gasoline in the next few months, and here we have a bill that encourages the creation of six hundred and eighty-five million gallons of ethanol from the State of Illinois each year to supplement that supply of And it's also ironic because here in the audience we have individuals who are going to benefit specifically from this bill in future years and those are the members of the Future Farmers of America, who are here in the gallery today surrounding us. This bill is for them. This bill is to keep them on the farm, to make sure they have jobs in the future, to make sure they have a -- a future to look forward to. That's what Senator Sullivan's trying to do. He's trying to help people, and this is a good way to do it. This is a Illinois industry that we're trying to help out. And I understand why we've got a lot of these questions. I was a number-one target myself for years, and probably am again, actually, but I know how these questions

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

come. But realistically, when you look at this, a major Illinois industry, a major Illinois product. And if you look at the bumper sticker that Larry Walsh is handing out here, it says — it says a lot about what's happening. It says, "No Farmers, No Food." No Farmers, No Food. That's Larry Walsh's slogan, which he repeats every time we're out to dinner. And I would just say that this is an outstanding bill with an outstanding sponsor. I think it should be passed unanimously. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I pioneered in ethanol fuels since 1973. I ran for the Illinois House in 1972 because I got tired of the Arabs cutting off our oil supply. And I can honestly tell you that this bill is in the right direction. In fact, at one time we mixed ethanol with -- with gasoline to make more gasoline, and the State did that under -- Governor Thompson. I probably have done more research on this subject than anyone in this whole Body, including the House and the Senate. So I can tell you that this bill is a You can make ethanol out of -- they use corn good bill. products, corn, wheat, rye, all the rest. I mean, there's no -no -- no stopping it. And I'll tell you, Brazil is doing it with the manioc plant and the sugar plant because they don't have much oil. They're making fuel from ethanol. Ethanol is cleaner than -- than methanol and it's -- it's -- it's less pollusive and more efficient. I certainly urge a favorable passage of this bill, because even though it's going to cost us some money, in the long run the farmers can use their waste farm products for ethanol. And -- and this way they're good products for -- for food, and we'll be ahead of the game. I -- I urge a strong support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator John Jones. SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: You know, this is an important piece of legislation here today in the Illinois Senate. One little complaint I would have with it, in Agriculture and Conservation Committee, and being the Spokesman

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

on that committee, we have a lot of important bills that comes out of that. I was -- was hoping to be a hyphenated cosponsor on such an important piece of legislation along with -- with Senator Sullivan and Senator Walsh. But that did not happen, and I would hope that in the future on important bills such as this, and the Grain Code that we're working on, that we would work strongly in a nonpartisan way in passing such important piece of legislation as this. This is great for agriculture in the State of Illinois. It will help us with our dependence on foreign oil. Hopefully, we'll get to the point some day where we -- we don't need foreign oil at all. Having made my living for thirty-one years in the oil industry in the State of Illinois, if we could give some incentives maybe to the oil industry also, much like we did in years past at the federal level and the State level, maybe we could completely move away from -- from our need of foreign oil. But I rise in strong support of this bill. The only other thing I would ask is that, you know, along with -- with legislation like this and the Grain Code that we're working on, would be extremely important that --Governor Blagojevich would name a Director of Aq immediately. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Roskam, for a second time. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

I wouldn't. He indicates he will yield. Senator Roskam. SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, you -- you earlier indicated that you had to spend money to make money, and I think we all understand that proposition, but whose money are you going to spend on this? Just getting back into it. This is a sales tax exemption. The sales tax, fifty percent of it, goes to the Common School Fund. So, when you say you're going to spend money to make money, you're not going to spend your money, are you, Senator? You're going to spend some schoolkids' money. Isn't that right? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Like I said earlier, the money that this incentive generates throughout the community is passed through the community several times. It increases the tax base because it gives farmers more income, more money to spend. They're able to purchase land. It holds land and property values up. It, again, goes through the farming sector as far as the chemical and -- and equipment dealerships. They employ people. Those people are put to work. They have children. This is a -- this industry is a very stabilizing industry for rural America.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Roskam, the Chair would like to advise you to bring your remarks to a close. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

I understand. I understand. I will. Senator, just -just in closing. You -- you didn't ask the -- answer the
question, and if you would in your closing remarks, I'd
appreciate it. Here's the question. It's very simple. Your
bill, under your own testimony earlier, is going to cost fortyfour million dollars over the next few years. The question is,
where is that forty-four million dollars going to come from?
The Economic and Fiscal Commission made that argument. They
said it was unambiguous. I'll pause while you listen to Senator
Welch.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator -- further discussion? If not, Senator Sullivan may close. Senator Sullivan.

## SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

This is not a new program. This -- this -- actually, this legislation reduces the State's tax incentives over the course of the program. So, there's no -- no taxes -- no new taxes being taken away from any schools or any children. In closing, I'd just like to say... I'd like to thank my colleagues that stood up and supported this legislation. It's a -- it's a excellent piece of legislation. It's beneficial to the State, to the farmers, to the business community. Especially to Senator Geo-Karis for those kind words. Also, I think it's appropriate, as Senator Welch indicated, that the Future Farmers

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

are here today, and -- including some from my hometown. I'd like to -- in the gallery, if they'd stand up. The advisor, Morris McClelland, Adam Bauer, Rusty Herche, Lindsey McClelland, Virginia Benninghoff. And here on the Floor with me is my daughter, Emily. I'd like to -- everybody to welcome them here today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Our guests in the gallery who are here, welcome.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

And in closing, I'd like to ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 46 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. Senate Bill 46, having received the required constitutional majority vote, is declared passed. Senate Bill 50. Senator Cullerton. 61. Senator del Valle. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Mr. Secretary, is Senate Bill 61. Read the bill.

## ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 61.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator del Valle.

## SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 61 will require hospitals to take the necessary steps to provide translator services to patients. The bill establishes a complaint system within the Illinois Department of Public Health, a penalty for violation of the Act, as well as it calls for the Department to establish rules for the administration and the enforcement of this Act. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Is there discussion? If not, question is, shall Senate Bill 63 {sic} pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 49, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. Senate Bill 61, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 63. Senator del Valle. 75. Senator Link. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 75. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 75.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is -- well, it is a bill, a work in progress. It's -- we -- we did a lot of work on this. It was a cooperative bill that I -- I worked with my colleagues on, on both sides of the aisle, and I -- I -- I took input from my colleagues. Minority Leader Watson made some strong suggestions, Senator Petka, others. I thank Senator Cullerton for assisting me on this. What this is, is the judicial subcircuits for areas in Lake, McHenry, DuPage, Will counties and the metro county areas. What we are doing is basically the same that was done in the Cook County areas a number of years ago. We are changing these areas. These are rapidly growing areas. We worked on 'em. We devised the areas. I think that with the -- the areas, we understood the rapid growth. We made sure that there would be some new, additional judges to -- for the encumbrance of the additional caseloads in which they're facing in these areas. I -- I look forward to any questions that you may have on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Any discussion? Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you very much. I want to thank Senator Link for including southwestern Illinois in -- in this consideration.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

We have a lot of the same concerns that I would assume would be in Lake County and in other areas of this State, where it's rapid-growing. And we would like to see a political diversity, and we think this is an excellent concept. But if this thing passes and sees the light of day to the Governor's Desk, I'll probably have a full head of hair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The Chair will refuse to comment on that question. Further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, you said this was still a work in progress. What did you mean by that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

Well -- well I should have indicated that it's not a work in progress, that I think it's a work -- that it was in progress, that -- it started out as one bill. And Senator Watson, Senator Petka, Senator Cullerton, Senator Roskam indicated concerns and ideas that we worked on, on this bill. We saw things that needed to be changed, problems in the Metro East area that I didn't understand that I think were similar problems that we have in other areas. I think this bill was misperceived from the beginning. Once we worked on this bill, I think they saw the will of this, and that was the meaning of it. And to add to Senator Watson, I hope that if this bill does come to the Governor's Desk as it is, that it helps him, it helps Senator Luechtefeld and myself, that we all benefit from this signing, in the hair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luechtefeld.

## SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

I'd like to be there for that. Senator, would -- would you -- do you have any sense that or have you had any contact with the House that they might change this and take parts of it out?

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

You know, I think what's good for one area might be good for another area. Would you -- would you say that if this does get passed, it will get passed as it exists today, and there won't be selective scissors used?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

If -- if I could speak for the Speaker, I -- I would probably be the only person in the General Assembly that could, because I don't think anybody can. I have had discussions over there. They know this bill in its -- in its entirety. They know the intent of this bill. They know my wishes, and they have the hopes that this bill will stay the way it is. That's my intent of sending the bill over. If you think there's a backroom deal, there's not. The intent of this bill is hopefully that Senator Watson will be standing right next to me when Governor Blagojevich signs the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

If the bill comes back and is different and part of it's -- have been taken out, will you -- would you give us your word that you wouldn't call the changed bill back here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

## SENATOR LINK:

I can't give my word on that, because I got to see what they change first. They might -- they might add Champaign County in there and then Senator Winkel might not like that. So, I -- I have to see what they want to add to it or delete from it before. But I will be more than happy to sit down with you. I will be more than happy to sit down with Senator Watson when the bill comes back and we will discuss it at that time. That word I will give with you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Syverson. SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Questions of the sponsor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Indicates he will yield. Senator Syverson.

## SENATOR SYVERSON:

Can you help me on -- on this legislation, Senator? Does -- does this add new judges or does this create subcircuits?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Both.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Okay. Can you tell me what the criteria was used to determine the addition of those judges?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

The population, growth and the projected growth was worked in there. The caseloads. We -- we looked at the circuits and their -- their potential caseloads and what areas we are affected. And I know where probably this question is going to, and I know that probably every -- every circuit, including your own, is going to be affected by this. This was one of the questions that I brought up to the -- to the Speaker's Office, and they resoundly {sic} indicated that they would have a very difficult time adding judges to other circuits that were not going to be affected by this bill. And this bill effective date is the year 2006. So this will be a time off before the --hopefully the economy will have changed and the general revenue will be coming in on a lot better pace so that we will have money to effectively put these new judges into effect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Syverson.

# SENATOR SYVERSON:

Well, unfortunately, the bill doesn't give a criteria on -on that, and the concern is that we didn't look at caseload. We
didn't look at those areas where the -- where we have a higher
criminal court call, which is a more complicated load. We have
areas that are -- where we're creating and adding new judges,
that the judges have a lesser caseload or a -- and/or a less

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

complicated caseload than other districts. And so my concern is, was just trying to figure out why or what determination was made. If we looked at the Supreme Court statistics facing the caseload and the complication of those caseloads per district, how did we determine which districts were going to be in there when there are other districts that clearly had higher caseloads that were not part of this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. No! Senator -- Senator Syverson, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR SYVERSON:

Well, it was a question. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

To -- to answer your question, I -- I think if we probably looked at every judicial circuit, you probably could come up with a case for more judges. And I think if we sat down with every circuit, they would come up with a case for more judges. And as -- as your side keeps indicating, we don't have money, and we -- and we -- we have a problem. One of the things that we the effective date on this -- on this piece of legislation was 2006, hopefully, to have this. The only reason we did this is because the judges would be effective by the That's why the additional reapportionment of subcircuits. judges were affected in this area. That's the only reason that that was affected. I understand the caseload in your area, Senator. I would hope that the time will come that we have the money to effectively add on more judges throughout the entire State to affect these caseloads. But at this time, we're looking at the subcircuits. We're looking at the affected judicial circuits, and that's why we're facing it with this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, rather than to belabor the point, the bill, as amended, is a good bill and if it comes back -- if we pass it here today and it comes back from the House without that amendment on, then we're going

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

to have it in conference 'cause we have to have the amendment on to be fair to the whole -- whole area. I think it's worthwhile in the way it's amended and I urge its favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Link may close.

### SENATOR LINK:

Well, as I indicated, I -- I think we've showed the bipartisanship in this. We've worked together on this bill, and I hope it does come back in the way it was sent over there and the way I hope this is going to pass out of here with 56 votes on it. I appreciate a positive vote from everybody. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 75 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? I'd like to vote Aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 42, the Nays are 14, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 75, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 84. Senator del Valle. 89. Senator del Valle. 90? On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, middle of page 16, Senate Bill 90. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 90.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator del Valle.

## SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 90 amends the Employment of Strikebreakers Act and the Temporary and Day Labor Services Act {sic}. It indicates that no person may knowingly contract with a day and temporary labor service agency to replace an employee during a strike or a lockout. In the current statute, and it's a little-known provision that has been around for -- for decades: "No person shall knowingly employ any professional strikebreaker in the place of an employee during any period when a lockout or strike

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

is in progress. Nor shall any professional strikebreaker take or offer to take the place in employment of employees involved in a lockout or strike." That is the current law. That's the current law. We don't change that. What we add to this is a provision that says that the employer cannot make use of a temporary day or labor services agency during that period. Purpose of that is to, number one, I think, keep day laborers, who don't have much of a choice in terms of their employment options, from being put in precarious positions. that -- that -- that day laborers are -- are not sent to a place where, as a result of their temporary employment, they create an unfair advantage for -- for the employers. This ensures the leveling of the playing field, and so I'll be glad to answer any -- any questions that you may have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Senator, give me an example of why this should be changed, this law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator del Valle.

# SENATOR DEL VALLE:

There have been a number of instances over the years where an employer who is involved in a strike, in negotiations with a union, will call or contact a day labor agency and the day labor agency will then send thirty, twenty, twenty-five individuals, five individuals, to work for a day at that plant. That then creates an unfair advantage for the employer because they then, many times, end up not only prolonging the strike but also end up putting day laborers, who many times don't have much of a choice because that's the employment that the day labor agency is offering them, that's the employment opportunity that's being put in front of them, then those workers then, even though they are sometimes involved in crossing picket lines and, again, in precarious positions, they prefer not to have to do that but

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

really have no choice. What this bill does is that it kind of extends the definition of a professional strikebreaker, which is already in the statute. We already say you cannot use strikebreakers, professional strikebreakers. Day laborers, in fact, end up being professional strikebreakers in that under the definition of professional strikebreakers, through their work with that agency they end up being used continuously, on a regular basis, to be sent to locations where there are strikes. So, this expands that -- that definition. That's all it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

#### SENATOR WOJCIK:

Well, doesn't this enhance the union strike fund, then? I mean, if you're having these people do this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

No. In -- in -- in my opinion, I think what this does is that it levels -- it levels the playing field. I think employers end up with an unfair advantage when they're able to bring people en masse. And mind you, this does not prohibit them from hiring individuals temporarily. It doesn't prohibit them from hiring individuals, as long as those individuals don't fall under the definition of professional strikebreaker or are used by a day labor agency in a role that has them making themselves available on a regular basis to work at locations where there is a strike. And one other point I'd like to make is the temporary and day labor agencies and their professional association support this bill, because they don't want to be put in that position where they are being called by an employer where there is a strike and being asked to send workers to that location. So, we have strong support from the industry on this. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

# SENATOR WOJCIK:

Well, I think what's going to happen is it's a disadvantage to the businesses and what is going to go on is the business will probably have to close their doors because they can't be

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

hiring an individual to come in and do the -- you're saying individuals and not a group.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

No. Senator, the bill says that they cannot hire an agency to provide workers. The bill does not address individuals. In the current law, the Employment of Strikebreakers Act that has been in place, I think, since — the seventies, already says that they cannot hire individual professional strikebreakers. And professional strikebreakers are defined in the statute as a "person who repeatedly and habitually offers himself for employment on a temporary basis where a lockout or strike exists to take the place of an employee whose work has ceased as a direct consequence of such lockout or strike." That definition has been there forever. This bill does not prohibit employers from putting an ad in the paper and hiring individuals on a temporary basis. It does not do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, ma'am.

#### SENATOR WOJCIK:

Members of the Senate, I think that this does place a hardship on the businesses. Oftentimes, they do not have time to place an ad in the paper to hire someone. They rely on these people to come in and help them. Most often, if this doesn't happen, they're going to have to close their doors. And I think today we're losing enough jobs; we don't have to be worried about losing more jobs. So I would ask my side, or the Members of this Body, to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much. Senator Brady, what purpose do you rise, sir?

### SENATOR BRADY:

Purpose of asking the sponsor a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

### SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, the question that I have is does the National Labor Relations Act contain the same language as this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

# SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I have not looked at the -- at the Act for this language or any other language.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

### SENATOR BRADY:

My -- my question focuses -- we're -- we're governed by the National Labor Relations Act, as you know. And along the line of questioning Senator Wojcik was following is, if this were to be enacted, it would create a difference between the National Labor Relations Act, which we've tried to cooperate with and work with, particularly when we have to compete as a state with surrounding states. So a question that would -- I'd like to know the answer to is if this creates a difference between the State of Illinois and the surrounding states, which could drive at Senator Wojcik's concern and that is that we -- we may create a disincentive to locate here when we so desperately need these jobs. Do you know what the other states do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

# SENATOR DEL VALLE:

No. I -- I disagree with you. I don't see how expanding a definition that's already in place and has been in place for a long time creates a problem. And I don't know of any reason why we would be out of sync with the National Labor Relations Act. I just don't know any.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Brady.

#### SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, I respect your right to disagree with me. But it's hard to disagree with a question. My -- my question was, do the surrounding states have similar language to this?

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I have not checked surrounding states.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

A question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

According to our analysis, it said that you removed a provision that required the day and temporary labor service agency to inform the day laborer if there are any labor disputes at the location where the laborer is to be sent for work that day. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

That's correct, Senator Geo-Karis. And that had to be done in order to be consistent and have both Acts match up. If I hadn't done that, then -- then there would be an inconsistency in -- in -- in the law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Speak to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, ma'am.

# SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I think we should encourage businesses to stay alive. I cannot agree with the sentiments of this bill, because what you're doing is, little by little, denigrating business in Illinois. We're not going to be able to encourage good business to come into Illinois if we keep denigrating the importance of business. Labor needs business. Business needs labor. Without businesses, there are no jobs. Let's not forget we're in a critical period right now. We should not be taking away, piece

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

by piece, any business advantage that would help labor in the long run. And I do feel, in all due respect to the sponsor, that this is the wrong time to bring a bill like this up, and I am opposing it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Geo-Karis. Senator Righter, what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, sir.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator, you've used the term "day labor agency". Is that a -- is that a -- a temp agency like Manpower or some other like that? I just want to make sure that I understand what we're referring to here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Yes. There -- there is a statute, an Act that we -- we created just a few years ago called the Day and Temporary Labor Service Act, and the definition of a day labor agency is within that Act. And we're talking about, primarily, manufacturing workers. This definition does not include clerical and -- and professional workers. We're talking about, primarily, day laborers that are made available to work in factories.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, do I understand correctly then, your bill would not apply to clerical temporary workers, someone who might be in the office, as opposed to someone out on the manufacturing floor? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

No. Because they're not included in that definition of a day labor service agency.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

The concern I have, Senator, and I'm going to lay out a situation for you: I -- as I assume is true in many parts of the State - maybe for you - it certainly is in my district, with the job losses we've had, with the slumping economy, there are many people who, in order to find work, are signing up with temporary agencies in order to have the best chance of accessing an avenue to -- to have contact with an employer and get a job. You are, by this bill, foreclosing an opportunity they may have to get a job and provide for their family. And I wonder if -- if you've given some consideration to that side of the formula with regards to those individuals who need those jobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Oh, I've -- I've given lots of consideration. We certainly want people to work. But I've also given serious consideration based on my experience over the years and my observations to the acrimony that's created in -- in what ends up, in many cases, being tense situations and the fact that -- that these workers end up in the middle and many -- many times don't want to be put in that position. Even though the -- the -- under the current statute, they're supposed to be informed when they are being sent to a location where there's a strike, the fact of the matter is that because they need to work, they -- they go there anyway but many times end up in that -- in that very difficult I think what this bill does, and I think that's why position. the day labor agencies support it, is that it ensures that day labor agencies are not used. Just like the law does not allow for an individual to offer themselves as a professional strikebreaker, the day labor and temporary labor agencies are "We don't want to also fall into that category of professional strikebreaker," because it's not fair for those workers that you're talking about that are in such dire need of employment, for them to put in -- be put in that kind of And so, I think what this bill does is that it ensures that -- that -- that there'll be a level playing field and that -- and that the workers and -- and the union and the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

employer will see the need to be able to negotiate, to use the collective bargaining process, for the purpose of arriving at some kind of solution that will bring people back to work and will keep the business operating. And so I see this as a plus, rather than having a situation where bitterness remains for years and years as a result of -- of an employer being able to, in effect - in effect - work to break -- break a strike, to break a strike. And that -- that is an unfair labor advantage that I think this bill addresses, and that's why the day labor agencies prefer this, because they don't even want to be put in a position where they're being asked to provide an unfair advantage to employers and, in effect, work against the very same people that they care about, and those are the people who need to be employed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, Senator, as I understand the law now, those temporary agencies or a person who has contracted with a temporary agency to try to find a job would be entitled to notice now if they are being called into a situation where there's a strike. And if that's the case then, why don't you leave it up to the people who are looking for the jobs to decide whether or not they want to be put in that situation, rather than making that decision for them here in Springfield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

# SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I think I've already addressed that -- that point in my previous statement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

# SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. Then I'll -- I'll divide the question. The first question is, does the law already contain a notice requirement like I described?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

# SENATOR DEL VALLE:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator, I know the Act well because I created the Act. I wrote the Act. I created that Act, so I know it well. The reason we're here now amending the Act is because the provision of notification was not enough. And we do that a lot around here. We'll create a law and we'll let it work for awhile, and then we see that there are deficiencies in it and that's what we're here for. We're here for the purpose of then amending and trying to strengthen existing laws. That's what we're doing with this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Then I -- I guess I'm going to back up a little bit, Senator, and ask you a question. I don't feel like it's my place to decide whether or not someone in your district should go to work in a situation like that. That's up to them and their family and their needs. What is -- what is the thinking that you have that brings you to the conclusion that it's your job to decide for the people in my district whether or not they want to go to work there and whether or not they want to try to put some food on their family's table?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

It's my job, as well as it is your job, to establish public policy for the entire State of Illinois. You will have bills that affect my district. You have lots of legislation that affects my district. I will not say to you that it's not your job to pass or sponsor a bill that affects my district, because it is your job to establish public policy, as well as my job, for the entire State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

# SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: First to the Senator's final comments. I'm happy to go down the Calendar of the bills I'm sponsoring with you to see if I've got any of this kind of legislation. You won't find any. Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope we're paying close attention to this bill. This bill

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

doesn't leave it up to the person who needs the job to decide whether or not they want to go to work in that situation. I agree with Senator del Valle. There may be situations in which the person doesn't want to go there because they don't want to get caught in the middle of a situation. But why don't we leave that up to them? Why don't we let them decide, for the sake of their children and their families, whether or not they want to go get that job? This seems to me to be Springfield reaching right down deep into the family's decision on whether or not they're going to put food on their family's table. Leave it up to them. Leave it up to the workers in your district. I would urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. My friend and colleague from Kane County, Senator Lauzen, what reason do you rise, sir?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Mr. President DeLeo. You know, there are a series of antijob and anti-competition bills before us in the Senate and this is one of 'em. I would ask each of -- each Member of the Senate who is considering voting for this bill to recognize that there are now more government jobs in Illinois than there are manufacturing jobs. This bill will make that worse. I think Senator Brady pointed it out very well when he -- he described how labor laws have established a delicate balance between the authority of management to compete worldwide and the rights of workers to withhold their services. This bill throws that off. This is not about a level playing field. The practical application of this law is if there's a strike -- if a strike occurs and the employer uses one of these employment agencies, this bill closes that firm down. This is not good for business. I think that it was Governor It's not good for jobs. Blagojevich who said there's no way you can be pro-jobs and anti-business. This is an anti-business bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you very much. Senator del Valle, to close, sir.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. No doubt about it. This It is. But I think it's also a is a pro-worker bill. It is. bill that helps businesses in that it makes sure that whenever a labor dispute develops, that the kind of communication that needs to take place and the kind of negotiation that needs to take place takes place on a level playing field so that the workers are not left feeling like they're being totally railroaded and the workers and the union that represents them does not -- is not left feeling like their strike is being broken because of an unfair advantage. This bill does not say that the employer cannot hire individuals on a temporary basis. They can place the ad in the paper. They can make phone calls. They can put a -- a "Help Wanted" sign in front of the plant. People will drive by. They'll stop in. They'll apply. They'll get hired. This bill doesn't change that. What it says is that the employer cannot pick up a phone and call a day labor agency and say, "I've got a hundred and fifty employees on strike. Send me -- send me a hundred and fifty workers, because I want to continue to operate for the next six months or eight months, and I don't care. I'm going to continue to operate and the hell with the union. We're not going to do anything about -- about these poor workers that are out there and not able to feed their families and put food on the plate because of that strike." That's what this bill says. That's why we need to support workers in the State of Illinois. And I ask for an Aye vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 90 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. All opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 32 voting Aye, 25 voting Nay, and 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 90, having received the constitutional majority, is here declared passed. Senator Watson, what reason do you rise, sir?

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. I'd just like to ask for a verification. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

That is always in order. Senator Watson has requested a verification. Will -- will all the Members please be in their seats? Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Following voted in the affirmative: Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, del Valle, Demuzio, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Jacobs, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Munoz, Obama, Ronen, Sandoval, Schoenberg, Shadid, Silverstein, John Sullivan, Trotter, Viverito, Walsh, Welch, Woolard and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. Secretary. Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Hendon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon is right here in the aisle, sir.

SENATOR WATSON:

No further requests. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

If not, Mr. Secretary, on a verified roll call, there are 32 Ayes, 25 Nays, and 0 voting Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is here declared passed, on a verified roll call. Senate Bill 95. Senator Shadid. Out of the record. Senate Bill 96. Senator Watson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 100. Senator Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 105. Senator Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 111. Senator Jacobs. Senator Denny Jacobs, on Senate Bill 111. Out of the record. Senate Bill 113. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 113, sir. Out of the record. Senate Bill 118. Senator Cullerton. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 118.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 118.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill affects the adoption -- Illinois Adoption Registry Act {sic}. Right now if you want to get information exchanged between birth siblings, adopted children, there's this adoption registry, which we've had in Illinois for a few decades. you have to fill out a information exchange application, and on that application you -- you have to have it witnessed and And we've found that -- the Department has found notarized. that a lot of people forget to sign the -- the witness section, and since it already has to be notarized anyway, what this bill does is just remove the requirement that there be a witness, as well, because these things have been -- have to be sent back to people and hasn't been proved effective. So it's a very minor bill. Be happy to answer any questions, and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 118 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 118, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- Cullerton, on 123. Senate Bill 123. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 125. Senator Obama. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 125.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill is attempting to address a growing

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

problem in many of our districts. Over the past several years, I think, with the support of both sides of the aisle, we have significantly tightened up the criminal justice system and tried to aggressively deal with the scourge of drugs Unfortunately, what we're starting to see is a communities. huge influx of nonviolent offenders who have left the system, have paid their dues and are now trying to get employment so we can make sure that they don't go back into lives of crime, and they're having difficulty with respect to finding gainful employment. What this bill does, which was -is a recommendation, actually, of business and civic leaders in the Chicago area, is to set up a certificate of relief from disabilities system whereby if a nonviolent offender has shown themselves not only to serve good time, but have -- has also subsequent to their release stayed out of trouble, kept their nose clean, that they could obtain this certificate and this would then assist them in terms of getting around some of the current disabilities that they have with respect to, example, being barbers or cosmetologists. It was debated in committee and discussed. It came out of the committee, I believe, with no opposition. And I would ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Watson, for what purpose do you rise, sir? SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Just a quick question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor will yield, sir.

## SENATOR WATSON:

I -- I think we all know of young people who went astray and got this -- this one felony, as -- as you said here, and I think it's an excellent idea, what you're doing, to try to give them the opportunity to go ahead. But -- when someone has a felony conviction, I don't believe that they have the opportunity to get a firearm identification card - FOID card. Will this enable them, then, to -- to do so?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

No. That's not my understanding. But perhaps your staff has other information that you might be aware.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, why wouldn't you want to include that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Obviously, the -- it's always a difficult process in terms of striking the balance. We want to return these folks to good standing in the society, but at the same time, we want to make sure that the community is protected. And the -- I think that firearms ownership is obviously an area that people are -- fellow citizens are a little more sensitive about. I think they might feel a sense -- they're not concerned that somebody's giving them a manicure, but they might not feel as good about them having firearms.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The Senate would like to welcome the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Illinois. Lieutenant Governor Pat Quinn. Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he will, sir.

# SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Obama, for the benefit, I think, of everybody, this is not an expungement bill. Is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

# SENATOR OBAMA:

That -- that's correct, Senator. The -- I know that there's significant debate surrounding expungement. I think there's some bills over in the House. This is a more modest measure. It still retains the authority of the Prison {sic} (Prisoner) Review Board and other licensing boards. They, at their discretion, may grant these certificates, but they could

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

still withhold them if there were any reasons whatsoever where they thought that the applicant might still present some sort of danger to the society.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

And this doesn't have anything to do -- or, I mean, you've narrowed the -- the crimes. Isn't that right, Senator? And then you can pick up one other question and it has to do with the interplay between this bill and State licensure. Can you address those two questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

Remind me of the first question. I'm sorry, Senator Roskam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam, you want to join all of us in debate? SENATOR ROSKAM:

The narrowing of the -- the crimes. In other -- right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

This applies only to nonviolent drug offenses. And with respect to the interaction with licensure, as I said before, the -- what this does is prevent an automatic bar, which exists currently, from these individuals obtaining a license, but it still has to pass through the various licensing boards and they still have discretion, potentially, to prohibit them from obtaining it if they determine that, in fact, they do not have the sort of character that we expect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Obama, to close, sir.

# SENATOR OBAMA:

I would ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. The question is, shall Senate Bill 125 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 45 Ayes, 8 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 125, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 130. Senator Obama. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 130.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We had extensive debate on this bill yesterday as I moved it from 2nd to 3rd. You'll recall this is the issue relating to the KidCare program. The original underlying bill removes the sunset date. The amendment provided from the Governor seeks to move eligibility from a hundred and eightyfive percent of poverty to two hundred percent of poverty. I have some figures that were requested yesterday with respect to the cost of the program. It is my understanding that by raising the eligibility, total eligible children that would be increased would be twenty thousand. We anticipate a -- a participation rate that allows for twelve thousand children to -- additional children to enroll. The total cost is anticipated at ten million nine hundred and forty-four -- ten million -- ten million nine hundred and forty-four thousand dollars. But keep in mind that the State cost to that, it is estimated to be at three million eight hundred and thirty thousand and four hundred dollars, with the federal match at sixty-five percent being seven million one hundred and thirteen dollars and -- or, seven million one hundred and thirteen thousand and six -- six hundred dollars. So, just to clarify, the -- I -- I think that there is obviously bipartisan support for this program. This is an initiative where I think the Governor wants to make his -- his mark with respect to expanding, very modestly, eligibility for children under KidCare. We get a sixty-five-percent match, which means a hundred and thirty -- a dollar thirty for every dollar we put

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

in. And I would urge an affirmative roll call and answer any questions that Members may have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Rauschenberger, what purpose do you rise, sir? SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

A question and a comment of the -- the -- on the bill. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I asked yesterday whether we thought the premium share portion, the one-fifty to two hundred, was the portion that was going to be expanded. Is that the way you understand the bill to work?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

That is my understanding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Rauschenberger.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Just, you know, again, I won't belabor the whole statement on 2nd Reading. I -- I like the underlying bill a lot better without the amendment. I just think we're sending the Governor the wrong message even if we're doing it to try to accommodate We've got extraordinary financial circumstances in the balance of the '03 fiscal year. I think we're now talking maybe in the range of 1.3-billion-dollar meltdown in the fiscal year we're in. We're projected by the Governor's own numbers to be looking at a 3.6-billion-dollar hole. No matter how worthy or how important, one of the last things I think we ought to do is send on an affirmative roll call one of his -- his State of the I think it's time to whistle the Governor in State promises. and let him know we need him in the Capitol, not at firehouses around our districts criticizing the Senate for not having voted on a bill that hasn't been brought yet. So, I would just urge Members to seriously consider that this is not the right time, that this ought to be part of the budget negotiations. the sponsor has the best intentions and the underlying bill is good, but I think it's the wrong time to expand eligibility, to

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

-- to make those kind of promises when we don't have the wherewithal to pay for 'em.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Trotter, what purpose you rise, sir? SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of this I rise in strong support of this legislation. when we implemented KidCare, this General Assembly recognized that a healthy child will be a productive child, that if we've had a child who had his ears checked, had his eyes checked, had more of an opportunity to absorb those lessons that are going to be taught to him. And we have found out, through statistics, that has happened. But in 1998, as did all the other states in this country, we found out that we couldn't implement that program as fast as we could. And as a direct consequence of that, last year we sent back to the federal government fifty-nine million dollars - fifty-nine million dollars - which, in fact, we could have enrolled more children. By raising the threshold in which we now -- the income threshold, we can enroll more children in this valuable program, and we can utilize those dollars that the feds have deemed we deserve to get. Those are our taxpayer dollars coming back home They should not go to New York and also down to Tennessee where our fifty-nine million dollars went. So, this is -- again, is a -- is a worthwhile program. Regardless if it was the Governor's or anyone else, it is our children, it's our dollars and we need to vote for this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Obama, to close, sir.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much. I think Senator Trotter stated eloquently this is -- we get more bang from the buck because of the federal match. It doesn't make sense for us to leave this money on the table. I appreciate the wonderful work that Senator Trotter, Rauschenberger, Syverson and others did in terms of helping set this up. And this represents, I think, a intelligent, modest step, even in difficult times, for us to

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

move forward and deal with the insurance crisis that so many families are experiencing. I'd ask for an affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. The question is, shall Senate Bill 130 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 42 Ayes, 13 Nays, 2 voting Senate Bill 130, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 142. Out of the record. Senate Bill 150. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 152. Out of the record. Senate Senator Halvorson. Out of the record. Bill 155. Senate Bill -- 167. Senator Lightford. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 167.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Assembly. Senate Bill 167 creates a new Act. It creates the Council on Responsible Fatherhood. This initial movement began in Florida in 1997 with similar legislation. Since the beginning of this commission, over twenty-seven programs have been funded Florida assisting thirty-five counties, reaching out to over five thousand fathers and eleven thousand children. California and Iowa has also implemented similar legislation, and I'd like for us to take a leadership role here in the State of Illinois to assist fathers and children with this effort. What the Act would actually do is create a twenty-one-member Council. Tt. would describe the duties of the Council in relation to the The Act will repeal on July 1 of 2005, and create a initiative. fund through the State Treasurer's Department. It does not have a fiscal impact whatsoever. Funding sources would come from different grants throughout the State. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you very much. Senator Righter, what purpose do you rise, sir?

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Questions for the sponsor, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, sir.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, we discussed this a little bit in Health and Human Services Committee, and I want to discuss some of those subjects again here on the Floor for the benefit of the full Membership. First, the new -- the Council. How does that fit into if you know the Governor's plan with regards to reordering the boards and commissions? There was a bill, I think, that passed out of the House committee, I believe, yesterday with a total reorganization of those boards and commissions. Have you -- I guess, two questions. First, have you spoken to the Governor's Office about this? And if -- and if so, do they think that this will be part of their package?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. In fact, I have spoken with some of the Governor's staff, and we've been speaking on a couple pieces of legislation that we'd like to move forward. In regards to this one in particular, their emphasis is more so on demolishing programs that require funding. This is a piece of legislation that a commission is set up but no funding will be required. There will be no pay at all to the members, only compensation for travel, which they will take from the funding that they receive from grant sources.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

# SENATOR RIGHTER:

What are the potential grant sources for the Council? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

TANF, Maintenance of Effort, which is called the MOE, the Welfare-to-Work program, child support enforcement, social

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

services block grants and community services block grants, the CSBG grants.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, those are all public monies that if they weren't granted to the Council, would be going elsewhere to -- arguably to other services that are provided by State government. Is that -- I mean, is that fair to say, that that's -- and I'm not -- I'm not trying to nitpick here. I'm -- I'm truly asking whether or not the Council, by accessing those grants, is going to pull some dollars away from some of the other programs that we already offer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I -- I believe what would happen here is in an effort to support TANF clients and also Welfare-to-Work clients, child support division, in helping them to bring in funding from fathers that are not involved, that the funding would inadvertently help itself through the programs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, I'm looking at the text of the bill, and under the Section that describes what the fatherhood initiative must include but not -- is not necessarily limited to, there's description of public education programs and provision of assistance to men in preparing for the legal, financial and emotional responsibilities of fatherhood. What kind of assistance do you envision running through this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I would hope that the promotion of public education concerning the financial and emotional responsibilities of the father is displayed, the encouragement of fathers in fostering an emotional connection to their children and furnishing the financial support that their children so desperately needs, the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

development of support mechanisms for fathers' relationships with their children and also the integration of State and local services available to families. And let me just iterate here the importance of -- we've got programs now that says if the father is absent from the home, then you are eligible for. And so, actually, as a -- as society, with social policies, our policies are geared towards moving the father away from the home and not bringing him to, and being involved with his family. I think it's time for us to encourage fathers to be an integral part of their child's life regardless if they're in the household or not. It's my effort to assist families that -- when you're dealing with divorce, separation, things of that nature, the child is highly affected. As adults, we just think of our own emotional feelings. I think it's time for us to take a step back and look at how it affects our children.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, perhaps for another day we'll save the discussion of whether or not it's best to change our policies with regards to trying to move families away from the -- I'm sorry, fathers away from the families, whether it's not best to reorder those programs than to create another program and put on top of it. One last question. The bill also says that the Department of Human Services is going to provide the staff to support all that's being done through here. Have you talked to the Department and do we have an idea of how much staff that they are going to have to pull away from what they are doing now in order to -- to -- to serve this purpose, especially considering all of the early retirements that we've suffered?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

# SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Actually, we would just need one member, one staff person from DHS, and DHS is not an opponent. They did not file a fiscal note, and I believe that we would be appropriate in -- in requesting support from one staff person.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The distinguished gentleman from DuPage, Senator Dillard, what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR DILLARD:

Would the sponsor yield for a few questions, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

She indicates she will.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Senator Lightford, what role do churches or religious institutions play with this Council on Responsible Fatherhood?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator Dillard, thanks for asking that question. Actually, the church -- the member will be set up by the President, the Minority Leader from both caucuses and the Speaker. And then what would happen is, we would hope that those would be selected are members that are already involved in the fatherhood initiative movement. If they have connections to churches, then they can bring in the pastors. But right now I'm not focused on a church being responsible. What I'm hoping is that the State can take a look from our prospective in determining how this could help us. I believe it would increase our child support funding mechanisms and a possibility of lowering the number of women that are typically TANF clients and Welfare-to-Work clients.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

What year was this enacted in Florida?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

It was enacted in 1997 in Florida. And since then, this program has assisted thirty-five counties, over five thousand fathers and over eleven thousand children.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Just one last question, Mr. President. Groups like Voices for Illinois Children, I read their reports and similar ones like it, and I clearly know from statistics what the cost is to society not to have a father living in the home. What's this going to provide that Voices for Illinois Children and other studies that don't require government expense are -- are going to give us?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford.

#### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Well, actually, they're needing assistance. I believe that if the Voices of Illinois Children, which is an excellent group, I believe if they could solve all our problems, we wouldn't be here today trying to gather support for our children. And so if I could just quickly reiterate, the purpose and the goal of the commission would be to promote public education, to assist fathers in becoming financially solvent with their children, to encourage them to develop a loving, connecting relationship, and to also identify and promote methods that will reduce the negative outcomes that children experience by divorce, separation and disputes concerning custody battles and often visitation amongst the child.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Sieben, what purpose do you rise, sir? SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of the Senator's initiative here. For several years, in the summer, I attend Promise Keepers events with my son, various places across the country. I'm fortunate enough to have three grandchildren and realize that for me, personally, it's been a wonderful experience to have an intact family and have grandchildren, and I understand the importance and significance of a strong relationship — intergenerational relationship between fathers and sons and fathers and daughters and fathers and grandchildren. At those summer Promise Keepers events, there's a booth set up by the National Center on Fatherhood {sic} (for Fathering), and they have a book that they put out called The 7 Secrets of Effective Fathering {sic} (Fathers). I got the book, took the material

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

back and started teaching some classes in our church for the young fathers in our church. I think the sponsor is going in the right direction with this. I know some of -- colleagues on my side of the aisle look at this as another program that has some costs associated, but the cost here is minimal - only for a non-paid Council of twenty-one members that can hope -- help focus, in the State of Illinois, on this critical issue of fatherless children. Every night in this State more than half of the children go to sleep without their biological father in the home. Now, that's a crisis. And that leads to significant problems socially, criminally, educationally. The ramifications of the fact that these young people in our State go to bed every night without the biological father in the home is a huge problem. If we can move forward with this initiative, tremendous resources in this whole fatherhood movement across the country, this is a huge step in the right direction to try to hold fathers accountable for their responsibilities to those children that they have fathered. They may not be married to the biological parent, but once a father, always a father. And these men in our society need to be held accountable for their responsibilities to the children that they have fathered, and if this initiative can focus the people in this State on the critical problems caused by fatherless children in Illinois, it's a good initiative. There's no significant cost to this, and I would urge an Aye vote on this excellent initiative.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Sieben. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Lightford, to close, please.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 167 will address a social policy and practice that has concentrated on the difficulties of raising a child in a single-parent family and have frequently created barriers to the involvement of both parents in their child's life. And this is definitely a profamily bill, and I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. The question is, shall Senate Bill 167 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all who voted who wish? Have all

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 42 Ayes, 13 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 167, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 168. Senator Cronin. Out of the record. Senator Shadid, what purpose do you rise, sir?

#### SENATOR SHADID:

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

State your point, sir.

#### SENATOR SHADID:

In the gallery behind me today are constituents of mine from Junior High -- they're junior high school students from St. Mark's Catholic School in Peoria. And with them are their social studies teacher, their priest, and their parents. Would you join me in welcoming them to Springfield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Shadid. Will our guests in the gallery -- please rise and be recognized? Welcome to Springfield. The following members of the media seek to have leave to photograph the proceedings: The <a href="Chicago Tribune">Chicago Tribune</a>. Is there any objection? Leave is granted. Senator Walsh, what purpose do you rise, sir? SENATOR WALSH:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

State your point, sir.

## SENATOR WALSH:

I would like to be recorded as an Aye vote on Senate Bill 167, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The record will -- the record will so reflect, sir.

### SENATOR WALSH:

My button evidently didn't reflect that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Record will so reflect. Thank you, sir. Senator Clayborne, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

# SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I rise for a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

State your point.

#### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Just to my left behind me is my former boss and the State's Attorney of St. Clair County, Bob Haida.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

We'd like to welcome you to Springfield, sir. Returning to page 17 of the Calendar. Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 173. Senator Cullerton. Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 173. Out of the record. Senator Walsh, on --Senate Bill 174. Out of the record. Senator Walsh, on Senate Bill 175. Out of the record. Senator Walsh, on 176. Out of the record. Senator Walsh, on 178. Out of the record. Senate Bill 180. Senator Sullivan. Dave Sullivan, on Senate Bill 180. Out of the record. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 184. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 184. Out of the record. Senator Jacobs, on Senate Bill 186. Out of the record. Senator Sullivan, on Senate Bill 196. Out of the record. Turning our Calendar to page 18, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Watson, on Senate Bill 199, sir. Out of the record. Senator Watson, on Senate Bill 200. Out of the record, sir. Senator Lightford, on Senate Bill 207. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 207.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Lightford, on Senate Bill 207.

# SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 207 amends the School Code regarding student achievement improvement grants. Currently we have a system set up where schools that are on the Academic Watch List, if there's more than one in a school district, they have to provide a school improvement plan, but what we have not done is provided any financial support to help those districts bring their children up to the State's standards. Currently we have fifty-two schools on the Academic Watch List and forty-eight of them are in the Chicago area. Outside of the Chicago area there are a couple and -- Member districts. Now, this does have a fiscal impact and there was an

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

amendment draft subject to appropriations. So, I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Senator Burzynski, what purpose you rise, sir?

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just -- just to rise to say here we go again. Another bill, unfunded promises, building expectations. Great concept, great idea, but we don't have the money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, sir. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Lightford, to close, ma'am.

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. The question is, shall Senate Bill 207 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 21 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 207, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 211. Senator Clayborne. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 211.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Clayborne.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 211 is a check diversion program that has been initiated by the State's Attorneys to provide offenders who agree to voluntarily participate in this program instead of undergoing prosecution. It provides that the program may be conducted by the State's Attorney or by a private entity who contracts with the State's Attorney. And the bad check diversion program may require an offender to pay for, or at his or own -- pay for, at

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

his or her own expense, and successfully complete an educational class held by the State's Attorney or a private entity; two, make full restitution for the offense; three, pay a check administrative fee. There's also other parts of this bill that ensure some of the issues as it relates to collection of this -- of -- of these funds. The entity has to maintain a million-dollar general liability insurance policy; they have to create a trust account that has to be audited; and the State's Attorney can terminate this contract under various -- for various reasons. I would urge an -- a -- a Aye vote on this legislation. I'm open for any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The gentleman from Will County, Senator Petka.

## SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. To the bill, I -- I rise in support of this legislation. For a long period of time, there has been a ongoing debate within the State's Attorneys' offices about the role of State's Attorneys when bad checks are issued. This bill, as the sponsor pointed out, strikes a very, very healthy balance between collection agencies and the State's Attorney's office. I think that because of that, it is a bill that we should support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Petka. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Clayborne, to close, sir.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thanks, Senator -- Senator Petka. I just urge a -- a favorable vote on this Senate bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. The question is, shall Senate Bill 211 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 211, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Clayborne, on -- Senate Bill 215, sir. Out of the record. Senator Clayborne, on Senate Bill 222. Out of the record. Senator Clayborne, on 223. Out of the record. Senator Cronin, on

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate Bill 226. Senator Cronin, on 226. Senator Link, on 227. Senator Link. Senator Terry Link, on Senate Bill 227, sir. Out. Senate Bill 232. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 232. Out. Senator Trotter, on 233. Out of the record. Senator Silverstein, on Senate Bill 240. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 240.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Silverstein.

### SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Excuse me. I just apologize. I was talking to the Majority Leader and I apologize for not recognizing you right away, sir. Please proceed on the bill.

### SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Don't do that again, please. Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Home Repair Fraud Act. It lowers the monetary threshold for enhanced penalties. Take any questions, if there's any.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no discussion, Senator Silverstein, to close.

## SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Just ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 240 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 240, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Silverstein, on 242. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 242.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Silverstein, on 242.

## SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amends the Financial Identity Theft and Asset Forfeiture Law. It changes the name to the Identity Theft Act. It expands the definition of personal identification document to include any documents issued -- made or issued or claimed to have been made by the United States or the State of Illinois. I'll take any questions, if there are any at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Silverstein, to close.

#### SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Just ask for a favorable Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 242 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those -- opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 242, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Halvorson, on Senate Bill 252. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 252.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 252 requires that the Department of Human Services contract with an entity to compile a cross-disability database for Illinois residents. Thirty days after this is -- becomes law, the Department of Human Services would appoint a seven-member board, none of whom are paid - only their expenses - which would

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

make recommendations. The cost from the fiscal note that was filed says undeterminable; the reason being is nobody really knows how much it's going to cost to put this database together. However, I know from doing research and listening to people that have said that -- University of Illinois already have started this process and have indicated that it wouldn't cost much, if anything at all. I'll answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no -- no further discussion, Senator Halvorson, to close.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

I just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 252 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 252, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Haine, on Senate Bill 254, sir. Out of the record. Senator Haine, on Senate Bill 255. Out of the record. Senator del Valle, on Senate Bill 265, sir. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 265.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator del Valle.

### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This bill was amended in committee to address the concerns of the Chair and -- and Senator Petka. We were able to come up with -- with a bill that everyone agrees with, and it addresses the issue of -- of drug money laundering. It's an attempt to make sure that individuals who are engaged in drug money laundering in large amounts of money will get jail time. So it establishes a Class 1 non-probational offense for amounts exceeding five hundred thousand dollars, and it also allows for -- for the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

State's Attorneys and others to engage in -- in sting operations so that we could catch people who are engaged in money laundering. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Seeing no further discussion, Senator del Valle, to close.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 265 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay and 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 265, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. On top of page 19, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Jacobs, on Senate Bill 267. Out of the record. Senator Jacobs, on Senate Bill 268. Out of the record. Senator Walsh, on Senate Bill 272, sir. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 272.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Walsh, on Senate Bill 272, sir.

## SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 272 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code in regards to unsafe grade crossings. What this bill does is that after the determination has been made by ICC that they are going to close a rail crossing, an unmarked rail crossing, for improvements to add signalization or gates or both, that there will be the placement of a stop sign on the crossbucks, indicating the danger crossing here that has been determined by the ICC. That stop sign will be the responsibility of the rail carrier for the purchase of that sign and the maintenance of that sign, and I'll answer any questions.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Walsh, to close, sir. Excuse me. Senator Burzynski, what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Purpose of a question, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield, sir.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. I haven't had a chance to look at this, Senator Walsh, and just very quickly, but is it my understanding that —that a railroad crossing in a rural area, which the ICC comes in, does a study, says we're going to put flashing lights up, but until we do that, you have to post a stop sign on the — on the crossbuck? Is that what I understand?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

That's correct. After they've made that determination, Senator, that they are going to -- improve a crossing because of, evidently, the high volume now or whatever they've deemed reasons why. We are allowing them to pick the crossings. We're not going to any crossings other than what they've already chosen on their own to -- to upgrade. We are going to -- the rail carrier is going to place a stop sign there to indicate the fact that this is a dangerous crossing and that within a span of probably ten months to fifteen months, there will be improvements made there through signalization or gates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Is -- is there an engineering study or anything that's been done, I mean, you know, based on the grade and everything else, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

It is our understanding that there was a very thorough engineering study done in order to make the determination that that crossing needed to be changed for safety reasons. We are using that engineering study, basically, as the -- as the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

foundation blocks of why this -- this -- this crossing needs to be designated as a dangerous crossing, and we -- that's why we are putting the stop sign on there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

So, there's a specific crossing that brought this to mind for you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

No, not really, Senator. I have been working with the railroad industry. If you remember back, I've had a couple of bills that dealt with trying to make our rural crossings safer. I had a bill that we were going to basically look at doing stop signs on all rural intersections or unmarked intersections, and so -- but that -- that bill fell. And now, basically, what we are doing under the -- under the direction of the ICC, using their own -- their own determinations and engineering and making their determination which crossings are dangerous, that need upgrading, we are just placing a stop sign there for the interim period, between that designation was made and the time that the crossing is reopened to traffic with new signalization.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Is -- is there any kind of signage prior to the crossing relative to stop ahead or -- I'm just concerned that we create a greater problem, perhaps, by putting the sign up than what we do without it until time of construction. That's my only concern, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Walsh.

## SENATOR WALSH:

And -- and I thank you for that, Senator, and that was discussed in committee. The only way that there will be additional signage is if due to visibility problems, that there will be a sign placed prior to that that says "stop ahead". That determination will be made, and the railroad carrier will

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

be responsible for the purchase of that sign, but not the -- not the erection of that sign.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Risinger, what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR RISINGER:

Will the Senator yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The Senator indicates he will.

#### SENATOR RISINGER:

Yeah. Senator, in the committee, we discussed who would be responsible for maintaining the signs and that was a concern of IDOT at the time. It was also the concern of local agencies, if they had to maintain the signs and so forth. As I understand it now, the maintenance and the -- the placement of the signs, buying the signs and maintaining the signs will all be the responsibility of the railroads.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you for that question, Senator. Yes, Senate Amendment No. 1 specifically says in the -- in the language that it will be the responsibility of the rail carrier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Risinger.

### SENATOR RISINGER:

With -- with that change, I urge the people on this side of the aisle vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Walsh, to close, sir. The question is, shall Senate Bill 272 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 272, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cullerton, on --274. Senator Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 275? Cullerton. Senator Haine, on Senate Bill 280, sir. Senate Bill 280. Out of the record. Senate Bill 281, sir. Senator Haine.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate Bill 291. Senator Shadid. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 291.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Shadid.

#### SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 2 deletes all and becomes the bill. It prohibits a sheriff from being civilly liable for serving, as directed by the court, any warrant, order, process, or judgment that has been issued or affirmed by the court of the State of Illinois and that is valid on its face unless the service involved willful or wanton misconduct by the sheriff. I'd appreciate support on this bill.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam, what purpose you rise?

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

I rise in support of Senate Bill 291. It passed unanimously out of the Executive Committee, and urge an Aye vote.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Shadid, to close, sir.

## SENATOR SHADID:

Yeah. Thank you, Senator Roskam. And I would appreciate an Aye vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 291 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 291, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Carol Ronen, on Senate Bill 306. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate Bill 306.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

### SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 306 clarifies specific services under the Medicaid program that might be provided to low-birthweight babies -- to prevent low-birthweight births. The bill allows the Department of Public Aid to require a whole host of supportive services that have been found to make a difference in birth outcomes. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

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

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Questions for the sponsor, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

She indicates she'll yield, sir.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Ronen, we discussed this bill a little bit in committee. It's -- it's my recollection, at the time that we voted on the bill and then, in fact, voted on the amendment, we did not have yet a fiscal note from the Department of Public Aid. I've got a copy of their fiscal note and it indicates that the cost would be approximately 21.5 million dollars. Is that your understanding?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

#### SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you for that question, Senator. No, the fiscal note was done on the base bill, so we amended the bill to make it -- to not require services, and so the bill, as amended, would not have that fiscal note attached to it. There should be very small fiscal impact.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator, I'm -- on the fiscal note itself, it says Senate Bill 306, Senate Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment 2. And I'll -- I'll read it very briefly, and I think it'll -- I think this will help explain -- or -- or, maybe explain to you why they're saying what they're saying. It says, "Although the language in the bill appears to be permissive regarding the specific services that will be covered, advocates of the bill appear to believe this bill will still have a cost. Therefore, the Department assumes that additional services will be provided." Then it goes on and lays out the 21.5 million dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

### SENATOR RONEN:

Yes, Senator. I'm talking about Amendment 3, not Amendment 1 and 2. So, I think we're both...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

What change did Senate -- would Senate Amendment 3 make other than permissiveness, because even though -- I mean, I think the Department, in this letter, is assuming permissiveness, at least that's what they say.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

#### SENATOR RONEN:

I -- I don't believe they were and that's not how I read that letter. My understanding is the Department issued that fiscal note in relation to the base bill and maybe Amendment 1 and 2, which were never adopted, not Amendment 3. Amendment 3 makes clear that this is permissive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Ronen, then I guess I would ask, would you be willing to pull it out of the record just briefly so that we can contact the Department and get this cleared up, from our side of the aisle? I mean, this is the only communication we have. The communication they've given us is 21.5 million dollars.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Ronen.

#### SENATOR RONEN:

I -- I think -- if -- you read it yourself, it -- it said the fiscal note related to Amendment 1 and 2. I'm talking about Amendment 3. So I think it's clear that we're talking about something different. That fiscal note does not apply to Amendment 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. Senator, let's move on to another area, very briefly. It's my understanding that the underlying bill requires services to a certain class of individuals and it's been -- it's been brought to my attention that the Medicaid regulations don't allow you to pick and choose among classes for services if they're over eighteen years of age. If that's the case then, will the State not get any Medicaid match monies for this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

## SENATOR RONEN:

That's not the case. And the -- the bill does not require the Department; it allows them. All this bill does - and I think it's really sound public policy - is talk about better targeting of Medicaid dollars to focus in on high-risk areas and making sure that those services that are available through Medicaid, all those -- that whole array of supportive services, are, in fact, targeted towards the areas where -- where they -- they are needed. This will not cost the State any additional money. I think you'll find the Department is supportive of this because it's permissive. It -- I think it's good government. And we've shown, when this has been done before in other areas and in other states, a better targeting of resources, you really can have an -- an effect on birth outcomes, and I think we all should support that goal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Well -- and I think that we all do. I think it's an issue of the implementation and the language, Senator. If the Department, assuming this -- okay, going forward with this as a permissive bill, if the Department goes forward to offer these services as outlined in this bill, is it fair to say that they will attract no federal match money at all because they are only -- they are selecting certain classes of individuals, rather than affording them to everybody?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Ronen.

#### SENATOR RONEN:

If your question is will we lose out on federal match, the answer is, no, we will not. This is -- we are not changing the -- the definitions of who might be eligible at all. So, this would not jeopardize federal match.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter, anything further, sir?

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Very briefly, to the bill. First, Senator, I appreciate very much the forthright answers to my questions. I think there are some serious questions about -- out here about whether or not if the Department goes forward with this, whether or not we'll be able to draw a federal match, as well as questions of fiscal impact. And I would urge the -- the Membership of the Senate, for the time -- time being, to either vote No or Present just to give us an opportunity to find out exactly what the cost may be, with the idea of -- of moving forward with this at a later date. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Ronen, to close.

### SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just urge all Members to vote Aye. This is an -- a bill that could have an impact on the quality of life in many of our communities. It just is permissive. It will not require extra resources. It will not deny one dollar of federal reimbursement, and I think it's good public policy and I would urge an Aye vote.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you, Senator Ronen. The question is, shall Senate Bill 306 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 42 Ayes, 10 voting Nay, 0 -- 6 voting Present. Senate Bill 306, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate -- Senator Haine, on Senate Bill 317, sir. Out. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 318, sir. Out. Senator Link, on Senate Bill 328, sir. Out. Senator Link, on Senate Bill 328, sir.

Senate Bill 330.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this bill does is in regard to towing vehicles that meets the specified requirements in towing any disabled vehicles from an initial point of a wreck or disable to a -- a point where repairs can be made and adds that this movement shall be validated only on a State route approved by the Department of Transportation. The tower must abide by posted bridge weight limits. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Senator Bomke, what purpose do you rise, sir?

### SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. With the -- the amendment on the bill, the -- it passed out of committee unanimously, and I rise in support of the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you for your comment. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Link, to close, sir.

#### SENATOR LINK:

I just ask for affirmative vote.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you. The question is, shall Senate Bill 330 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 330, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, on Senate Bill 331. Out of the record. Leave of the Body, we - we'd like to return to Senate Bill 332. Senate Bill 354. Senator Peterson. Out. Senator Link, on 361, sir. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 361.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you. This is a -- a bill that would increase the -the fee of tire -- retail tire sales from one dollar to one
dollar and fifty cents, with the fifty -- with the money going
to the Department of Public Health, with the increase of the fee
to be used for the expense related to the West Nile Virus. As
we all remember what happened last summer with the breakout of
the West Nile Virus and the amount of cases that were brought up
during the area and the amount of deaths that happened,
unfortunately, also put a very heavy burden on the Department of
Public Health in the State and also to the local public health
departments. With this, we've decided to use this fifty cents
to try to supplement this, and hopefully this will help them
manage their budget and be able to alleviate this terrible virus
that's going around. Be more than happy to answer any
questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger, for what purpose, sir?

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

A couple of questions of the sponsor...

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, sir.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Sullivan's not here and normally the spokesman would raise some concerns we have about this bill. Like a lot of fee-increase bills that we may be faced with at the end of Session once we hear what's on the twin tablets that comes from the burning bush on April 9th, I think this is a bill that may be a little bit before it's time. You know, I understand the anxiousness of the public health departments to find a dependable revenue source, but we all know, I think, that tires aren't the only breeding ground for mosquitoes. Isn't that correct, Senator Link?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

Yes, you are correct, but it's probably the biggest cause.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

And -- and, Senator Link, I guess, you know, particularly those people who live on borders of the State of Illinois, and I think someone estimated last year that -- that about eighty percent of the population of the State of Illinois lives within one mile of a border, this, again, is one of those things that tire retailers believe put them at a competitive disadvantage. The first dollar that we imposed was to properly dispose of those tires so that they did not create a breeding ground for mosquitoes. Adding now a fifty-cent additional penalty on those people who are properly disposing of their product to fund public health departments kind of seems like, you know, penalizing the good child, you know, punishing the -- the kid in his seat behaving himself rather than the miscreants. although I know it's a good idea that we look at public health funding, I would argue that this kind of fee bill needs to be included in the -- the Governor's comprehensive presentation rather than dealt with piecemeal. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mr. President, I move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. Senator Jacobs moves the previous question. And prior to that motion, there's five people seeking recognition. Senator Watson, what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, sir.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

I notice in our analysis that it says here that the Act amends the Department of Public Health Act to provide that the increases in the fee shall be distributed to the county health departments based on population. Now, this is a -- I would think, a -- a different direction than it's currently being funded, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link. Senator...

#### SENATOR LINK:

Basically, you're correct, Senator Watson, that -- that the public health -- State Public Health Department basically does it at -- at their whim, at the way they want to do it. But when you look at the cases of the West Nile breakout, it pretty much breaks out into population that the cases were -- like the example of -- the largest amount was in Cook County, where there were six hundred and thirty-four cases of West Nile Virus. In your area, in St. Clair-Madison County, there were fourteen cases in each county. DuPage County, there were forty-nine cases. This is a typical type of breakout in what was going on that were reported cases. So, you know, is it scientific? Probably not. But -- in analysis, it's probably the best way it could be broke out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I understand that the current formula for distribution of funds to local health departments is not done by population. Is that correct?

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

You are correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

And I understand -- I believe there's legislation in that will change the methodology by which local health departments are funded, to using that population figure. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

That I am not familiar with, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I believe that there is, and those of us that are from a -- small rural counties, this could be a very concerning direction by which we're going. We think -- or, I think, personally, that need should be considered here, not only just population, but actually need, and maybe the Department is best to -- to make that decision. So, I would think that we ought to -- and I -- and, quite frankly, I'm surprised that the -- the local health departments are for this because they are vehemently opposed, at least the ones in my area, to the new formula that could redistribute funds based on -- on population. So, this could be establishing a precedent that could initiate a whole change in the formula by which we fund local health departments, and I think that would not be a good idea. So, I urge all of us to take a close look at this and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wendell Jones, sir.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes, thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

He indicates he'll yield, sir.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Senator Link, would any of these funds go to the mosquito abatement districts of suburban Cook County?

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

No, they would be going to the public health department of the suburban Cook County area.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Who in -- if you know this, who in suburban Cook County is responsible for the eradication of mosquitoes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

I have no idea. That's your area. I have no idea who it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Well, the eradication of mosquitoes in my area is the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District, the North Shore Mosquito District, and the Des Plaines Valley Mosquito Abatement District, which Senator Schoenberg is trying to do away with. Why couldn't some of this money go to those mosquito abatement districts and maybe get rid of this huge West Nile problem in Senator Schoenberg's district? I have nine cases of West Nile Virus in my district because we have the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District, one of the finest mosquito abatement districts in the world, yet we're trying to collapse it, close it into a countywide system which will take the money out of the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District and put it into these other mosquito abatement districts via - via - the largest county in the world, Cook County, which will then kill the mosquitoes in my neighborhood? Why can't some of this money go to the mosquito abatement district in my district?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Well -- well, Senator Jones, I -- I don't want to dispute you because you know your area very well, but there were -- the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

highest amount of cases of the West Nile Virus were in suburban Cook County with four hundred and seven cases in the State of Illinois that were reported. And I -- it -- it's obvious that something's not working, and the public health departments are always the one that this burden is thrown upon. They're the ones that had to do the money, they're the ones that had to expend this money throughout this last virus breakout, they're the ones that had, you know, spend down to zero on trying to solve this problem. They're the ones that need the money right now. That's why we're handing the money to them through this increase.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wendell Jones.

### SENATOR W. JONES:

Well, to the -- to the contrary, Senator Link, the -- the people in suburban Cook County who kill the most mosquitoes are the mosquito abatement districts, not the Department of Public Now, I don't know when Senator Health in Cook County. Schoenberg's bill is going to come up, but he's going to want to merge -- he's going to want to merge three mosquito abatement districts in suburban Cook County into the Illinois Department of Public Health. And I think if there are a lot of West Nile Virus cases in his neighborhood, we ought to take this used tire money and give it to his mosquito abatement district instead of giving it to a health department who doesn't know anything about killing mosquitoes. Apparently, in Senator Schoenberg's district, the only mosquitoes that have been killed in the last year were by hand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Jacobs moved the previous question earlier, but Senator Wendell Jones used Senator Schoenberg's name in debate. Senator Schoenberg.

## SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I was going to let the first four times go, but when he started getting to the fifth and sixth... I just want to rise in support of Mr. Link's bill because, contrary to the protests of the prior speaker, this is an issue which has to be -- the West Nile issue has to be viewed in the context of public health. I represent suburban Cook County. A number of others, like Mr.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Maloney, represents suburban Cook County. Senator Garrett represents suburban Cook County. Mr. Harmon represents suburban Cook County. Those of us in suburban -- Mr. Woolard does not represent suburban Cook County. Those of us in suburban Cook County feel very strongly that we have to address this issue in the context of public health, and that's why this is a sound measure. And I urge everyone from the suburbs, regardless of what side of the aisle you're from, to support this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wendell Jones, for a second time, sir.

#### SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the second and last time, because really we're -- I'm probably getting a couple of bills mixed up, but I do think it relates and that's why I rose for the second time. This money could go to his mosquito abatement district. If we gave the money for this tire exchange program to his mosquito abatement district, this map in suburban Cook County would not have so many West Nile Virus cases in Senator Garrett and Senator Schoenberg's district, and there would be very few if they killed 'em like we kill 'em in the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District. And I will come back to this argument at a future time. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link. Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

I -- I just would ask Senator Jones -- I know his point is there, and I hope that he saves up this debate when Senator Schoenberg brings his bill forth because I know it's a passionate plea on his part. And I would be more than happy to listen to his debate on that, but we are talking about this bill, Senate Bill 361, which is unrelated. So, I -- I would -- I would have that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The gentleman not from Cook, from Kane County, Senator Lauzen.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I think that Senator Rauschenberger made a excellent point that raising fees becomes

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

a disincentive for people to legally dispose of the tires. I think that's important. I think a -- I think that Senator Wendell Jones is going to the effectiveness of any money that we raise here. And so, I have a question for the sponsor. Would he yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield, sir.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Senator Link, is this money going to go to -- how will the departments of public health spend this money? Will it be -- I mean, I've been watching this, as all of us have been watching it, very closely, and the public health solution seems to be to send out brochures to tell seniors to wear long-sleeved shirts during the summer and to wear DE -- you know, the DET {sic} to protect themselves, as opposed to going to the source of the problem and killing mosquitoes. Do you have any idea about how this money will be effectively spent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

Senator Lauzen, with all due respect, I -- I -- I know where your question's coming from and I -- I would like to answer that in a medical term. And I -- I -- I know exactly where you're coming from. It's the same type of questions I have when we use the money on the tobacco settlement to stop smoking. I question how we use money on that. I hope we will use this money directly to solve the problem of West Nile Virus, not to use it for posters or stuff of that sort. I feel that the public health departments are out there to solve this problem. I feel that the limited amounts of money they have for this they will direct to the most positive venue to solve this problem. We are not talking of a huge amount of money. We are talking of an allocation of a small amount of money to address a very serious problem that has caused a number of deaths from an unfortunate disease that is coming around with mosquitoes. And I would hope that we could solve this problem with this limited amount of money.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Once again, I apologize to the Body. I know the previous question has been moved, but Senator Woolard's name was used in debate. Senator Woolard, for a short comment.

### SENATOR WOOLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to ask a question, if I may, in regards to the -- my name...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The sponsor -- the sponsor indicates he'll yield, sir.

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

The additional monies that will be collected will be distributed in the same formula that is in place today or will there be a new formula?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

No, it will be based on population throughout the State, and it basically is used on the case of -- because of that's where the -- the amount of cases the West Nile Virus have been attracted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Woolard.

## SENATOR WOOLARD:

So, even those counties where there has not been a West Nile death but maybe there has been mosquito problems will be able to receive a portion of the new monies that are being generated?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

No, this is basically on only the cases of where there are West Nile problems that have been evolved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Woolard.

## SENATOR WOOLARD:

So, in fact, what we're going to be doing, we're going to be adding another fifty cents on the tire to collect a new pool of money that will all be distributed to those counties where there has been a death reported in the county, and then it shall be distributed -- okay. Explain to me again.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

No, it has nothing to do with deaths; it has to do with cases, and it has to do -- all of 'em will get some sort of money to try to solve this problem. It will be based on the population because of -- the amount of breakout of cases have been basically broke down due to the -- the amount of cases have been proportionately figured out to population. So, the figuring out of the State on this is that it would be broken down on Senator Watson indicated that maybe there would -population. could be something that we could work on, in a technical amendment when we get over to the House on this, that we could change it per cases or of something of that nature. I have no problem of changing that into a technical amendment. understand the -- the concerns that we're raising right now on this. But the basic formula was on population right now. We are trying not to do anything as far as making this a precedent for future monies from the public health department.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Woolard.

## SENATOR WOOLARD:

One last question. No, it's not a question. To the -- to the bill. You know, I -- I -- I really believe that I understand exactly what he's trying to accomplish but I have some real concerns about the fact that there are -- neighboring counties, especially in rural-setting Illinois, that one county is receiving monies to address a problem and the next county to it is not receiving anything and this is not correcting that problem. And, in fact, probably, the mosquito that caused the virus to be infecting the individual, probably flew from the next county. So, I think we need to incorporate some kind of protection for every county health department to have some of these funds in order to attack this serious problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no -- seeing no further discussion, Senator Link, to close, sir.

SENATOR LINK:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Well, we have discussed this question, and I -- and I can understand the concerns of Senator Watson. I can understand the concerns of all the colleagues here that have faced this. But there were eight hundred and seventy-seven cases last year. There were sixty-two deaths of West Nile Virus. There was an epidemic that broke out in the State of Illinois. It was from every portion of this State that we've had a problem facing. We don't know what we're going to be facing this year. I hope last year was an unusual year. I hope last year was the -- the part that was unusual in the fact that it was not the norm. I hope we're not going to be facing an epidemic that's going to be twice as large this year. But I want to be prepared for it. We're talking fifty-cent increase on a dollar on a -- on a tire. We are not talking a huge increase on these tires. But we're talking about facing a problem before it happens. I think this is a small amount that we're talking about to end a problem. Let's face it now before it's too late. I ask for an Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator Link. The question is, shall Senate Bill 361 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 31 Ayes, 22 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 361, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Let me guess. Senator Burzynski, what purpose do you rise, sir?

Thank you, Mr. President. We'd like to verify the roll call, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

That request is in order. Senator Burzynski has request a verification. Will the Members be in their seats? The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, del Valle, Garrett, Geo-Karis, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Jacobs, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Munoz, Obama, Ronen,

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Sandoval, Schoenberg, Shadid, Silverstein, Trotter, Viverito, Walsh, Woolard and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Senator Burzynski, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative, sir?

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yes, but I see them scurrying from wherever they've been in the Chamber. So, just one second please. We were trying to expedite this for you. Your -- your Members are very helpful when they -- when they raise those hands.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you so much.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

It's greatly appreciated. Is Senator Viverito here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Viverito. Is Senator Viverito in the Chamber? Senator Viverito in the Chamber? If not, Madam Secretary, strike the name from the roll. Strike the name from the roll, Madam Secretary. Senator Burzynski, do you question any -- presence of any other Member voting in the affirmative this afternoon?

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I'm -- I'm fairly certain that I saw him just a moment ago but I don't right now. Oh, I see him back there. Senator Welch. Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Welch is in the Chamber.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I think that's it, sir. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, sir. On a verified roll call, there are 30 Ayes, 22 Nays, 2 voting Present. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Going back to page 19, 3rd Readings. 363. Senator Roskam? Senate Bill 363. Senator Roskam. Out of the record. Senator -- 368. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 368, sir. Out of the record. Senator Hunter, on 376. Senator Hunter, on 376. Turning to page 20 of the Calendar, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Hunter, on

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate Bill 377. Senator Hunter, on Senate Bill 378. Senator Halvorson, on Senate Bill 390? Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 390.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 390 amends the School Construction Law. It defines school district to include an administrative district, or governing board, of a special education joint agreement and provides that a joint agreement shall be deemed eligible for a school construction project grant. What happened was, we have a wonderful coop, ECHO Coop, in our district that uses its funds to the best of its ability to supply education to the special education community at a cheaper cost; however, they want to build onto their building and they found out that they're not eligible to apply for school construction grant funds. So, all this does is add joint agreement into the School Construction Law that was enacted in 1977. The fiscal note comes — came back showing that there was no fiscal impact to the CDB.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any discussion? Senator Burzynski, what purpose do you rise, sir?

## SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a couple of questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

She indicates she will, sir.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator Halvorson, I understand what you're trying to do, don't necessarily disagree with it, but how many special coops -- special education coops are there that might qualify?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Seventy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Will they be given priority on the school construction list?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

However, if they're on the construction list or if they -if their -- if they can apply, there are school districts, then,
that possibly could be bumped backwards on the list that are
already applied, or do they go to the bottom of the list or -or what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

Senator Burzynski, they do not interrupt the process of what we have currently, but this now gives them the ability to apply like anybody else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

## SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. I was just looking at my analysis here, and I understand there -- there is a court case pending relative to the utilization of -- of the school construction fund by special ed coops.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes. I believe that came up in committee; however, it doesn't have anything to do with them being able to apply for these funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

That -- I'm not sure why that would be the case. If -- if we pass -- if we don't pass this bill, obviously it would seem that these school districts would not be able to apply for the funds. If we do pass it, then the court case is moot?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

I believe you're correct. But what we're doing is it doesn't immediately allow them to be a part of it; it would just give them the ability to apply like anybody else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. I'm trying to think through this right now. The -- the qualifications and some of the concerns relative to applying for school construction grants, I think, is -- is the -- the number of students, the growth of students, the age of the building, the age of the structure, those types of things. How would special ed coops be ranked? I mean, because not all of those situations would necessarily apply to a special education coop. So, would there be a different set of rules that would be implemented?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

### SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Senator Burzynski. They have to apply and be accountable like everybody else. This particular coop has its own building and all the districts feed into this building. So, there's -- they would get nothing any different than anybody else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

## SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I guess what I'm thinking about is if you've got a special education coop that's meeting in a -- in a building that they're leasing from somebody, they decide they want to apply but there's also a local match that's necessary. In the situation you're talking about, can you tell me how that match would be

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

derived? Do you -- do you understand what I'm saying? I mean, there's no mechanism for them to have a referendum or anything else. So, would their funds come from the school districts that are in the -- in the special ed coop? Would all of them have to agree, pass a resolution?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

They would -- it would come from the school districts themselves.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Would -- are there provisions in their -- articles of incorporation that would -- that would go to the -- the building mechanism or the funding mechanism? You know, I'm not real familiar with how they all work. I do know I've got a couple and -- and they work very closely together, but I think their rules are -- are separate. I've got two special ed coops in particular that I'm familiar with in my district, but their -- their rules are different, I guess is what I'm trying to say. So, are we putting them on an evil -- even playing field? Are we doing something that harms one at the expense of another? That's what I'm asking.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

To my knowledge, this does not harm anybody to help them. The Capital Development Board told them - they didn't tell me, but the ECHO School District - that they should seek legislation because possibly the joint agreement language was left out when we put forth the law in '77 -- or, '97.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld. SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

She indicates she'll yield, sir.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator, there are certain qualifications that a -- when a school applies that they must meet, and one of the qualifications has to do with enrollment. Could you tell me how that -- because most of those schools would not meet the enrollment qualification that I -- most of them that I know something about at least.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Halvorson.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

I'm not sure this answers your question, Senator, but right now there are only two joint agreements that are even able to apply for this legislation -- or, this grant.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

You said there were seventy of these facilities in the State of Illinois, and only two are available? What is this, special legislation then that we were not aware of, or what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Hendon, in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Halvorson.

### SENATOR HALVORSON:

Senator Luechtefeld, the Illinois State Board says there are seventy, but from what we know of and have heard of, there's only two or three that even want to apply for this at this moment. Because what we've found out -- we didn't want people to think that seventy joint agreement schools were then going to apply for a grant. There are seventy that could, but we only know of two that may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

## SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

So -- so, all seventy, at least, would have a shot at it, is that what you're saying? If they want to apply.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Halvorson.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

Potentially, yes.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

And the two that qualify already have already attempted to do that, is that what -- how -- explain that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Halvorson.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

No, they haven't because they can't. They've been told they cannot. The way they got that number was they had tried and when they -- the reason they couldn't was when they found out that their coop could not based on the law that we have.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Luechtefeld. And I do want to remind the Members that we will be here all night. We'd like to speed the process up. Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

So, you are pretty sure that if the other seventy want to, they can, and I -- I'm not real sure that you answered the -- the number question, as far as qualifying, the number of students.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Halvorson.

#### SENATOR HALVORSON:

We don't know exactly how many students, and, yes, all seventy could possibly apply. We don't know how many will. This just gives everybody an opportunity. Here, we've got to remember, we've got -- this is a coop who are using dollars to the -- getting the best bang for their buck for special education. We need to encourage people in the form of a coop instead of having to pay a lot more to send them somewhere else. And if we don't help some people be able to get the construction grant to make it bigger, they'll have to go somewhere else and be paid for by the State, probably at a much higher cost.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Luechtefeld, and would the gentleman please bring his comments to a close?

## SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

I understand what you're -- what you're trying to do. I just have some questions about the qualifications. First of all, how many would qualify, as far as numbers are concerned. What numbers would -- would be counted, for instance. Maybe, is it you add up the -- add up the total. I don't know. But there are, I think, an awful lot of questions still need to be answered about the -- this bill. I have a couple of those facilities in my district. Again, I would -- I would hope that if they in your district can qualify, they can in mine, too. But there are certainly an awful lot of open questions, I think, here that need to be answered.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. Quickly to the bill, 'cause I know that you're anxious to -- to move along on this particular bill. I just point out a couple of things. Number one, last year we authorized a billion dollars in new bond authorization for the school construction program. appropriated about five hundred million. There's five hundred million dollars left in the appropriation. There's claims at the State Board of Education for already over five hundred and sixty million. And as I understand it, there's three-quarters of a billion that have been turned away by the State Board who've told districts they can't apply. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me to be changing the eligibility for a program that we haven't decided to renew yet. The last two extensions of that program included new revenue sources that the majority in this Chamber voted for to -- to do, along with help from -- from the Democrats as well. So, it -- it -- (a), it -- it seems foolish when you've got that kind of demand in school districts to define new entities that are able to access it. I would also argue that the whole structure of the school construction program takes the relative wealth of the school district into account to decide what percentage a State share there's going to be. There are also guidelines for the construction of elementary schools, middle schools and high schools and the proportion of buildings that qualify under the Development Board rules and regulations for what's reimbursable.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

For example, we'll reimburse for -- for hallways and classrooms; we don't reimburse for swimming pools and field houses. you take a special education coop, which has different purposes - okay? - and try to shove it into the program to benefit, two special education districts, you're perhaps, perverting a whole program, and next year all of the Members here are going to have all kinds of special education uses coming to us with bills to "put us in". "She put -- she put us -- she put her people in. Put us into the bill." think the sponsor, (a), since we have no authorization left, we don't have enough appropriation authority to cover the existing applications because there's already sufficient demand from schools, and because this is not a school district -- I mean, the school districts who are in the coop could gather together and change the articles of -- of their incorporation to make them eligible. We shouldn't do special legislation to fix this in anybody's district. I'd ask the sponsor to take this out of the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Halvorson, to close.

## SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, I -- I thank everybody for their comments. I think this is very important. Last year all of you put forth a -- a piece that said that area vocational schools should be able to have this opportunity. I think this is very important for the special education community. We aren't able to fund them like we should to begin with and now we're going to stop them from being able to save more money. I think this is a good bill. We want to encourage coops for special education to make sure that we have the ability to house the members that we need to, and I ask for a favorable vote.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 390 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the -- the Ayes are 38, the Nays are 19, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 390, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 392.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Woolard. ...Bill 399. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 404. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 405. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 409. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 410. Senator Jacobs. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 410.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 410, as amended, provides that when suspending or revoking a -- a licensee's license, the State Liquor Control Commission action shall be limited to the license for the specific premises where the violation occurred. The reason for this is, there are a lot of companies now that have multiple stores, so if one license is revoked, it doesn't affect the rest of those.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

## SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Indicates he will.

## SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, one of the things that came up in committee was, what happens if you've got an operation that -- that is really a joint operation? In other words, I understand the problem if you have, you know, a -- a supermarket chain or a -- a chain that has, you know, a facility in Peoria and another facility in the Quad Cities and another facility in the collar counties, this bill makes sense. My question, though, is why would we limit the ability -- let's say you're in a college town and you've got a -- multiple operations, multiple licenses, presumably. You're a bad actor, you're doing some bad things and you're really gaming the system. Why would we want to limit the Liquor Control people's ability to take those types of enforcement measures on when it's really a scam?

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Senator. I do remember that question in -- in in caucus. I thought we had that squared away, but it's my
understanding from the Liquor Control Commission that if you are
-- are revoked as an individual, that all other licenses you
have are revoked. This basically is, in effect, for the
corporations that have multiple, but if you yourself, as a -- as
a owner of a liquor establishment and you are revoked in that
same town, the local liquor commissioner cannot issue a license
to those other locations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, the -- the weakness of the argument, though, is if you're a -- let's say you're -- you're not a big corporation that's -- that just has a manager who's not doing the right thing. You're a -- you're a small company that is incorporated. You know, I went to the University of Illinois and I remember visiting some of these establishments occasionally, and, you know, these were -- these were operations that were not big operations but they're all incorporated. That's for sure. They're not -- they're not mom-and-pop shops necessarily. They're all incorporated. And wouldn't we be limiting the ability to do the types of discipline and enforcement that needs to happen in those particular cases if they are incorporated? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes, sir. I understand the question, and it's my understanding -- and -- 'cause this was negotiated and -- and pretty much agreed on, this one. The next one that we have coming, you're still to give me some language on. But the -- this particular bill, the Liquor Commission, when we met with them, indicated that they have methods of which even with this legislation, that they can deal with that problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The question is, shall Senate Bill 410 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote No -- Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no voting Nay and none -- 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 410, having received the required constitutional majority, is -- declared passed. Senate Bill 411. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 415. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 423. Senator Lightford. Senate Bill 424. Senator Lightford. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. 424.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 424.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

#### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 424 amends the Unified Code of Corrections. We all know that most of inmates, since the late eighties, have charges relating to some sort of substance abuse, use, alcohol, things of that nature. This is a bill that would just simply say that if you were arrested with any charge offense relating to substance abuse, that you should undergo substance abuse treatment while you are incarcerated. If not, it would be subject to some of the good time credit that inmates would receive. We had great testimony on this bill in committee by -- from a former inmate that was addicted, a substance abuse user, who is now a counselor at Safer Foundation. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have, and I'd ask for an Aye vote otherwise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Would the sponsor yield for a couple questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will. Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Does this bill now have "subject to appropriation" language in it?

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

#### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

It's not necessary to have. I think one of the concerns that some Members shared was that it would create a fiscal impact, but if I could defer you to 4.5 of the actual bill. "A prisoner may not lose good conduct credit as a result of being placed on a waiting list. A prisoner placed on a waiting list eligible for increased good conduct participation in an educational, vocational, or correctional industry program under clause (4)" of this subsection. basically, what it's saying is that if all of the classes are full for the substance abuse, that there is other programs that this prisoner could be deferred to, to also receive help - the self-help meetings, vocational courses, things of that nature.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Dillard. SENATOR DILLARD:

So, Senator Lightford, on page 6, I'm looking at page 6 of the bill, and on page 6, line 22, it says - actually, line -- starts at the end of line 21 - "Availability of substance abuse treatment shall be subject to the limits of fiscal resources appropriated by the General Assembly for these purposes." What -- what's that? Isn't that a "subject to appropriation" sentence?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

No, Senator Dillard. If you would just go a little bit further than that, down to 29, it addressed the concern of the substance abuse actual course itself. That was a concern that was originally given, that if a corrections facility currently has -- Mr. President, can I ask this Body to lower their voices? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Could we have some quiet and control in the Chamber, please?

#### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you. Senator, basically there's already substance abuse courses provided in the Department of Corrections, but

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

apparently there's a -- a waiting list for that particular course if some people want to take it, what have you. So, what we did in this bill would allow them to do self-help counseling, to do any type of education program, vocation program that would also assist their substance abuse addictions. So that's where - that portion in the bill that you're relating to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Isn't it true -- isn't it true, Senator Lightford, that last year Senator Munoz had a similar bill and there was a fiscal note filed on that bill that said something like this has the potential to cost 1.6 billion dollars?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

#### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Well, I've got to tell you, last year I was not looking at Senator Munoz's bills because I was hoping to have a bill or two passed myself. So, what I can defer this back to is this current legislation that we're dealing with, Senate Bill 424. And there is not a fiscal note attached by the Department of Corrections. I believe your Party has had ample time to file a fiscal note if you had that concern. And I'd just like to simply say that your concern has been addressed in this bill. During committee, I was not aware of the details that were broke down here, but if you could just go a little further down on page 6, again, to line 29, it again says that a person may not lose good conduct credit. That will be the reason why you thought the inmate would stay in prison because they would be prolonged. But this bill does not allow them. All this is doing is encouraging substance abuse users, substance abuse -- the result of use, abuse, or addiction to alcohol or any controlled substance, we're trying to get them to not return to the Department. The recidivism Most inmates with a substance abuse rate is extremely high. problem while they're incarcerated, they're not treated. They leave the prison system, they return to society and they still have the same addiction. And so...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will...

SENATOR W. JONES:

Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. President. I think Senator Dillard was not finished. I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard, would you please put your light on if you're not finished? And I'm going to ask you if you could wind it up so we can get to these other esteemed Senators that seek recognition. Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. I never turned my light off, so... I was in the middle of my questioning, but to the bill. I just want to warn this Body that there was a similar bill a year ago that had a fiscal note filed for 1.6 billion dollars. If there is no waiting list, this will cost 1.6 billion dollars. And at a time when -- the bill may be laudable, but at a time when we have a budget deficit of this size, I don't think we have 1.6 billion dollars to fund the potential of this bill. And, you know, unless you want to vote for a tax increase of some kind, I'd urge caution on this legislation that's worth over a billion and a half dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Senator Lightford, was this part of Governor Blagojevich's State of the State Address when he talked about Sheridan and reopening it for nonviolent drug offenders?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator -- Senator Wendell Jones.

#### SENATOR W. JONES:

Isn't it -- it was my understanding from what he said that his intention was to take prisoners out of their current placement and put them in a nonviolent situation where -- where they're with other -- other abusers but where they can get counseling, which is exactly what your bill would allow. Can we tie it in with the -- with the Governor's plan to reopen Sheridan and put these abusers in where they don't learn behaviors in -- in prison and come out with a worse drug problem than they went in it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Senator Jones, for bringing up that point. I'd like to be in line with the Governor and help his initiatives, and if he's looking to move more individuals who are receiving a minimum sentence to receive substance abuse, that's fine and dandy. That's wonderful. But I'd like to address all inmates, the women population who are birthing children born to crack cocaine and addicted things in their system, so that they too can receive treatment, not just at Sheridan. This should be across the board, all prisoners who were arrested, committed, had some sense of substance abuse or alcohol addiction in their system or part of the crime, that they, in fact, receive some type of treatment so that when they return to society, they do not continue the same behavior, that we have, as a Body, to just not -- we didn't hold them like it's the Boys and Girls Club, that we, in fact, tried to address -- address their problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones, for -- to close.

### SENATOR W. JONES:

In that case, I rise in strong support of this bill. One of the biggest problems we have in this State, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that forty percent of the prisoners - forty percent of the prisoners in our prisons - are there because of drug abuse, alcohol abuse. And putting -- putting the nonviolent ones in Sheridan and separating and give them

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

counseling is a great idea. Doing what this bill will do is also a good idea. I would urge a strong Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I just rise in support of the bill. Just wanted to point out that it passed unanimously out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I want to make sure it's clear this bill does not cost any money. It just provides an incentive for people who are -- have a substance abuse problem to take advantage of any available substance abuse programs. There's no requirement that any new ones be implemented, doesn't cost any dollars, and it was passed unanimously out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford, to close.

#### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I'd like to ditto Senator Cullerton and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 424 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 voting Aye, 13 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. 424, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 425. Senator Haine. Senate Bill Senator Haine. Senate Bill 431. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 440. Senator Lightford. 440. Senate Bill 451. Shadid. 451. Senate Bill 452. Senator Maloney. Senate Bill Senate Bill 461. 459. Senator Trotter. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 467. Senator Maloney. Top of page 21, Senate Bill Senate Bill 476. Senator Cullerton. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 487. President Jones. Senate Bill 494. Harmon. Senate Bill 506. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 528. Senator Cronin. 528? Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Point of personal privilege.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, two people standing up in the gallery up above, Larry and Connie Wright, they happen to be constituents of Senator Bomke, two of the nicest people you'd ever want to meet. Mr. Wright is the chief -- is the bell captain up at the Renaissance Ramada and we couldn't have a better person representing the people there. We just want you all to welcome them here today. They're my friends.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized? Please rise. Welcome to -- the Springfield. And may I add, you could not have been introduced by a more lovely Senator. Senate Bill 529. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 533. Senator Maloney. Senate Bill 553. Senator Harmon. 553. Senate Bill 559. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 561. Senator Link. Senate Bill 568. Senator Crotty. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 568.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

### SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 568 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. It provides that the Secretary of State may issue a series of special plates that the General Assembly has authorized for issuance on or after the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 93rd General Assembly only if the Secretary has received either cash in the amount sufficient to cover the cost of issuing one thousand five hundred sets of special plates or -- or a performance bond guaranteeing the required amount. It also provides that the amount -- be deposited by the Secretary and any proceeds from the redemption of the bond shall be deposited into the Secretary of State's Special License Plate Fund. It

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

provides that within three years after the date on which the issuance of the -- plates are authorized, the Secretary of State must receive applications for at least that one thousand five hundred sets of plates, and if the required number of applications is received, the Secretary of State shall return the amount of that cash deposit. If the required number of -applications is not received, then the Secretary shall recall those plates. I think this bill is pretty up front with the organizations on the criteria that is asked by the Secretary of State on all of these plates. I also would like to make mention that this does not cost the State any money and, a matter of fact, it serves the taxpayers well by having these plates actually pay for themselves. The -- the fiscal note also on these -- on this bill has no immediate fiscal impact on the Secretary of State's Office, and I think it's important to note that it also reads it should have a long-term positive fiscal impact. I'll entertain any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will yield.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Senator, you indicated there is no fiscal cost to the State. What is the total -- what are the total receipts on fifteen hundred plates?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

According to the Secretary of State's Office, the receipts would generate twenty-two thousand five hundred dollars and that would be enough for the total cost of designing, manufacturing and issuing those plates. So, they pay for themselves.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you, Senator. But I -- the information I have indicates that the cost would be forty-five thousand dollars, and that figure came from the Secretary of State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

It was just given to me that currently fifteen dollars of the initial registration fee for special plates is retained by the Secretary to offset the cost of producing the plates. the minimum fifteen hundred sets required by this -- this bill, the Secretary would receive twenty-two thousand five hundred toward the cost of the production. Several types of special plates that are available to the general public have sold far fewer than fifteen hundred sets. For example, one type was -sold only two hundred and eighty-eight sets. This is one thousand two hundred and twelve fewer than the fifteen-hundred minimum. Therefore, this bill guarantees an additional eighteen thousand one hundred and eighty in fees toward the cost of producing these plates. So I think the Secretary of State has really done his homework and his math on exactly where his Department falls short.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Bomke.

#### SENATOR BOMKE:

...you, Mr. President. But -- but what I'm asking -- I understand fifteen dollars times fifteen {sic} is twenty-two thousand five hundred. What I've been told, the cost is forty-five thousand and this doesn't cover the cost. But, in addition to that, is it not under the Secretary's -- of State's discretion under current law, he must receive ten thousand applications or a number in which he has determined to be adequate to cover the cost? And if that, in fact, is the case, why do we need this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

That's true and I looked -- I looked into that. And I think that currently the language says the Secretary of State shall not issue a series of special plates unless applications

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

as prescribed by the Secretary have been received for ten thousand plates. So, for the many organizations that I have, I think by the Secretary making a statement here that they're not looking for the ten thousand - it's fifteen hundred - I think any of the organizations that I've worked with will have that criteria right in front of them. And I think it's a -- a -- an honest approach by the Secretary of State's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Bomke, could you please...

SENATOR BOMKE:

I'm sorry to belay this but...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

No problem.

SENATOR BOMKE:

...but -- but the point is, under current law it -- it states that the Secretary of State must receive applications for ten thousand license plates or a number that he or she deems to be appropriate to cover the cost. It seems to me that it's covered under current law without this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rutherford. Senator Rutherford. Do you seek recognition, Senator Rutherford?

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Well, I -- I am but if the -- Senator Bomke had a question that was waiting to be answered, I'm going to give deference to him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Well, I think Senator Bomke indicated to me that he was wrapping up. I was quite patient, and Senator Crotty indicated that she already answered. Senator Rutherford, are you -- do you have a question?

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Go right ahead. Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Crotty, Senate Bill 1362, which we passed unanimously last week, provides for a universal charitable plate. This does nothing to

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

alter that, I assume. Right? This is for any existing plate system that's out there today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

### SENATOR CROTTY:

That's correct. It -- it doesn't make an impact on -- on that bill, 'cause I voted for that bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rutherford.

#### SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Does this affect the -- the plates that are in existence today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

Yes, it will.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rutherford.

#### SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Will it get rid of any plates that don't meet this minimum standard?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

That would be under -- that would be up to the Secretary of State's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rutherford.

### SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lauzen. Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

She indicates she will.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Crotty, we discussed this in Transportation Committee a little bit, and I don't think that I

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

ever quite got a handle on what the problem is with the current law now and I want to try that again. Senator Bomke, a couple times, laid out what the criteria are in current law with regards to either the receipt by the Secretary of State's Office of ten thousand applications or whatever he or she may deem sufficient to cover the cost of the design and production of the plate. What need is there out there now that you see that requires this change? What's wrong with the current system now? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

Right now what -- what seems to be the problem is we have organizations that I think I currently had stated that may come up with fifty plates and the -- the Secretary of State's Office proceeds with those special plates, and then perhaps you only have a few people that are getting the plates and it's costing the State quite a bit of money when -- when we're manufacturing plates and there aren't really the call from -- from the organizations for that many plates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, the problem with the current system, then, is that the Secretary of State is not abiding by the guidelines that are in the law, because if -- if there's fifty applications that are sent in and the Office goes ahead and designs that plate and produces that plate and it costs the taxpayers a great deal of money, that's because the Secretary of State is choosing to go forward with it. If the Secretary would not do that, then there wouldn't be a taxpayer expenditure problem. Is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

### SENATOR CROTTY:

Could you -- could you repeat that? I'm sorry, Dale.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The problem, then, seems to be if there -- if the Secretary is taking applications for, let's say, fifty license plates and he or she deems that that is sufficient and they design the plate and they manufacture the plate at a tremendous loss to the taxpayers, which is what you just described, that's an issue of the Secretary deciding to go forward with that. If the Secretary of State would abide by the guidelines that Senator Bomke -- outlined earlier, we wouldn't have this problem. So, isn't this an issue of simply the Secretary of State abiding by the guidelines that are in the law and that fixes the problem? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

I think that's what this law is going to do, though, is to change that to make sure that the -- the Secretary of State is letting the organizations know that they need to have the one thousand five hundred sets of plates - those applications ready - before these plates would be manufactured.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, wouldn't it be easier, rather than going through the exercise here of debating this on the Floor and passing a law, to simply go to the Secretary of State's Office and ask them to not produce or design plates until they've got a sufficient number that they can pay for it? I mean, there's a clear guideline in the law now. The Secretary of State is choosing to ignore that. So, we're going to pass another law, which -- I mean, how much confidence should we have that that one will be followed as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

### SENATOR CROTTY:

And I would have to say that I don't think the Secretary of State is -- is not following the law now. I think he's trying to be very up front and honest with all the organizations that are out there, that come to us, as the General Assembly, and ask for a special plate. I've heard many times here, since I've been in the Senate, that we want to make sure that we're pretty

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

frugal with the dollars. I think since I was a State Rep, we've asked agencies to cut back on their budget, find where there's waste. Here's a perfect example of the Secretary of State looking over all of the programs and he wants to be up front, honest with people that want special plates. We've backed their — their aspirations to get those plates. But we don't want our taxpayers to have to be paying for plates that aren't going to be used by the organization. So I think this is commendable on the Secretary of State's part in his efforts to be very, very up front with all of us: the General Assembly, the organizations, and quite — most importantly, my taxpayers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter, if you -- if you would kindly...

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you, Senator.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator, for your answers. I appreciate that. The Secretary of State can clearly be up front and honest with all the taxpayers in Senator Crotty's district, in my district, in all our districts by simply telling them that this is how many applications we have to have in order to produce your plates, and if you don't come up with that many, then we're not going to produce the plates. That's what the law gives him now. That's the discretion the law affords him now. I think we should just let the Secretary of State do his job and simply be straight, as Senator Crotty said, with the taxpayers. If he does that, the State won't see these taxpayer-paid-for expenses. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty, to close.

### SENATOR CROTTY:

I want to thank you very, very much for your comments. And I think from the previous speaker and everything that he has just stated is exactly what Senate Bill 568 is. So I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The question is, shall Senate Bill 568 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 37 voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 568, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 573. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 576. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 576. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 578. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 601. Senator Radogno. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 601.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Radogno.

#### SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill amends the mental health parity bill that we passed a couple of years ago. As amended, it's a much more modest proposal than it started out. It simply adds eating disorders, specifically anorexia and bulimia, to the diseases that have to be covered. As amended, it's removed most of the opposition. I -- I'm not positive if all, but the insurance industry is okay with this bill as it currently stands. So I would be happy to answer questions and ask for a favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 601 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 3 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 601, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 631. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 633. Senator Shadid. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 633.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

### SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 633 establishes the Community Senior Services and Resources Act. It requires DOA to make grants to local community senior services and resource centers. Senate Bill 633 is the recommendation of AARP. The purpose of the bill is for DOA to advocate on behalf of community senior services and resource centers and promote their financial stability through direct grants and identification of alternative funding sources. I'd appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger. SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I just wanted to complement the sponsor. He's one of the looking men on the -- the Floor of the particularly those who've been ex-sheriffs. But I will tell him -- I will tell him again that I think this is premature. mean, I -- I know a grant program is a good idea and subject to appropriation makes it a little bit better, and -- but I just think we're kind of holding out false hopes. You know, today should be a spirited debate about where our Governor is and what we're doing about 1.3 billion dollars in structural deficit we I -- I just hate to see us continue to raise people's expectations. We already run the most comprehensive drug -- pharmaceutical program in the United States for seniors in our Department of Aging. You know, further embarking on that and at the same time promising people we're going to do something about school funding and that we're going to maintain our commitment to the universities and that we're going to be fair with the hospitals and the nursing homes, just seems like we're playing in the game. I know this sponsor doesn't intend that, but I think this is a really good bill to take out of the record and ask for postponed consideration or extended deadline or -- or we'll deal with it on a House bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 633 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the question -- take -- take the record. On that question, Senate Bill 633, having received 50 voting Aye, 3 voting Nay, 2 Bill voting Present, 633 Senate having received the constitutional required majority, is declared passed. Senate Senate Bill 640. Bill 634. Senator Woolard. Senator Link. Top of page 22, on 3rd Reading are Senate Bills. Senator Lightford. Senate Bill 689. Senator Cullerton. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 689.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill deals with the Lottery, and it allows for -- as you know when -when -- Lottery winners can receive money in a lump sum or they can get it paid out over a course of time. What this bill would do is to allow for a Lottery winner to change their mind. they're getting the money over a lump -- over a period of time, change their mind and voluntarily assign remaining winnings to a third party and get a lump sum. This is done in a number of states. I think twenty states that -- out of the thirty states that have the Lottery allow this. And it's done through a court order. So there are protections built into the bill where a -- where a court would -- would order this voluntary assignment only after conditions are met: Must be in writing; the purchase price being paid for the payments in the future must be discounted at an annual rate that doesn't exceed the State's limit; there is a sworn affidavit indicating that the person that's making this decision, the Lottery winner, has had independent legal counsel to explain all of the effects. And it -- it's an option, I think, that will also benefit the State, because it turns out that, in other states that have done this, people -- about twenty-five percent of the people choose to -- to have this done and it has the effect of accelerating

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

our tax payments to the State of Illinois. So we'll -- we'll -- there's about 1.4 billion dollars in Lottery payments due to Illinois residents. About twenty-five percent of them could take advantage of this program, based on other states. So we'd have a -- an actual increase in our revenues if we do this. Gives an -- an option that's not available now. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Risinger.

#### SENATOR RISINGER:

Yes, to the bill. This bill passed out of committee and it passed out of committee because it was -- our understanding and -- and testimony that the Lottery was okay with the bill, and they were okay with the bill because it takes a court order to -- to get this done and there were -- certain protections in place. So I hope this side of the aisle will vote for the bill. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Questions for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield. Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Senator Cullerton, first of all, I appreciate your perseverance on this issue. I -- I recall that Senator Cronin had a bill. There was a time I had a bill on this. And it was consistent -- the Lottery was consistent in its objection against this because they claimed, and I thought very inaccurately, that this would create constructive receipt for taxpayers on other Lottery winnings where it's spread over time. Have you heard that objection to the bill? I mean, I'm -- I'm for the concept of your bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

You know, I -- I had not heard that. They had not indicated that was their potential objection. The -- the concerns I think that they had in the past had to do with whether or not there were consumer protections built into the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

legislation, which perhaps that was added from the previous versions and perhaps that's why they're -- they're now in favor of it. But I had not heard that particular objection before.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

I'd encourage you not to be surprised when that -- when that comes up. The other -- the other real concern that I always thought was -- that they were talking about was that when you consider the present value of those future earnings, they can't claim that you're going to win ten million dollars when the present value is closer to five million. So, thank you very much for your work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Senator Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 689 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 689, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Wendell Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR W. JONES:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point, Senator.

#### SENATOR W. JONES:

In the gallery above the Republican side, I'd like to introduce an elected township official from Elk Grove Township, Nanci Vanderweel. Will you please stand and be welcomed by the Senate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guest in the gallery please rise and be recognized? Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 690. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 698. Senator Demuzio. Senate Bill 699.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 70... Leave of the Body, we'll skip down to middle of page 26. Bottom of page 26 is Senate Bill 808. Senator Wendell Jones, on 808. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 808.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

#### SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is an effort to make sure that the money follows the client, or patient, if you will, in the Department of Human Services. We're -- we're moving people out of our -- our State agencies and we're moving them back to the local level. This bill is an effort to make sure that the money that has been spent on that individual in this State agency stays with them when they go back to the You're all familiar, I think, with community level. Olmstead Act. If you're not, please become familiar with it. It's returning these people to the least restrictive environment that they can handle. It doesn't mean that we're going to close all of our State institutions, by any means. It simply means that we're trying to -- to have these people in a more normalized situation in their local communities. And this bill is an effort to make sure that the money follows the individual. I would appreciate a favorable roll call and I'd be happy to try to answer any of your questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. A couple of questions for the -- the most sincere sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator, if we have a given mental health center that's got a twenty-million-dollar budget, and perhaps, let's just say

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

hypothetically, there's lots of tradesmen in this facility that maintain buildings and there's lots of other administrative expenditures. Let's say as much as twenty percent of the ten million dollars that was spent on this facility was spent for administrative costs or for maintaining these buildings. If we close that center, are we required to dedicate all ten — under your bill, would we be required to dedicate all ten million of the operating funds that were formally appropriated to the care of the individuals that you believe would be served?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

#### SENATOR W. JONES:

No. We would, under this bill, be required to send that portion which was spent on the individual patients in the facility. Now, if the facility closed completely, obviously you wouldn't save a hundred percent but you would certainly save quite a bit, and whatever money was spent for the operation and maintenance of their program would be sent to the facility where they go, to wherever it might be. That's one of the problems in Illinois. We've closed a lot of State facilities, but we haven't opened a lot of local facilities. So there isn't any place for them to go. So we're kind of shooting ourselves in the foot here. But I'm trying to help the community centers that get these people and have some of that money, not -- not nearly all of it, flow to the patient.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Senator Jones. I'm -- I'm not sure I agree your bill provides for us to have administrative savings or consolidation savings. I think the bill requires it, in my quick reading, that you would take all of the funds that were appropriated to this unnamed closed facility and it would have to track and that would be notwithstanding whether they're -- let's say, for example, the Elgin Mental Health Center, at one time, just two years ago, had two hundred and eighty beds. Their average occupancy dropped to one hundred and fifty-six beds but we were still funding it at twenty eight million dollars. It we were to close that facility, we would have to

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

dedicate, under this bill - and it appears to be in perpetuity - twenty eight million dollars to the care of those -- those individuals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

### SENATOR W. JONES:

Well, it's interesting. You had how many at Elgin, a hundred -- two hundred and fifty and you made it down to one fifty?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

We -- we had capacity. We had -- we had funded beds that we paid for staff for, that we paid for buildings for, that we paid for roofs for, that we paid for administrators for, that we paid AFSCME employees for, but we only had a hundred and fifty six people, on average, occupying those beds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Was -- was that a question, Senator Rauschenberger, or a statement.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

It was an answer to his question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I got lost too...

### SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. It does answer my question and it makes my point on the bill. If you keep the same budget for half of the people that were at Elgin and you send the rest of 'em to the local area, who pays for it at the local area? So it makes my point. If the money doesn't follow the individual that has been released from Elgin or some other developmentally disabled facility, then how are -- how are the local communities going to pick up this tab?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger, if you could wind up with Senator Jones.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Jones, I want to tell you -- yeah. I just want to be fair, beat up on a Republican, like I -- you know, I try to -- I don't very effectively beat up on your guys 'cause you got thirty-three votes. But I do want to say, Wendell, I am ready to cosponsor your bill, if you ever write it, that it capitates {sic} the care dollars for the individuals who are sick or ill. That's not what this bill does. That's not what the current Department of Mental Health budget does. We fund institutions and programs. We do not fund individuals. This bill does not make that distinction or it does not capitate the funding. right way to deal with this is through the appropriation process, and although it's good to raise this issue and it's good to raise our awareness, this bill doesn't go to the -- to solving your underlying concern about making sure that treatment dollars follow individuals. And finally, I'll close with the fact that in the -- in the eleven years I have been in the General Assembly, we have never reduced the budget of Department of Mental Health or the Office of Mental Health or the Office of Developmental Disabilities. So it's a spending allocation question that you really want to get at, not a budgeting by region. But I appreciate your bringing this bill to the attention of the General Assembly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

#### SENATOR SHADID:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Will the -- I don't know if I have a question. I don't think I have a question, Senator Jones, but I can certainly sympathize with you. And you're fortunate that the previous Governor didn't just close yours up, which -- what he did in Peoria, and we've transported over a hundred patients from Mental Health all over the State of And Senator Rauschenberger is absolutely correct. Illinois. There's a proper way to close up an institution and an improper Ours was closed in Peoria County in the dark of night, overnight, with no regard to the Mental Health patients or anything else. And also, they did a very poor job in Peoria County when they ran Zeller Mental Health when they didn't reduce the staffing levels over three years and caused it to be

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

way out of whack, and that's when they just closed it down, disregarding the mentally ill people. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones, to close.

### SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. Thank you both, Senators, for your comments on that and you may -- I'm sure you have some good points. The -- the state -- the stated purpose of this bill is to redirect the funds, and the funds can be redirected if that facility is not completely closed. Because if those people leave, they have to go somewhere and the State has to pay for them. I would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 808 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, and 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 808, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Walsh, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR WALSH:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point, Senator.

### SENATOR WALSH:

Yes. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, today, as many of us know, is town -- Township Officials Day. Many of our township friends are here today to say hi to us and lobby us on a couple of issues. Behind me in the gallery, I'm very proud to welcome some of our friends from Will County area townships: township officials from Joliet Township, Lockport Township and Will Township. And I would like them to be welcomed by the Illinois Senate.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests, the township officials in the gallery, please rise, be recognized? Welcome to Springfield. On Senate Bill 809, Senator Cronin, do you wish this bill -- let's go to - on top of page 27 is Senate Bill 810. Senator Syverson.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate Bill 813. Senator del Valle. 813. Senate Bill 821. We're going to go to the bottom of page -- middle of page -- middle of page 29. On 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 876. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 878. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 882. Senator Clayborne. 882. Senate Bill 883. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill... Senate Bill 883. Senator Clayborne seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 884 to the Order of 2nd Reading -- 883 to -- to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 883. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Clayborne.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Clayborne, on Amendment No. 1.

#### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes -- yes, Mr. Chairman. Senate Bill 883 makes a change that basically allows the investigators of the Death Penalty Trial Assistance and Capital Litigation Division to inquire through the State Police or local law enforcement regarding the Law Enforcement Agencies Data System to determine whether their potential witnesses that they have to interview have criminal backgrounds, for their own protection. In other words, when they go out and conduct investigations on -- on behalf of the clients that they represent, sometimes there -- they have to go and meet with people who are potentially dangerous, and they basically want to have that information before them before they meet with those individuals. To my knowledge, there's no known opposition and I would ask for a favorable vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, say Nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Mr. Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 884. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 885. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 886. Senator Clayborne. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 886.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Clayborne.

#### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. 886 is basically a -- a bill in which the county or municipality issues a permit or other authorization for construction of residential buildings within a residential-zoned subdivision through a recorded plat after July 1st, 2003, are required to give the community antenna television system franchise notice of this issuance of this permit and authorization. Basically what's happened, the utilities are getting notice as it relates to the new subdivision, new homes being built, but cable television isn't. So we're just given -- giving -- requiring that the municipalities at the same time they -- notify the utilities, that they also notify the cable TV association.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 886 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 886, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 890. Senator Obama. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 890.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill was the result of a -- a conversation I had with a constituent of Asian-American heritage, and they were

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

concerned about the fact that their children generally learned nothing about Asian-American history in their textbooks and in And as we know, the Asian-American community their curriculum. is -- is one of the fastest-growing communities in the State. She had researched it and it turned out that we specified in the School Code the study of the Irish Famine, study of African-American history, study of Latino history, and, yet, Asian-American history was omitted and so asked whether this would be something that could be included. I indicated that I'd be happy to work with her. I know that in discussions in committee, there were some concerns expressed on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle indicating, "Well, where do we You know, "If we mandate this to schools, then won't we have to do keep on going?" And, "Where's the stopping point," I think as one of the Senators indicated. And I indicated to them that I actually do not like imposing mandates on local I think that we can all trust local school districts to good -- do a good job. The problem is, is that once you've already placed a litany of cultures, and ethnic groups that are to be studied that already are, currently in the School Code, for us to omit an important constituency like this seems to send them a message that somehow they're less important and less worthy of study. So, as a consequence, this just adds Asian American to the list of other groups that are studied as part of the curriculum, and I'm happy to answer any questions. I ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Cronin. SENATOR CRONIN:

Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Well, here we go again. I understand the sponsor's intent, but let's take a little catalog of what's happened here the last couple of days. We have mandated prison tours. We have mandated organ donation programs that need to be taught. We're now mandating Asian history, and we also had a bill that shortens the school day. So we're going to do more in a shorter period of time. It's getting a little nutty in here. Let -- let me clarify a few things, if I may, with all due respect to the sponsor. I think that you were a little bit inaccurate in your remarks. When you

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

talk about the Irish Potato Famine or you talk about some of these other programs, those are recommendations. They're under the permissive part of the School permissive. Code. They are not, and I repeat "not", mandated. There is a very -- well, it's growing everyday here, but there's a smaller list of what's mandated and I'll read to you what are mandated to be taught courses of study. And they are as follows: American patriotism and the principals of representative physical education, consumer conservation, avoidance of abduction and drug substance abuse, American Indian day, "Just Say No" day, Holocaust study, Black history study, history of women, history of the United States, Motor Vehicle Code, curriculum for reduction of self-destructive behavior, steroid abuse prevention, violence prevention, and conflict revolution -- resolution and driver's ed. Those are the only mandated courses of study under our School Code. As of the last couple of days, we've added organ donation to this list and Asian studies. Now, I like to talk about and want my kids to learn about organ donation and Asian studies as much as the next guy and I also when I meet a constituent, I want 'em to be my friend too. But I don't promise 'em that I'm going to change the way every classroom is conducted and how every student is taught in the State of Illinois on the basis of a conversation with one individual whose vote I may want or whose friendship I may seek. I think that this is going too far. I know people are going to vote for it, because, Lord knows, they know some Asian people in their community and they want to please 'em, but this is bad policy. Please vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Senator. The -- this was not by the way -- it was initially initiated by one conversation. Actually it's a broader conversation that I've had in the communities. What I would like to do, though, is -- is, because I do think that there -- it's important to clarify what's mandated and what's permissive, I'm going to withdraw this from the record, discuss this with Senator Cronin. I've got some different information with respect to my staff, and we'll see if we can

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

potentially make some modifications on this that deal with that particular issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you seek... Out of the record. Senate Bill 897. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 897.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. This is an initiative of the State Treasurer's Office and it says that the Treasurer may take a little part, not more than ten percent, of the earnings -- of the earnings investments in the Technology Development Account and use it for purposes of grants to Illinois schools to purchase computers and to upgrade technology. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And again, it's the earnings out of this fund. It has no GRF impact.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 897 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 897, having received the -- the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 901. Senator Garrett. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 901.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Ladies Gentlemen. Senate Bill 901 -- by the way I'm dedicating this This bill prohibits the use of bill to Senator John Jones. {sic} (by) the driver of a commercial vehicle of an engine braking system that emits excessive noise. It also provides that the prohibition applies only when signs have been erected to prohibit the use of these sign -- these engine braking Basically what this bill does is provide uniformity with the signs that are being posted. It also takes the moving violation away. And it is supported and the proponents are the Mid-West Truckers, the State Police, the Illinois Municipal League, and IDOT is neutral. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator John Jones.

#### SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I, well, wasn't really going to speak on this, but since the Senator used my name whenever she was giving her opening remarks, I couldn't pass up the opportunity. You know, this has been an issue that Senator Garrett has worked on for many years. She has done a lot of compromising and she does have the Mid-West Truckers support on this. She didn't have my support until committee yesterday, but I finally did give her a vote. And -- and I just want her to know, for the record, that if I ever see another bill about engine brakes or Jake Brakes, whatever you want to call 'em up here I'm assured -- I want to assure you right now, you will have a very difficult time of passing it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett, to close.

#### SENATOR GARRETT:

I just want to thank both Members of the House and the Senate who have been with me on this issue for the last four years, and ask for a -- a Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 901 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

are 54 voting Aye, 3 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 901, having received the required constitutional majority, is Senate Bill 902. declared passed. Senator Garrett. Bill 908. Senator Jacobs. 908. Skip down to Senate Bill -page 32, please. Bottom of page 32. Senate Bill 973. Top of page 33. Senate Bill 974. Senator Wendell Jones. Page 35, please. With leave of the Body, we'll skip to page 35. Top of page 35 is -- on 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1031. Senate Bill 1035. Senator Meeks. 1031. Senator Collins. Senate Bill 1037. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 1044. Senator Schoenberg. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1044.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schaumburg {sic} (Schoenberg). Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Representative {sic} Wojcik is from Schaumburg. My name is Schoenberg, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Take it out of the record. No. Go right ahead. Go right ahead, Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Sure you don't want to file some notes to this bill, too, while you're at it? Anyway, Senate Bill -- all the kidding aside, Senate Bill 1044 provides for an income tax checkoff to benefit the Les Turner ALS Foundation which has been fighting to find a cure for ALS, which is more commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease. This is the twenty-fifth anniversary that we have been -- that this institution has been seeking to help combat this -- this fatal neurodegenerative disease. The -- this would begin with the taxable year ending on December 31st, 2003, and I'd be happy to answer any questions on this very worthwhile proposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Senator Schoenberg, I don't -- I don't disagree with what you're trying to do here by placing this in the tax statement. However, I did notice that rather than the checkoff dollars going to the Lou Gerhrig Foundation or research fund they're indicated that they're to go to a specific entity. Now, I'm not sure that we've ever at least limited these funds going to a specific entity like that. At least -- maybe you can clarify that for me. It seems to me like a more appropriate place for the dollars to go would be to the Lou Gerhig's research fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The -- the Foundation is really the disbursing agent for research grants, most notably to the Les Turner ALS Research Library -- Lab at Northwestern's Feinberg School of Medicine, which is really the national leader in this regard. So I think that it is an -- it is an appropriate and certainly an independent entity which provides the disbursements for the grants.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

So they act as an arm or an agent of the research fund? Or is...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg. Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

They -- they are really the disbursing agent. I can assure you that all the funding will remain in Illinois institutions through the disbursements that are done by the Les Turner ALS Foundation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Unfortunately - thank you, Mr. President - my computer doesn't work again, so I can't get through to an analysis. Would the sponsor yield for question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

When you say, ALS, are you referring to what?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I'm referring to that which is more commonly known as Lou Gerhig's disease.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

And what -- what does -- what does your bill do, sir?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The bill would provide for a tax checkoff where individuals could choose to fund the efforts to address this disease, which while many of the symptoms are treatable, there simply is no cure. Illinois and institutions within Illinois are the national leaders in addressing this debilitating disease which affects most people between ages forty and seventy and -- and accelerates at a very rapid rate. The institutions that are here in -- all the money will remain in State and I hope that addresses most of your questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

To the bill. I think there's been an influence -- rather an influx of more cases in Lou Gehrig's disease recently. I know from my own experience with people back in my county, and I support your bill. I think it might be a step in the right direction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to echo Senator Burzynski's concerns. Historically, when we have a taxpayer checkoff, when people check off and make a donation, assumption is that they're giving to a State agency or they're -- they're giving directly to what's stated. And I understand that there's no bad intention in the pass-through structure, but you might seriously consider amending this in the House. Otherwise, I think we're really opening up a new way of -- of kind of doing checkoffs, because it -- it just -- it just does not follow current practice. The -- the idea that we would hand it to a private entity, which would then make judgmental decisions about where to place the grants, just, you know, is something that I would encourage the sponsor to review as it goes through the House process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg, to close.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1044 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 6 voting Present. Senate Bill 1044, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1051. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1053. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1053. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1054. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill 1056. Senator Sullivan. Senate Bill 1060. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 1066. Senator Crotty. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1066.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1066 creates the Good Samaritan Energy

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Trust Fund to assist low-income energy consumers in reducing high arrearages so that service can be reconnected or connected. The fund consists of private voluntary donations. Fund policies and allocations will be set up by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity with the advice and the consent of a policy advisory committee. Fund resources will be awarded to local area agencies that already administer LIHEAP grants. I think we all have seen on TV, especially in the colder months, how arrearages are really a serious problem for many low-income energy consumers. Although we do have LIHEAP grants, that grant is for four hundred dollars per -- per household and LIHEAP also allows a once-per-year emergency services grant of seven hundred and fifty dollars. But if these two grants are insufficient to reduce the arrearage sufficiency {sic}, then the household will Although most utilities will not shut off not be connected. consumers during the cold months, many consumers cannot get connected at all due to the arrearages and there are no other monies available to help these consumers. The lack of the heat and the electricity create a serious risk and health and safety issues, especially for persons with disabilities, our elderly and our children. I ask for an Aye vote, but if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer 'em.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Crotty, I -- I didn't hear that whole explanation. Is this the bill that we playfully referred to in committee as the "bake sale" bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

#### SENATOR CROTTY:

Well, you may have, but I haven't and I don't think the other Members did. But thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

But this bill is the one where, for the first time, we're suggesting that we do fundraising to support people in this Good Samaritan bill, isn't it? The first time, that -- that

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

anybody's noticed, that we've suggested fundraising as part of State policy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

## SENATOR CROTTY:

I don't know if it's a -- it's a fundraising technique per se, Senator, but it's -- it's a way in which people can make a choice on helping people at a time in -- in need. And so, you know, I don't know if I would call it any more of a fundraising than any other checkoff list or any other person asking for contributions to such a fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, I'll call your attention to Section 20. The bill says "Solicitation of Contributions to the {sic} Fund", that -the Department to insert fundraising allowing solicitation letters in utility bills. So I would call that fundraising. But just to the bill and to the point: The federal government runs a low energy -- low-income energy assistance program, the LIHEAP It is a very large and comprehensive one. has the honor of having the largest state LIHEAP program, which layers on top of that. We have the most generous contributions to LIHEAP in -- in the State. And this is, again, another constitutional officer who's got an idea that he would like to bring before the General Assembly in the middle of very extraordinary times, when I think we ought to be focused on other business. I -- I think there's some good work we can put Lieutenant Governor Pat Quinn to. I don't think fundraising letters and the Good Samaritan Act are the right direction to go. I respect that the sponsor is concerned about people having access to utility bills, but I think it's about time we take bills like this out of the record. Let's get to those important shell bills and move on with our work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1066 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

are 33 voting -- voting Aye -- Aye, 17 voting Nay, 5 voting Senate Bill 1066, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1067. Senator Halvorson. 1067. Senate Bill 1069. Senator Lauzen. Senate Bill 1070. Senator Martinez. 1070. Senate Bill 1081. Senator Martinez. Senate Bill 1095. Senator Sullivan. Senate Bill 1098. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 1102. Senator Jacobs. Top of page 36 are Senate Bills on 3rd Reading. Senator Sandoval. With leave of the Body, we'll return to Senate Bill 1108, 1109, 1110, 1111, 1115, 1116. Senate Bill Senate Bill 1126. Senator Burzynski. Silverstein. Senate Bill 1149. Senator Shadid. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1149.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

## SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill represents an agreement between the Illinois Automobile Dealers Association, the Community Bankers and the Illinois Credit Union League, simply holds that within twenty-one days after payment in satisfaction of a security interest in a vehicle is received, a release of the security interest must be executed and the certificate of title delivered to the proper person.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Bomke.

### SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I'm cosponsor of this bill. It's one of the finer bills that Senator Shadid has this Session. I'd urge an Aye vote on this side of the aisle.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1149 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, 0 voting

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1149, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1150. Senator Cullerton. 1150. Senate Bill 1164. Senator Hunter. 1164. Senate Bill 1190. Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 1193. Senator Lightford. Senate Bill 1198. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1200. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 1201. President Jones. Senate Bill 1204. Senator Harmon. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1204.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1204 amends the Open Meetings Act to permit a local government to discuss, in closed session, the appointment, performance, compensation, et cetera, of legal counsel in much the same way they would discuss the same matters with respect to an employee. I'd urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

# SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, is there an amendment on this bill that changed the scope of the protected discussions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

# SENATOR HARMON:

The bill was amended, Senator, not to change the scope but to the change the structure. Originally the bill created a new exception to the Open Meetings Act that -- applied only to legal counsel. It paralleled the provision relating to employees. The Illinois Press Association was concerned about creating another exception and we simply consolidated the same language

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

or the same concept into the paragraph that currently exists with respect to employees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

## SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, what is -- under your bill, is it the legal advice that would be off limits to the public or would it be discussions about the attorney themselves?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

#### SENATOR HARMON:

It would be discussions about the attorney or the firm itself. The appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of legal counsel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

# SENATOR ROSKAM:

Aren't there other areas though, Senator, where you may -- I mean, in order to be consistent? Would this be the first area where a professional relationship is -- is offline for the public? In other words, if you have an engineering firm that you want to talk about, that wouldn't be subject to an exception, would it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

# SENATOR HARMON:

Not pursuant to this amendment to the Act, no. I -- I don't disagree that there may be other potential exceptions, but I think that this bill attempts to deal with the issue of legal counsel. If we need to take up the issue of engineers or other consultants or contractors with another bill, I'd be happy to discuss that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

# SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, it -- it just seems to me and I -- I can understand, Senator, if a -- a governmental body needs to have the advice of counsel offline. That makes sense. And if it's not part of the -- the current Open Meetings Act, then that would be an area

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

that I think is meritorious. You know, an attorney/client privilege sort of setting. But this would -- this would really separate out attorneys from any other profession and it -- it seems to me either unwise or inconsistent, pick your adjective, but either one of them aren't really a good idea because it would -- it would separate out -- you know, accountants wouldn't be treated this way engineers wouldn't be treated this way, contractors wouldn't be treated this way. There's no other -- there's no other group that would be treated with -- this way. And I'm trying to figure out what -- if it's not the legal advice, which I agree should be offline, what is it that you're trying to protect from the public?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

### SENATOR HARMON:

Senator, the bill was an -- an initiative of the West Central Municipal Conference. They posed it to me as a problem that their members were facing. I confess that this bill -- there are a great many problems of the world that this bill does not address and you could say the same about any piece of legislation. This bill is -- is narrowly tailored to address a particular problem raised by municipalities who wish to discuss the appointment, performance and compensation of their outside legal counsel. I think that the bill solves that problem and I make no argument that it solves other problems.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

# SENATOR ROSKAM:

To the bill. You know, I -- I -- with due respect to the sponsor, you didn't answer the question and maybe you can in your closing. Maybe I'm the only person that's going to ask you questions on this. But the -- the question still remains: What is the problem? What is the underlying problem that -- that brought this bill to your attention? If -- and it just seems to me like you got a group of people that don't want to disclose a problem that they have with an attorney, and with all due respect, Senator, I think that this sets us up to move in a direction that's pretty unattractive. I can understand if you want to say, look -- as I said before, the legal advice, yeah.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Maybe there's times when the legal advice needs to be offline. But to say we just don't want -- we just don't want our conversations about this firm to be public, I -- I think that it is inappropriate and ill-advised, and I'd urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I can understand the sponsor for having this bill. I have been a municipal attorney myself and how -- all we are is we are employees of that particular village and/or county and I -- why -- why not have it in closed session, I mean, like they discuss employees in the -- in the executive session? It's no different than that. Even though we're lawyers, we're still employees, and therefore I support the bill. I -- I think that it might be a step in the right direction. They're still employees and they're still -- it should be -- they shouldn't be blatted out, and if they -- and made nasty remarks about 'em outside. I think it's something that does require confidential nature, since a lawyer is an employee, just like an engineer or anyone else. I certainly support the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

## SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. I'd like to rise in favor of this bill. The Committee on Local Government passed it. We discussed it thoroughly. It has to do with personnel in an executive session and really is unrelated to anything else. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this legislation and want to commend the sponsor for responding to the West Central Municipal Conference and also add that the Illinois Municipal League is also a proponent. As a former trustee in my hometown, I know the importance of privacy and an executive session. So, I support this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1204 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 38 voting Aye, 20 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1204, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR JACOBS:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

### SENATOR JACOBS:

On the Democratic side of the aisle over here, have two of my chiefs from -- from my area. One of 'em happens to by my chief from East Moline, Reggie Freeman. He's the fat one. And Chief Etheridge from the City of Moline. So it's -- glad to have 'em here. Give 'em a great Senate welcome.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise and be recognized? Welcome to Springfield. Top of -- Senator Peterson, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. For the purposes of a personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your personal privilege point.

# SENATOR PETERSON:

I'd like to have the Senate look up in the gallery behind the Republican side. We have some township officials from Fremont Township, Pete Tekampe, the Supervisor, and Bill Grinnell, the Highway Commissioner.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise, the township officials, and be recognized? Welcome to Springfield. Top of page 37. Senate Bill 1321. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 1330. Senator Collins. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1330.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Collins.

## SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1330, as amended, prohibits gas and electric utilities from disconnecting consumers who are active participants of LIHEAP and are unable to pay their bill during the coldest -- winter months between December 1st and March 31st. As amended, Senate Bill 1330 addresses the concerns that were raised by the Energy Association and several of the utility providers. I would like to thank Peoples Energy, Nicore, the Illinois Energy Association and the other utility companies that worked with us on this bill, as well as the City of Chicago, CUB and the other proponents of this legislation. I would request an Aye vote on Senate Bill 1330 and would be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1330 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1330, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1331. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 1332. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 1336. Senator Schoenberg. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1336.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

On 1336, Senator Schoenberg. On 1336. Schoenberg. On 1336. We're on 1336. Senator Schoenberg.

## SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. 1336 is an initiative of the construction industry and

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the Builder -- Builders Association of Greater Chicago and the Laborers. It amends the Public Construction Bond Act relative to the amount required for a surety bond. The feeling is that the level -- existing level of surety bonds precludes a number of smaller contractors from participating. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none the question is, shall Senate Bill 1336 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1336, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1342. Senator Radogno. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1342.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Radogno.

### SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill amends the Code of Corrections as it pertains to the provisions of not guilty by This bill was brought to me by a reason of insanity. constituent who had a really horrendous experience in his own family in that his -- in that his brother was murdered by his sister-in-law and then she was found not guilty by reason of So this constituent, who is actually an attorney, insanity. became very familiar with all the nuances of this law and worked up a number of suggested changes to the provisions that are contained in this bill. Specifically, it does -- some of the things that it does is that when someone has been convicted -or, when they've committed a first or second degree murder but found not guilty by reason of insanity, it -- it mandates that services provided are inpatient. That commonsensical, but that's not currently the case. mandates that the -- the inpatient services be delivered in a

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

secure setting. Again, kind of a commonsense thing, but not clear in the law. It also states that for involuntary admissions - and again, this is not in general in the Mental Health Code, but under not guilty by reason of insanity - it strikes the reference that the patient would have to be -- have potential for danger in the near future, that being because they've already been demonstrated to be quite dangerous as it is. It also amends the conditions of conditional release. That is when the person is getting ready to be released. provisions for frequent random drug trusting {sic} (testing) to ensure that the person is taking the medications that will keep them from becoming psychotic and thereby committing this kind of a violent crime again. It extends the time period for which those conditional -- those conditions apply. It's currently five years. It goes to ten years with a possible five-year extension. And an additional provision is that it increases from one hundred and twenty to three hundred and sixty-five days the time that must elapse before someone can refile a petition for release. It does allow a -- a judge to shorten that time, however, if that's deemed appropriate. I would be happy to try to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1342 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1342, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1364. Senator del Valle. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1364.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill requires the Department of Human Services to forward to the Governor and General Assembly every two years instead of every year. The bill was amended to respond to a concern of the committee Members regarding the -- the frequency of the report to require the report every two years instead of every year. And this report is for the purpose of looking at the disparate impact of various provisions of the TANF program. I'll be glad to answer... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Okay. Is -- is there any discussion? Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I simply rise in support of the legislation. It came out of Health and Human Services unanimously and appreciate the sponsor's responsiveness to the committee's concerns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1364 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1364, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1373. Senator Garrett. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1373.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Garrett.

# SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill -- 1373 amends the Property Tax Code by providing that the township or multi-township assessors in counties with between five hundred and seven thousand {sic} inhabitants shall, on or before October 15th of the assessment year, return the assessment books or workbooks to the supervisor of assessments. It also states that in counties with between

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

five hundred and seven hundred thousand inhabitants, that complaints to the board of review may be filed with the assessor or chief county assessment officer who certified the assessment who shall forward the complaint to the board of review. Basically what we're doing is making sure that if somebody wants to file a complaint, that they don't have to -- they can do it at their local assessor's office and that, after talking to assessor's, the books will be closed a month earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there -- is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1373 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1373, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1380. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 1384. Senator Hunter. Senate Bill 1403. Senator Woolard. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1403.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Woolard.

## SENATOR WOOLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1403 eliminates the duplicative powers of the State Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education in regards to private business and vocational schools. I think it's a very simple bill. I -- I don't know of any opposition. Would appreciate your support.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1403 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1403, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

passed. Senate Bill 1404. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 1405. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 1408. Senator Obama. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1408.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill creates the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Transportation Act. Essentially what this bill is designed to do is to coordinate with various agencies that have jurisdiction over transportation dollars to try to secure additional matches and to coordinate some of the geographical mismatch that exists between persons who need jobs and where the jobs are and try to improve transportation flows for our workforce. It just passed out of the House 117 to nothing. And let me make sure. I don't recall any significant opposition, but I want to make sure that I've got this right. So I don't want to stand corrected. I don't believe that there was any opposition to this bill and I would ask for an affirmative roll call.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1408 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, none voting Nay, 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 1408, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1412. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 1414. 1412? Senate Bill -- we're on Senate Bill 1412. Senator Obama. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1412.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a bill that we discussed when we moved it from 2nd to 3rd yesterday. It essentially provides some order to the process whereby organ donations are made. It creates a hierarchy of decision makers in determining such donations. As was noted yesterday, Senator Dillard attached an amendment that made some adjustments that were caught by Republican staff. At this point, I know of no opposition. This is a consensus bill. I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1412 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1412, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1414. Senate Bill 1415. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1415.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

## SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill addresses a concern that I think many of us have, and I know the public certainly has, and that is the ever escalating costs of elections, but a particular kind of election: the judicial elections for the Illinois Supreme Court. As many of you are aware recently, these elections have started to cost upwards of a million dollars a year, and although we're obviously concerned both personally and as citizens about the escalating costs of political campaigns generally, I think we're all particularly concerned about the

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

unseemly process where judges have to raise this kind of money or candidates have to raise this kinds of money typically from lawyers. They're the only ones who pay much attention to these races, and as a consequence, I think that there is a -- arising, at least the appearance, if not the actuality, that this may be impacting the judges' impartiality as they're deciding cases. So what this bill does, it's a trial effort at public financing for Supreme Court elections. What it would do is create a checkoff, similar to what exists at the federal level. not start until the trust fund for the checkoff builds up to a five-million-dollar level. At that point, it would provide public financing for candidates for the Supreme Court after they've qualified in a variety of measures: that they've raised a certain number of hundred-dollar contributions, that they've received the requisite number of signatures for petitions, and that they've indicated themselves to be significant candidates. And the funds that they might receive might go up to seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. This is a experiment that is being tried in North Carolina. The President of the American Bar Association, A.P. Carlton, was in town testifying on behalf of this bill. This is strongly supported by the American Bar Association as a way of reducing the appearance of impropriety with respect to judicial elections. I will be happy to answer any questions people may have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

# SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, could you just walk through the limitations of this bill? In other words, which -- which elections would be subject to this initiative and which judicial elections would not be eligible for this initiative and -- and why.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaking directly to a concern that I know that you, Senator Roskam, have had, it does not deal with retention The concern there was that, first of all, we don't elections. know yet whether this pool will actually create enough money for it to work, and I just want to emphasize that. If we don't if the public decides, "You know what? We don't think this is issue," and it doesn't obtain the requisite amount funding, then it doesn't happen. But what -anticipate, at least, was -- is that there are only going to be a certain number of actual elections. It would be more costly if retention elections were available as well and we did not think it appropriate to try to figure out how to potentially fund groups who might want to target a particular judge, what their qualifying criteria would be and so forth. And -- for that reason, retentions were left out, although I know that you made the point in committee that perhaps that might have been something that you guys would have been interested in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

## SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, I'd be just interested in your affirmation this afternoon that retention would be a good idea. And I -- and I understand the rationale for an incremental approach, but it seems to me what is good for the goose is good for the gander. We're -- we're having, really, a series of election -- electoral decisions that would be offline, not subject to availability, and there may very well be folks who are interested in the retention decision of a Supreme Court justice that wouldn't have the ability. And you would -- and, Senator, just for purposes of the record, you would agree with me that in a perfect world, if you didn't have the limitations of funding, that that would be good, to include retention.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

## SENATOR OBAMA:

I will agree with you that I think the public -- I would agree with you that it is very difficult to vote a judge out of office under the current retention rules, and some of that has to do with the ability of getting information out to the public.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Whether we can design -- I would -- I won't state for the record right off the bat that I think the next step in this phase should be retention because I think we still have to see how this works, and it may turn out that -- just the mechanism is not ideal for doing that. But I do recognize your concern that to the extent we want the public to still have some impact or input on judicial behavior, that the retention mechanism, as it's currently constituted, probably is not perfect. My sense is that it was designed in that fashion to balance, on the one hand, electing judges; on the other hand, having some continuity and -- and some protection of judges from the -- the -- whatever winds are blowing politically.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

There are a great number of esteemed Senators wishing to speak. Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Two other brief questions. I'll give 'em both to you if you could respond to 'em both and then I'll sit down. Senator, the first would be, could you discuss the -- I think in your opening remarks, although I wasn't paying close -- as close attention as I should have, you said it was a voluntary checkoff. I think that it would -- would be voluntary for the public but then there could be an obligation that attorneys would -- would have if the Supreme Court were -- were to assess a fee. And then the second question is, could you describe how any other limitations interact with this bill? In other words, are there limitations on soft money? Are there limitations on what candidates can accept and what they can't accept? If you could direct your attention to those two, I'd appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

# SENATOR OBAMA:

Yes. If you have a candidate who is qualifying and taps into this fund, then they would not obtain additional contributions above the initial qualifying threshold of thirty thousand dollars. All right? So after that, they wouldn't be soliciting additional contributions. As to your first question -- I apologize, Senator Roskam, this is the second time you've done this to me today. The -- I used to be sharper, but I'm

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

getting worn down here by -- by the long day. What was the first question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam, for...

## SENATOR ROSKAM:

It was -- Senator, it was the funding -- the voluntary nature of the funding, and then one other question that I thought of, when I -- when I was seated, I was going to whisper to Senator Righter - I know, you made a big mistake by giving me eye contact - and -- and that is, what happens if a justice -- or, if a successful candidate violates the rule?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

There are fines in place, and the fines, then, would be placed into the -- into the fund that was created.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR OBAMA:

And...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Oh, I'm -- I'm sorry. Senator Obama. I thought you were finished, Senator.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Sorry. Well, it was just he added another question and then I realized there was still that first question that was -- next time write 'em out, please, Senator Roskam. With respect to the first question, it is true that we are looking at potential -- some fines or fees from the Bar that are administrated by the Supreme Court going into this fund, but those would be done by Supreme Court rule, as -- as opposed to statutorily.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

## SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, will the sponsor yield to -- for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I -- finally this machine of mine is working, if it's correct. Does your bill say that candidates for the Supreme Court of Illinois can apply for public funding for their campaign?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

And for -- from whom do they get the public funding? From the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

This is a checkoff system in which a fund would be set up, similar to the Presidential checkoff fund at the federal level. It does not come out of GRF. It has no fiscal impact in that sense.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, much as I respect and admire the sponsor of this bill, I -- I'm speaking against it. I don't think it's good public policy. We have to go out and get our funds when we run for office. What's wrong with people who want to be Supreme Court candidates getting their funds the same way we do? I just can't see it at this time, and therefore I rise in opposition to this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield, Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator, I -- I appreciate how you're -- what you're trying to do, but can you tell us, how do you ensure that all in-kind contributions are counted? You know, people show their support for a candidate with money and volunteering time, but there's so many things that people bring to campaigns that are under a radar screen and not reported. How do you ensure that everything is accounted for in the seven hundred and fifty thousand?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Well, keep in mind that none of this impacts existing disclosure provisions for campaigns. If anything, it might strengthen them. And so, as a consequence, in the same way that there are current rules in place that require us and judges to disclose in-kind contributions, just as they have to disclose cash contributions, that would not change, that we would still have that mechanism. Now, are there going to be folks who get around rules? Of course. This rule prohibits it. If they get caught, they get fined, and I can assure you that if somebody's running for Illinois Supreme Court and, turns out, are going out of their way to disobey Illinois law, in addition to the fines, that's probably not very good publicity with respect to the race. So my assumption would be, I think that there would be fairly strict adherence to the rules.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard.

# SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a bill that Senator Obama and I have worked on with many groups, some of the groups are the highest esteemed groups in the State of Illinois, like the Joyce Foundation, and the Campaign for Political Reform has been very, very active in this bill. This is an optional bill. It's voluntary, but it is certainly something that I think is worth a unique experiment in the history of Illinois elections and certainly with respect to a third of our branches of government, the Judicial Branch. Our political races - and we know we had Senator Hawkinson, one of our colleagues, run for the Supreme Court recently - our Supreme

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Court races have become very expensive, like they are California and other states, and I don't think that is a very, very good trend. This is limited to the highest court in the State of Illinois, a court that has to be, in the eyes of the public and those who litigate in front of it, totally pure in its decision-making process. I think that this bill sends and this mechanism sends, if somebody gets elected through it, a very good message to the voters that if, God forbid, you ever have a case in front of the Supreme Court or a case is there that affects you, that there is a Supreme Court that is beyond reproach, that campaign contributions don't make a difference when a case is being decided by the highest court of our State. This has been tried in North Carolina, a state which I believe, among major states in America, is very similar to Illinois. It's a state that's known as a regular state, not some state that is -- is not -- absolutely mirroring the philosophy of -- of Illinois, and it's worked well, and it's going to work well there. Senator Geo-Karis, this is a little different than us who have to raise our own money. When you are elected to the General Assembly, we all come here with particular biases when we take our seats. You know, Democrats have somewhat of a different philosophy of government than we do, but unlike us, who may come with some particular leaning or bias when we take our seats, and we take positions and we have campaign fliers and we fill out questionnaires ad nauseam, when you go to the judicial system or Judicial Branch, especially the Supreme Court, you are supposed to go there blind. You are supposed to go in there neutral on every case that is in front of you. That's why the lady that you see has her eyes blindfolded who is always on the scale of justice. And I think this is a very, very innovative new way to stop some very bad trends in the Illinois It's worth our way of -- of trying to do this Supreme Court. again, it's optional. These races have become expensive, and I think that people of Illinois ought to have a mechanism to elect somebody to the Supreme Court who certainly will be neutral when they get there. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you. I want to remind the Body, it is 4:15. We intend to get through this Calendar. Senator Righter.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a couple brief questions, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Obama, first, I notice, in going through our analysis and looking through the bill a little bit, that in order to qualify for public funds, a candidate has to have a certain number of what -- what the bill terms as qualifying contributions, and a qualifying contribution is one, in terms of monetary amounts, that is between five dollars but no more than twenty-five dollars. Can I ask first, why is that threshold so low, the -- the twenty-five dollars? Why is that -- why so low? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

This is modeled on, I think, similar mechanisms that exist in other states on other elections, like, for example, Maine. The basic idea is, is that we want to establish people's credibility by the fact that they're able to obtain a broad-base of grassroots support, including financial support, but we don't want that measure to be one person writing a ten-thousand-dollar check. We want to indicate that this is a person who's widely credible, and as a consequence, we want to see if they can gather up a large number of small donations just to indicate that they've got a -- in that sense, it complements the petition-gathering process that we undertake as candidates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, also in the bill, it indicates that a nonparticipating candidate, someone who's chosen not to make themselves available for the -- the public financing, that there is a straight contribution cap for -- of a thousand dollars. If the person in the race who chooses not to participate is -- has decided not to be part of the system, can you tell me again the rationale for capping their contributions at a thousand dollars

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

even though they're totally waiving the public -- the possible public benefit?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

This would not prevent them, obviously, from spending their own money. That's governed by the First Amendment, according to the Supreme Court of the United States. It does limit their -contributions that they receive because that's part of the overall scheme that we're trying to restrict: the appearance that the Court can be bought. And I know that Senator Righter is an excellent attorney and -- whose wife is a judge. I -- I'm sure that if -- you know, that if you solicited me, I might be willing to, you know, contribute to her campaign. I don't know if I could afford more than a thousand dollars though, but the -- the -- but -- but -- but I think that the basic idea is, is that what we want our judges to be perceived as is somebody who's impartial and who's willing to serve for the benefit of the public. And as you and I both know, judges hate having to raise money. It's -- it's because they really can't solicit. One of the questions that alderman -- that Senator Geo-Karis indicated was: What makes us different? Well, one of the differences is, is that we can actively go out there and say, "I'm running a campaign. I need money, can you help me?" Judges aren't in the same position to do that, and so they live in this twilight zone with respect to public financing. need money for the campaign, but they can't really go out there and beat the hustings for the money. The campaign contribution limit is part and parcel the overall notion that we don't want these seats to be bought. We don't want a well-heeled trial lawyer in some particular jurisdiction to be able to just say, "You know what? Let me write a hundred-thousand-dollar check to this candidate, and I've got myself a judge."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President, for your indulgence a second time. Senator, I just have a question. Could you get a copy of the bill? Because I think there might be a drafting error,

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

otherwise I'm just misreading something. On page 4, in Section 10, paragraph (b), just tell me when you're there. This has to do with the qualifications of somebody who would have eligibility, Senator. Paragraph (b), it says a candidate shall be certified by the State Board as an eligible candidate for receipt of public funding -- financing for a primary election if the candidate complies with subsection (a) above - which, as you know, swearing out an affidavit and all that stuff - and receives a qualifying number of - here's the question - contributions at least equal to .15 percent of the number of ballots. Is that a drafting error? What is a contribution as it relates to ballots?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

What that means is that the number of discreet contributions as opposed to amount equals the percentage -- this percentage of the ballots that are cast. So, it describes the number of persons who are making one of these small contributions that Senator Righter and I just discussed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1415 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 voting Aye, 17 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1415, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1417. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 1431. President Jones. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1431.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

# SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1431 is an initiative of the Illinois Cemetery Association and the Funeral

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Directors Association which gives the authority to the cemetery to deal with unused rights -- to deal with unused interment rights when the last known -- heir has passed on. And the -- by standard affidavit, the last known heir to multiple interment rights can transfer those rights either to someone else or to the cemetery. That's all the bill does. Ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Leader Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator, I see on the board it says Cemetery Protection Act. Does this have anything to do with voting in Cook County and Chicago?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

You know, you always told me, Senator, that down in southern Illinois, when a person died, they do not lose their right to vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1431 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1431, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Top of page 38. Senator Shadid, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SHADID:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR SHADID:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

In the gallery behind me are constituents of mine. They're called the Fun Time Seniors, from Pekin, Illinois. Would you join me in welcoming them to Springfield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will the Fun Time Seniors, from Pekin, Illinois, please stand and be recognized by the Senate? Welcome to Springfield. On the top of page 38. Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1440. Senator Dillard. 1440. Senate Bill 1441. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill 1442. Senator Woolard. 1442. Senate Bill 1461. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 1462. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 1466. Senator Silverstein. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1466.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Silverstein.

### SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this -- and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amends the Uniform Partnership Act and makes -- regarding correction of errors, as well as administrative dissolutions of a limited partnership.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1466 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, none voting Nay and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1466, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared Senate Bill 1477. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 1478. passed. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 1492. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 1497. Senator Link. Senate Bill 1499. Senator Link. Senate Bill 1500. Senator Link. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

## SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1500.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Link. 1500. Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Illinois Banking Act and Savings Bank Act and limited liabilities companies. Basically what this bill does is the authority is identical to that provided to the national banks by the Comptroller of the Currency. This bill also allows banks and savings banks to operate as limited liability companies. The FDIC recently authorized banks and savings banks to choose the corporate structure of limited liability companies if they meet certain -- regulatory criterias. There is no known opposition to this legislation. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1500 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1500, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- Senator Haine, for what question -- for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR HAINE:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

## SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have the Chief of Police of Glen Carbon, Illinois, in Madison County, the honorable David Bradford. He's here for the annual meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. I'd like the Senate to welcome this fine officer of the law.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Let's welcome Chief Bradford to Springfield. Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 1504. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1505. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1506. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1510. Senator

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Harmon. Senate Bill 1513. Senator Jacobs. Top of page 39. Senate Bill -- Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

In the back of our room here is the Township Supervisor of Shields Township, Charles Fitzgerald IV. Ask you to -- to welcome him here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Will we welcome to Springfield Township Supervisor. Top of page 39, Senate Bills on 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1523. Senator Crotty. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1523.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1523 amends the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Commission Act. It provides that the members of the Commission shall serve their terms until their successors are appointed and qualified. It also makes some changes concerning the duties of that Commission, and it provides that the Commission shall promulgate rules and regulations Act implement. this in accordance with the Administrative Procedural Act. Currently the Commission has come to me because there are eleven members, but they've had six vacancies. So this language would allow the people that are -have been members to continue until the Governor appoints commissioners.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a brief comment. I rise in support of the legislation. It passed out of Health and Human Services unanimously, and appreciate an Aye vote as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1523 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1523, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1530. Senator Demuzio. 1530. Senate Bill 1535. Senator Sullivan. Senate Bill 1543. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 1546. Senator Haine. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1546.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Haine.

# SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this bill was brought into the Local Government Committee by the Municipal League and it provides simply an option for small villages and cities to bill -- to send a billing that is sent at the same time the tax bill is sent on special assessments. For example, in a village or a city, if there's a neighborhood or a block that's decided to assess itself an extra fee for sidewalks, culverts or whatever, and the county clerk declines to send the bill for that assessment at the same time the tax bill is sent, the city has the option to bill those citizens directly at the same time and in the same installment fashion as the tax bills. Not all at once, but two -- installments. The tax bills are then paid to the city clerk. just provides an option under the law. I know of opposition to it. The County Clerks seem to be happy with it and the Municipal League would be overjoyed if the Senate would enact this into law. Thank you very much.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just a comment. The Local Government Committee passed this out 9 to nothing. I would ask for a favorable roll call. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1546 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 1546, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR SYVERSON:

Just an inquiry of the Chair. I think Senator Rauschenberger's light is broken. For the last three votes, he has voted green. I think that's a record. Maybe we should have his light checked.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

We will send a technician over there. I thought you were speaking about his speak switch. We hope that's broke -- no. Moving right along. Senate Bill -- 3rd Reading. Senate Bill -- top of page 40. Senate Bill 1589. Senator Hunter. Senate -- Senate Bill 1592. Senator Collins. Senate Bill 1601. Senator Cullerton. Madam Secretary, read the bill. 1601.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1601.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

# SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill deals with variable rate bonds, which is an alternative to fixed rate bonds. Local governments are allowed to use these and they are choosing them, more recently, over fixed rate bonds in light of the lowering of the interest rates. So, 1601 clarifies some

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

of the document questions and regulatory questions related to the issuance of variable rate debt. The law firm of Chapman and Cutler is a law firm that represents a lot of units of local government. They are the ones that drafted the bill. The -- the Sections of the Act that are amended, the Bond Authorization Act and the Local Government Credit Enhancement Act, have not been updated in over ten years. So, the bill is really more technical, but it does clarify language and definitions. It doesn't change any of the bonding authorization limits. It's just really technical. I hope nobody has any questions, but if they do, I'll do the best I can to answer them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Senator, is there anything in this bill that has to do with any State bonds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR E. JONES:

No, when you're through with this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He -- he indicates he will.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, in committee, we talked a little bit -- and I think Senator Lauzen touched on this briefly, but I just wanted to follow up. Is there any State guarantee behind any of these

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

bonds? Is the State the ultimate guarantor on any of these bonds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

## SENATOR CULLERTON:

I don't know the answer, but it -- I -- I would say there's nothing in the bill that changes current law. I think it depends on the bond issue as to whether or not the State is the guarantor. So, we're not changing the law with regard to that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

I understand that. My -- I hoped that you would have said no and we could be done, but you kind of gave the wrong answer, so let me ask it a different way. Is -- if -- this is a tool that gives more -- and we're all nervous Nellies right now about bonds, anything that rhymes with bonds, anything that is in the bond family, so that -- hence, kind of the line of questions. Is this -- yeah. James Bond. There you go. Does this increase the risk and exposure? This is a tool, isn't it, Senator? It is a financial tool for local units of government to use, and the only question I have is, does it increase the level of risk? I know it doesn't do it implicitly in the bill, but does it -- is the net result more exposure for the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

# SENATOR CULLERTON:

On that I can say, definitely no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

# SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Speaker yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

## SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

My analysis says that these are general obligation bonds.

Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

No, they're local government bonds. It does not affect the State at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I know, but it affects the municipality, though. And if it -- if it -- it's general obligation bonds for the municipalities, they will have a hard time paying them back. That's why I'm questioning this. In that case, I think it should have thirty-six votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. A couple of questions of the sponsor. I think what Chapman and Cutler are trying to get at is synthetic fixed bonds that use variable rates and -- and sell off elements of the risk. It's very similar to, I think, some of the suggestions involving the pension bonding. Is -- to me, that's where this bill is headed. Does -- do you agree, Senator Cullerton?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

The -- the ability to issue variable rate bonds is a power that all local governments now have, but not the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois does not have the power to issue variable rate bonds. So, we're not adding new powers. As I said, the -- we're taking the existing practice, which is ongoing right now, and this law firm, which has been representing these municipalities and doing this for them now, drafted the bill, most of which the -- these -- if you read it, there are just things like clarifying definitions, like the word "swap". They're adding the words "collar, cap, or derivative" to -- to show that that's what a -- that's what a -- a swap is. So, I -- I don't -- I don't know -- you've described the variable rate bonds, but the State doesn't have the ability to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Yeah. My -- my -- I wasn't asserting that the State has a right to issue variable rate bonds yet. I'm -- what I guess I referring to is the new device of what they call synthetically fixed bonds, and I think that's what the bill gets I happen to be a big admirer of Lynda Given and a lot of the attorneys at Chapman and Cutler, and I know their intention frequently is to update our bond statutes. But given kind of the nature of things, this would be a candidate that I would be very willing to spend a lot of time, maybe over break, with a very small group of Senators, if we could consider extending the deadline, and maybe just doing a little working group on this, because when we get in to the -- to the issue of updating local governments' bond authority, it just makes a lot of us nervous. But, certainly, I know the sponsor has good intentions. Whatever you choose to do is okay with me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

I had a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR WELCH:

The analysis says that the agreements include interest rate swaps, collars, caps, or derivative agreements. Derivatives is usually referred to as options. Is this going to let a local government purchase options or become engaged in options on bonds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Then what is the purpose of having derivative agreements in the -- in the explanation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senator Cullerton.

### SENATOR CULLERTON:

They are also known as derivative agreements. So, it -right now the current law defines interest rate swaps and they
are also known as derivative agreements, so we simply add the
words "collar, cap, or derivative agreements". But they're
still interest rate swaps, which is current law. We're not...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1601 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 31 voting Aye, 23 voting Nay and 4 voting Present. Senate Bill 1601, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Purpose of a verification, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Burzynski has requested a verification. Will all Members be in their seats? Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Clayborne, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, del Valle, Demuzio, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Jacobs, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Munoz, Obama, Ronen, Sandoval, Schoenberg, Shadid, Silverstein, Trotter, Viverito, Walsh, Welch, Woolard, and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Does Senator Burzynski question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

# SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I'd just like to commend your Members for being present. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

That's what good Democrats do. On the -- on the verified roll call, there are 31 voting Aye, 23 voting Nay and 4 voting Present. Senate Bill 1601, having received the required

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to page 19. On 3rd Reading on page 19, bottom of 19, is Senate Bill 332. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

# SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 332.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

## SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you know, we adopted Senate Amendment No. 1 yesterday. This is very simple. It extends the repeal of the Illinois Certified Shorthand Reporters Act of January -- of 1984 to January 1st of 2014. Has an immediate effective date. The amendment is the bill. I ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 332 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay and none voting Present. Senate Bill 332, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. President Jones, for what purpose do you rise, sir? SENATOR E. JONES:

Purpose of an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Make your announcement.

## SENATOR E. JONES:

Shortly -- shortly, we will be going to caucus, but just to inform the Membership so they can make the proper arrangement, we have gone through the Calendar a couple of times and we've moved quite a bit of paper so as -- we would not have to be in Session on Friday. Yeah. And so, we will cancel Friday's Session and we'll work until late tomorrow afternoon to make the load a little bit more easier for next week. But we will not be in Session Friday.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

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

I have another announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your announcement.

## SENATOR DEMUZIO:

We would like to make sure that all of the amendments are in by 10 o'clock next Wednesday. You know, next week is the last week of the first semester, and it's over and, therefore, we wanted to give you forewarning that 10 a.m. Wednesday of next week, we would like to have all the amendments so that we can make sure that we move with some dispatch and make sure that everyone is treated fairly. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Duly noted. Senator Halvorson, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm calling for a Democrat Caucus in the President's Office immediately upon adjournment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Burzynski, for what purpose of the senator burzynski.

Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Just to ask approximately how long the caucus might last? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

It's -- it's after adjournment, Senator. We won't be coming back in, so we may be there all night. It won't affect you at all. We won't, but we could. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Demuzio, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned:
Refer to Agriculture and Conservation Committee - Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1527; refer to Environment and Energy Committee - Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 268, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 884, Floor Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1001; refer to Executive Committee - Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 10, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 10, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 13, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 67, Floor

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 553, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 591, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 629, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 640, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1003, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1053 -pardon me, that's 1054, Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1497, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1510 and Floor to Senate Bill Amendment No. 2 1586; refer to Financial Institutions Committee - Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1116; refer to Health and Human Services Committee - Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1067, Floor Amendment No. -- Nos. 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1649; refer to Insurance and Pensions Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 908 and Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1150; refer to Judiciary Committee - Floor Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 15, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 52, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 96, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 173, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 275 {sic}, Floor Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 472, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 690, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 729, Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1035, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1053 and Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1506; refer to Labor and Commerce Committee - Floor Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 600, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1070 and Floor 1 to Senate Bill 1212; refer to Licensed Activities Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 254 and Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 698; refer to Local Government Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 267, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 605, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1105, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1762 and Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 196; refer to Revenue Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 529, Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1126 and Floor Amendment Nos. 2 and 3 {sic} to Senate Bill 1102; refer to State Government Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1069 and Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1530; refer to Transportation Committee - Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 150 and Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1361; Ве Approved Consideration - Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 199 and Floor Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 810.

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Sieben, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your point.

## SENATOR SIEBEN:

Mr. President, I think we need to commend one of our Members of the General Assembly here this afternoon, Senator Larry Walsh. His bill has not even been signed into law by the Governor yet and he has all afternoon been walking around putting popcorn all over our desks. I think he really is taking this seriously about this State -- State snack food. Compliment him on his generosity. He's been on both sides of the aisle. He needs a round of applause.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

I see he even has salt and butter on that popcorn. What a wonderful guy. Messages. Madam Secretary, any motions on file? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Motion filed by Senators Demuzio, Viverito, Cullerton, Petka and Roskam, as follows:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 3-7, we move that following Senate bills be -- re-referred to the Senate Rules Committee: Senate Bills 33, 34, 39, 42, 704, 705, 708, 716, 717, 721, 722, 730, 731, 753, 754, 760, 761, 762, 766, 767, 780, 781, 789, 790, 799, 803, 834, 835, 840, 848, 849, 850, 851, 855, 856, 940, 942, 952, 953, 959, 960, 961, 964, 965, 968, 970, 972, 975, 979, 981, 982, 983, 987, 988, 991, 997, 998, 1002, 1004, 1008, 1011, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1020, 1022, 1549, 1550, 1551, 1554, 1555, 1556, 1563, 1564, 1565, 1566, 1596, 1597, 1613, 1614, 1615, 1616, 1618, 1619, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1628, 1629, 1630, 1633, 1635, 1636, 1637, 1642, 1643, 1651, 1652, 1659, 1660, 1662, 1663, 1664, 1665, 1670, 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674, 1678, 1679, 1682, 1683, 1686, 1687, 1688, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1702, 1703, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1710, 1711, 1714, 1715, 1716, 1716, 1717, 1718, 1719, 1720, 1721, 1722, 1723, 1726, 1727, 1731, 1732, 1739, -- pardon me that's 1892, 1895, 1896, 1900, 1910, 1917, 1922, 1925, 1927, 1929, 1939, 1941, 1942, 1947, 1948, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968,

26th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

1970, 1981, 1985, 1986, 1987, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Place it on the Calendar. There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 27, 2003. The Senate stands adjourned.