31st Legislative Day 4/8/2003

HB0013 First	Reading	5
HB0020 First	Reading	5
HB0032 First	Reading	5
HB0044 First	Reading	5
HB0085 First	Reading	5
HB0089 First	Reading	5
HB0191 First	Reading	5
HB0197 First	Reading	6
HB0206 First	Reading	6
HB0215 First	Reading	6
HB0218 First	Reading	6
HB0248 First	Reading	157
HB0274 First	Reading	6
	Reading	157
	Reading	158
	_	158
	Reading	
	Reading	158
	Reading	159
HB0595 First	Reading	159

31st Legislative	Day	4/8/2003
НВ0596	First Reading	159
HB0597	First Reading	159
НВ0598	First Reading	159
HB0599	First Reading	159
НВ0600	First Reading	159
НВ0601	First Reading	159
HB0602	First Reading	159
нв0603	First Reading	159
HB0604	First Reading	159
НВ0605 НВ0606	First Reading First Reading	159 160
нв0607	First Reading First Reading	160
HB0608	First Reading	160
HB0609	First Reading	160
нв0610	First Reading	160
нв0611	First Reading	160
HB0612	First Reading	160
НВ0613	First Reading	160
нв0614	First Reading	160
HB0615	First Reading	160
НВ0616 НВ0617	First Reading	160 160
HB0618	First Reading First Reading	160
HB0619	First Reading First Reading	160
HB0621	First Reading	160
HB0622	First Reading	160
HB0623	First Reading	160
HB0625	First Reading	160
HB0626	First Reading	160
HB0627	First Reading	161
HB0628	First Reading	161
HB0629	First Reading	161
НВ0630 НВ0631	First Reading First Reading	161 161
нв0632	First Reading First Reading	161
HB0633	First Reading	161
HB0634	First Reading	161
HB0635	First Reading	161
НВ0636	First Reading	161
HB0637	First Reading	161
нв0638	First Reading	161
HB0639	First Reading	161
НВ0640 НВ0641	First Reading First Reading	161 161
HB0642	First Reading First Reading	161
HB0643	First Reading	161
HB0644	First Reading	161
НВ0645	First Reading	161
HB0646	First Reading	161
НВ0647	First Reading	162
HB0648	First Reading	162
HB0649	First Reading	162
HB0650	First Reading	162
HB0651	First Reading	162
НВ0652 НВ0653	First Reading First Reading	162 162
нв0653 НВ0654	First Reading First Reading	162
HB0655	First Reading First Reading	162
		102

31st Legislative Day		4/8/2003
НВ0656	First Reading	162
нв0657	First Reading	162
нв0658	First Reading	162
нв0659	First Reading	162
НВ0660	First Reading	162
нв0661	First Reading	162
HB0662	First Reading	162
HB0663 HB0664	First Reading First Reading	162 162
HB0665	First Reading First Reading	162
нв0666	First Reading	163
нв0667	First Reading	163
нв0668	First Reading	163
нв0669	First Reading	163
нв0670	First Reading	163
HB0671	First Reading	163
HB0672	First Reading	163
HB0673 HB0674	First Reading First Reading	163 163
HB0675	First Reading First Reading	163
нв0676	First Reading	163
нв0677	First Reading	163
нв0678	First Reading	163
нв0679	First Reading	163
нв0680	First Reading	163
нв0681	First Reading	163
HB0682	First Reading	163
HB0683 HB0684	First Reading First Reading	163 163
нв0685	First Reading First Reading	163
НВ0686	First Reading First Reading	164
нв0687	First Reading	164
нв0688	First Reading	164
нв0689	First Reading	164
нв0690	First Reading	164
нв0691	First Reading	164
HB0692	First Reading	164
HB0693 HB0694	First Reading First Reading	164 164
HB0695	First Reading First Reading	164
нв0696	First Reading	164
нв0697	First Reading	164
нв0699	First Reading	164
нв0700	First Reading	164
НВ0701	First Reading	164
нв0702	First Reading	164
HB0703	First Reading	164 164
HB0704 HB0705	First Reading First Reading	164
нв0705	First Reading First Reading	165
нв0707	First Reading	165
нв0708	First Reading	165
нв0709	First Reading	165
нв0711	First Reading	165
нв0712	First Reading	165
нв0713	First Reading	165
HB0714	First Reading	165
HB0715	First Reading	165

31st Legislative D	Pay	4/8/2003
НВ0716	First Reading	165
HB0718	First Reading	165
нв0719	First Reading	165
нв0720	First Reading	165
НВ0721	First Reading	165
HB0722	First Reading	165
HB0723	First Reading	165
HB0724	First Reading	165
нв0726	First Reading	165
HB0727	First Reading	165
HB0728	First Reading	165
НВ0729 НВ0730	First Reading First Reading	166 166
HB0731	First Reading	166
HB0732	First Reading	166
HB0733	First Reading	166
нв0734	First Reading	166
нв0735	First Reading	166
нв0736	First Reading	166
HB0737	First Reading	166
нв0738	First Reading	166
нв0739	First Reading	166
HB0740	First Reading	166
HB0741	First Reading	166
HB0742	First Reading	166
HB0743	First Reading	166
HB0744	First Reading	166 166
НВ0745 НВ0746	First Reading First Reading	166
HB0747	First Reading	166
HB0748	First Reading	167
нв0749	First Reading	167
HB0750	First Reading	167
НВ0752	First Reading	167
HB0753	First Reading	167
HB0754	First Reading	167
HB0755	First Reading	167
HB0756	First Reading	167
НВ0757 НВ0758	First Reading	167 167
HB0759	First Reading First Reading	167
нв0760	First Reading	167
нв0761	First Reading	167
нв0762	First Reading	167
HB0763	First Reading	167
HB0764	First Reading	167
НВ0765	First Reading	167
нв0766	First Reading	167
нв0767	First Reading	167
HB0768	First Reading	167
HB0769	First Reading	168
HB0770	First Reading	168
HB0771	First Reading	168
НВ0772 НВ0773	First Reading First Reading	168 168
нво 773 НВ0774	First Reading First Reading	168
HB0775	First Reading First Reading	168
нв0776	First Reading	168
	1 1100 110001119	100

31st Legislative	Day	4/8/2003
нв0777	First Reading	168
нв0778	First Reading	168
нв0779	First Reading	168
нв0780	First Reading	168
нв0781	First Reading	168
нв0782	First Reading	168
нв0783	First Reading	168
HB0784	First Reading	168
нв0785	First Reading	168
HB0786	First Reading	168
HB0787	First Reading	168
HB0788	First Reading	169 169
НВ0789 НВ0790	First Reading First Reading	169
HB0791	First Reading First Reading	169
HB0792	First Reading	169
HB0793	First Reading	169
HB0794	First Reading	169
нв0795	First Reading	169
нв0796	First Reading	169
нв0797	First Reading	169
HB0798	First Reading	169
нв0799	First Reading	169
нв0800	First Reading	169
НВ0801	First Reading	169
HB0802	First Reading	169
HB0803	First Reading	169
НВ0804 НВ0805	First Reading First Reading	169 169
нв0806	First Reading First Reading	169
нв0807	First Reading	170
HB0808	First Reading	170
нв0809	First Reading	170
HB0810	First Reading	170
НВ0811	First Reading	170
НВ0812	First Reading	170
НВ0813	First Reading	170
HB0814	First Reading	170
HB0815	First Reading	170
НВ0816 НВ0817	First Reading	170 170
HB0818	First Reading First Reading	170
нв0819	First Reading First Reading	170
HB0820	First Reading	170
HB0821	First Reading	170
HB0822	First Reading	170
нв0823	First Reading	170
HB0824	First Reading	170
HB0825	First Reading	170
HB0826	First Reading	170
HB0827	First Reading	171
HB0828	First Reading	171
HB0829	First Reading	171
НВ0830 НВ0831	First Reading First Reading	171 171
HB0831	First Reading First Reading	171
нв0833	First Reading First Reading	171
нв0834	First Reading First Reading	171
- 		1,1

31st Legislative D	ay	4/8/2003
НВ0835	First Reading	171
нв0836	First Reading	171
нв0837	First Reading	171
НВ0838	First Reading	171
НВ0839	First Reading	171
HB0840	First Reading	171
HB0841	First Reading	171
HB0843	First Reading	171
HB0844	First Reading	171
HB0845	First Reading	171
HB0846	First Reading	171
HB0848	First Reading	172
HB0849 HB0850	First Reading	172 172
HB0851	First Reading First Reading	172
HB0852	First Reading	172
HB0853	First Reading	172
нв0854	First Reading	172
нв0855	First Reading	172
нв0856	First Reading	172
нв0857	First Reading	172
НВ0858	First Reading	172
нв0859	First Reading	172
нв0860	First Reading	172
HB0861	First Reading	172
HB0862	First Reading	172
HB0863	First Reading	172
HB0864	First Reading	172
HB0865	First Reading	172
НВ0866 НВ0867	First Reading	172 172
нв0868	First Reading First Reading	173
нв0869	First Reading	173
нв0870	First Reading	173
нв0871	First Reading	173
HB0872	First Reading	173
НВ0873	First Reading	173
HB0874	First Reading	173
нв0875	First Reading	173
нв0876	First Reading	173
HB0877	First Reading	173
HB0878	First Reading	173
НВ0879 НВ0880	First Reading First Reading	173 173
НВ0881	First Reading First Reading	173
HB0882	First Reading	173
HB0883	First Reading	173
нв0884	First Reading	173
НВ0885	First Reading	173
НВ0886	First Reading	173
НВ0887	First Reading	174
НВ0888	First Reading	174
НВ0889	First Reading	174
нв0890	First Reading	174
HB0891	First Reading	174
HB0892	First Reading	174
HB0893	First Reading	174
HB0894	First Reading	174

31st Legislative	Day	4/8/2003
нв0895	First Reading	174
HB0896	First Reading	174
НВ0897	First Reading	174
HB0898	First Reading	174
HB0899	First Reading	174
HB0900	First Reading	174
HB0901	First Reading	174
HB0902	First Reading	174
НВ0903 НВ0904	First Reading First Reading	174 174
HB0905	First Reading	174
нв0906	First Reading	175
HB0907	First Reading	175
HB0908	First Reading	175
HB0910	First Reading	175
НВ0911	First Reading	175
HB0913	First Reading	175
HB0914	First Reading	175
НВ0916 НВ0917	First Reading First Reading	175 175
HB0918	First Reading First Reading	175
HB0919	First Reading	175
HB0920	First Reading	175
HB0921	First Reading	175
HB0922	First Reading	175
HB0923	First Reading	175
HB0924	First Reading	175
HB0925	First Reading	175
НВ0926 НВ0927	First Reading First Reading	175 175
HB0928	First Reading First Reading	175
HB0929	First Reading	176
нв0930	First Reading	176
HB0931	First Reading	176
HB0932	First Reading	176
НВ0933	First Reading	176
HB0934	First Reading	176
HB0935	First Reading	176
НВ0936 НВ0937	First Reading First Reading	176 176
HB0938	First Reading	176
HB0940	First Reading	176
HB0941	First Reading	176
HB0942	First Reading	176
HB0943	First Reading	176
HB0944	First Reading	176
HB0945	First Reading	176
НВ0946 НВ0947	First Reading First Reading	176 176
HB0948	First Reading First Reading	176
HB0949	First Reading	177
нв0950	First Reading	177
НВ0951	First Reading	177
НВ0952	First Reading	177
HB0953	First Reading	177
HB0954	First Reading	177
HB0955	First Reading	177
НВ0956	First Reading	177

31st Legislative Day	У	4/8/2003
нв0957	First Reading	177
нв0958	First Reading	177
нв0959	First Reading	177
нв0960	First Reading	177
нв0961	First Reading	177
НВ0962	First Reading	6
нв0963	First Reading	177
нв0964	First Reading	177
HB0965	First Reading	177 177
НВ0966 НВ0967	First Reading First Reading	177
HB0968	First Reading First Reading	177
нв0969	First Reading	177
нв0970	First Reading	178
нв0971	First Reading	178
нв0972	First Reading	178
нв0973	First Reading	178
нв0974	First Reading	178
нв0975	First Reading	178
нв0976	First Reading	178
HB0977	First Reading	178
НВ0978 НВ0979	First Reading First Reading	178 178
нв0979	First Reading First Reading	178
нв0981	First Reading	178
нв0982	First Reading	178
нв0983	First Reading	178
нв0984	First Reading	178
нв0985	First Reading	178
нв0986	First Reading	178
нв0987	First Reading	178
нв0988	First Reading	178
HB0989	First Reading	179 179
HB0990 HB0991	First Reading First Reading	179
нв0992	First Reading	179
нв0993	First Reading	179
нв0994	First Reading	179
нв0995	First Reading	179
нв0996	First Reading	179
нв0997	First Reading	179
нв0998	First Reading	179
нв0999	First Reading	179
HB1000	First Reading	179
HB1001 HB1002	First Reading	179 179
HB1002	First Reading First Reading	179
HB1003	First Reading First Reading	179
HB1006	First Reading	179
HB1007	First Reading	179
нв1008	First Reading	179
нв1009	First Reading	180
НВ1010	First Reading	180
НВ1011	First Reading	180
нв1012	First Reading	180
HB1013	First Reading	180
HB1014	First Reading	180
HB1015	First Reading	180

31st Legislative	Day	4/8/2003
нв1016	First Reading	180
HB1017	First Reading	180
HB1018	First Reading	180
HB1019	First Reading	180
HB1020	First Reading	180
HB1021	First Reading	180
HB1022	First Reading	180
HB1023	First Reading	180
HB1024	First Reading	180
HB1025	First Reading	180
HB1026	First Reading	180
НВ1027 НВ1028	First Reading First Reading	180 180
HB1029	First Reading	181
HB1030	First Reading	181
HB1031	First Reading	181
HB1032	First Reading	181
HB1033	First Reading	181
HB1034	First Reading	181
HB1035	First Reading	181
НВ1036	First Reading	181
HB1037	First Reading	181
HB1038	First Reading	181
НВ1039 НВ1040	First Reading First Reading	181 181
HB1041	First Reading First Reading	181
HB1042	First Reading	181
HB1043	First Reading	181
HB1044	First Reading	181
HB1045	First Reading	181
HB1046	First Reading	181
HB1047	First Reading	181
HB1048	First Reading	182
HB1049	First Reading	182 182
НВ1050 НВ1051	First Reading First Reading	182
HB1052	First Reading	182
HB1053	First Reading	182
HB1054	First Reading	182
HB1055	First Reading	182
HB1056	First Reading	182
HB1057	First Reading	182
HB1058	First Reading	182
HB1059	First Reading	182
HB1060	First Reading	182
НВ1061 НВ1062	First Reading First Reading	182 182
HB1063	First Reading First Reading	182
HB1064	First Reading	183
HB1064	First Reading	182
HB1065	First Reading	183
НВ1065	First Reading	182
HB1066	First Reading	182
HB1066	First Reading	183
HB1067	First Reading	183
HB1067	First Reading	182
НВ1068 НВ1069	First Reading First Reading	183 183
1101007	First Reading	103

31st Legislative D	ay	4/8/2003
нв1070	First Reading	183
нв1071	First Reading	183
HB1072	First Reading	183
HB1073	First Reading	183
HB1074	First Reading	183
HB1075	First Reading	183
HB1076	First Reading	183
НВ1077 НВ1078	First Reading	183 183
HB1076	First Reading First Reading	183
HB1080	First Reading	183
HB1081	First Reading	183
HB1082	First Reading	184
HB1083	First Reading	184
HB1084	First Reading	184
нв1085	First Reading	184
HB1086	First Reading	184
HB1111	First Reading	184
HB1112	First Reading	184
HB1113 HB1114	First Reading First Reading	184 184
нв1114 НВ1116	First Reading First Reading	6
HB1165	First Reading First Reading	6
HB1166	First Reading	6
HB1191	First Reading	6
HB1208	First Reading	6
HB1300	First Reading	184
HB1301	First Reading	184
HB1312	First Reading	184
HB1313	First Reading	184
HB1336	First Reading	184
HB1337 HB1339	First Reading	184 184
нв1339	First Reading First Reading	184
HB1341	First Reading	184
HB1342	First Reading	184
HB1343	First Reading	185
HB1359	First Reading	6
HB1402	First Reading	185
HB1403	First Reading	185
HB1404	First Reading	185
HB1405	First Reading	185
HB1406 HB1407	First Reading First Reading	185 185
HB1408	First Reading First Reading	185
HB1409	First Reading	185
HB1410	First Reading	185
HB1411	First Reading	185
HB1414	First Reading	6
HB1480	First Reading	6
HB1519	First Reading	185
HB1520	First Reading	185
HB1529	First Reading	7
HB1577	First Reading	7
HB1580	First Reading	185
HB1604 HB1729	First Reading First Reading	7 7
HB2088	First Reading First Reading	7
1102000	TITE REAGING	I

31st Legislative D	ay	4/8/2003
нв2203	First Reading	7
нв2219	First Reading	185
HB2220	First Reading	185
HB2234	First Reading	7
НВ2268	First Reading	7
нв2298	First Reading	7
HB2316	First Reading	7
HB2331	First Reading	7
НВ2360 НВ2361	First Reading First Reading	185 186
HB2362	First Reading	186
HB2364	First Reading	186
нв2365	First Reading	186
нв2366	First Reading	186
HB2374	First Reading	7
HB2386	First Reading	7
HB2412	First Reading	7
HB2447	First Reading	7
НВ2456 НВ2489	First Reading	7 7
HB2491	First Reading First Reading	7
HB2493	First Reading	7
HB2502	First Reading	7
нв2518	First Reading	186
нв2526	First Reading	8
HB2553	First Reading	8
нв2567	First Reading	8
нв2571	First Reading	185
HB2577	First Reading	8
HB2614	First Reading	186
НВ2615 НВ2654	First Reading	186
HB2655	First Reading First Reading	186 186
HB2656	First Reading	186
нв2657	First Reading	186
нв2659	First Reading	186
нв2661	First Reading	186
НВ2663	First Reading	186
HB2664	First Reading	186
НВ2668	First Reading	186
HB2669	First Reading	186
НВ2671 НВ2672	First Reading	186 187
HB2673	First Reading First Reading	187
HB2674	First Reading	187
HB2678	First Reading	187
нв2680	First Reading	187
нв2681	First Reading	187
HB2682	First Reading	187
HB2685	First Reading	187
НВ2686	First Reading	187
HB2688	First Reading	187
HB2691	First Reading	187
HB2693	First Reading	187
НВ2696 НВ2697	First Reading First Reading	187 187
HB2698	First Reading First Reading	187
HB2700	First Reading	187
		107

31st Legislative I	Day	4/8/2003
НВ2704	First Reading	187
нв2705	First Reading	187
HB2708	First Reading	187
HB2714	First Reading	187
нв2716	First Reading	188
HB2718	First Reading	188
HB2719	First Reading	188
НВ2721 НВ2726	First Reading First Reading	188 188
HB2730	First Reading First Reading	188
HB2735	First Reading First Reading	188
HB2739	First Reading	188
HB2741	First Reading	188
нв2742	First Reading	188
нв2743	First Reading	188
HB2744	First Reading	188
HB2745	First Reading	188
нв2746	First Reading	188
HB2747	First Reading	188
HB2749	First Reading	188
HB2750	First Reading	188
HB2751	First Reading	188
НВ2753 НВ2756	First Reading	188
HB2758	First Reading First Reading	189 189
HB2759	First Reading First Reading	189
HB2761	First Reading First Reading	189
HB2762	First Reading	189
нв2763	First Reading	189
нв2772	First Reading	8
нв2779	First Reading	8
нв2790	First Reading	8
нв2966	First Reading	8
нв2995	First Reading	8
HB2996	First Reading	8
HB3021	First Reading	8
HB3022	First Reading	8
НВ3023 НВ3044	First Reading	8
HB3057	First Reading First Reading	8
HB3062	First Reading First Reading	8
HB3082	First Reading	8
нв3086	First Reading	8
нв3095	First Reading	8
нв3316	First Reading	9
нв3407	First Reading	9
нв3409	First Reading	189
HB3410	First Reading	189
HB3412	First Reading	189
HB3413	First Reading	189
HB3414	First Reading	189
HB3415	First Reading	189
HB3417	First Reading	189
НВ3418 НВ3493	First Reading First Reading	189
нв3493	First Reading First Reading	9
нв3512	First Reading First Reading	9
HB3518	First Reading First Reading	9
1100010	TITUE REGULING	9

31st Legislative Da	У	4/8/2003
нв3530	First Reading	9
нв3532	First Reading	9
нв3547	First Reading	9
НВ3556	First Reading	9
HB3639	First Reading	189
нв3640	First Reading	189
HB3641	First Reading	189
HB3642	First Reading	189 189
НВ3643 НВ3644	First Reading First Reading	189
нв3645	First Reading	190
нв3646	First Reading	190
нв3647	First Reading	190
HB3648	First Reading	190
нв3650	First Reading	190
НВ3651	First Reading	190
HB3652	First Reading	190
HB3653	First Reading	190
HB3654	First Reading	190
НВ3663 НВ3664	First Reading First Reading	9 190
HB3665	First Reading	190
нв3666	First Reading	190
нв3667	First Reading	190
нв3669	First Reading	190
нв3670	First Reading	190
HB3711	First Reading	190
HB3712	First Reading	190
HB3714	First Reading	185
HB3715	First Reading	190
НВ3716 НВ3717	First Reading First Reading	190 191
нв3718	First Reading	191
SB0003	Recalled	61
SB0003	Third Reading	62
SB0073	Third Reading	73
SB0073	Recalled	71
SB0084	Third Reading	83
SB0084	Vote Intention	85
SB0100 SB0155	Third Reading Third Reading	85 93
SB0155	Recalled	92
SB0196	Third Reading	97
SB0263	Third Reading	150
SB0600	Third Reading	99
SB0600	Recalled	98
SB0683	Third Reading	110
SB0813	Third Reading	111
SB0814	Third Reading	112
SB0878 SB0973	Third Reading Third Reading	113 152
SB1070	Third Reading Third Reading	115
SB1116	Recalled	118
SB1116	Third Reading	119
SB1125	Third Reading	120
SB1212	Third Reading	121
SB1321	Third Reading	128
SB1329	Third Reading	132

31st Legislative	Day	4/8/2003
SB1378	Vote Intention	137
SB1378	Third Reading	133
SB1414	Third Reading	134
SB1417	Third Reading	136
SB1442	Third Reading	152
SB1461	Third Reading	154
SB1474	Third Reading	137
SB1476	Second Reading	61
SB1492	Third Reading	139
SB1506	Third Reading	142
SB1510	Third Reading	142
SB1527	Third Reading	9
SB1530	Third Reading	50
SB1543	Third Reading	14
SB1586	Third Reading	15
SB1586	Vote Intention	21
SB1589	Third Reading	20
SB1592	Third Reading	26
SB1592	Vote Intention	27
SB1640	Third Reading	28
SB1649	Third Reading	28
SB1737	Third Reading	29
SB1754	Third Reading	30
SB1763	Third Reading	35
SB1763	Out Of Record	39
SB1774	Third Reading	39
SB1777	Third Reading	40
SB1803	Third Reading	41
SB1864	Third Reading	42
SB1865	Third Reading	43
SB1881	Third Reading	44
SB1883	Third Reading	47
SB1906	Third Reading	48
SB1918	Third Reading	49
SB1938	Third Reading	51
SB1961	Third Reading	52
SB1963	Third Reading	52
SB1983	Third Reading	58
SR0114	Resolution Offered	2
SR0115	Resolution Offered	157
Senate to Order-Se	enator Demuzio	1
Prayer-Pastor Ed	Ingram	1
Pledge of Allegian	nce	1
Journals-Approved		1
Journals-Postpone	d	1
Messages from the		2
Messages from the	House	4
Committee Reports		27
Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes		59
Committee Reports		59
Messages from the	House	60
Adjournment		191

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, the hour of twelve o'clock having arrived, the Senate will come to order. It is my understanding that the Republicans are still in caucus. We have a number of housekeeping items to do this morning, and so I've indicated to them that we will be proceeding. The regular Session of the 92nd -- 93rd General Assembly will come to order. Our Members will be at their desks. Our guests in the galleries will please rise. And our prayer -- invocation today will be by -- will be given by Pastor Ed Ingram of the Western Oaks Baptist Church, Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Ingram.

PASTOR ED INGRAM:

(Prayer by Pastor Ed Ingram)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Link)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...of the Journal, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Senate Journals of Tuesday, March 25, and Wednesday, March 26, 2003.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the motion by Senator Woolard. Are there any objections? There are none. So ordered. Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

Mr. President, I also move that the reading and approval of the Journals of Thursday, March 27th; Wednesday, April 2nd; Thursday, April 3rd; and Friday, April 4th, in the year 2003, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

All right. You've heard the motion, as posed by Senator Woolard. Are there any objections? If not, so ordered. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution -- 114, offered by Senator Link and all Members.

It is a death resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Senator Harmon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HARMON:

On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point, sir.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you. For the last several months, I've been very fortunate in my district office to have two interns from Dominican University working. And to help round out their experience and let them see a little bit of what we do in Springfield, I invited them to come down. I'm very honored to present to the Senate, Teresa Grygiel and Dan Gajda, who've been working very hard. And I'd ask you all to join me in welcoming them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Welcome to Springfield. Right -- right behind the Senator. Message from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

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

House Bills 248, 314 through 316, 552 through 553, 557 through 557 -- pardon me, that was 555 through 557, 558 through 564, 567 through 569, 570 through 572, 575 through 581, 582 through 591, 592 through 601, 602 through 611, 612 through 619, 621 to 622, 623, 625 through 633, 634 through 643, 644 through 653, 654 through 663, 664 through 673, 674 through 683, 684 through 693, 694 through 697, 699 through 704, 705 through

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

709, 711 through 715, 716 through 718, 724 through 726, 620 --I'm sorry, 720, 721, 722, 727 through 736, 737 through 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758 through 767, 768 through 777, 778 through 787, 788 through 793, 794 through 803, 804 through 813, 814 through 823, 834 {sic} (824) through 841, 843, 844, 845, 846, 848 through 855, 856 through 865, 866 through 875, 876 through 885, 886 through 895, 896 through 906, 907, 908, 910, 911, 913 and (9)14, 916, 917, 918 and 919, 920 through 929, 930 through 938, 940, 941 through 950, 951 through 960, 961, 963 through 970 {sic} (971), 972 through 981, 982 through 991, 992 through 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1006 through 1012, 1013 through 1022, 1023 through 1032, 1033 through 1042, 1043 through 1052, 1053 through 1062, 1063 through 1072, 1073 through -- pardon me, through 1082, 1083 through 1086, 1111 through 1114, 1113 {sic} (1300) through 1101 {sic} (1301), -pardon me, 1312, 1313, 1336, 1337, 1339 through 1343, 1402, 1403 through 1411, 1519, 1520, 1580, 1641 through 1647, 1649, 1650 through 1659, 1660, 1661, 1663 through 1667, 1669 through 1671, 1672, 1674 through 1678, 1681 through 1684, 1685 through 1694, 1695 through 1697, 1699 through 1705, 1705 {sic} (1706) through 1714, 1716, 1717 through 1726, 1727, 1728, 1730 through 1737, 1738 through 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1752, 1753, 1754, 1756 through 1764, 1765 through 1774, 1775, 1776, 1778 through 1785, 1786 through 1795, 1796 through 1805, 1806 through 1808, 1810 through 1816, 1817 through 1821, 1823 through 1827, 1828 through 1837, 1838 through 1842, 1844 through 1848, 1849 through 1851, 1853 through 1859, 1860 through 1865, 1867 through 1869, -pardon me, 1871, 1872 through 1888, -- pardon me, that's 1872 through 1881, 1882 through 1891, 1892 through 1901, 1902 through 1911, 1912 through 1921, 1922 through 1929, 1931 and 1932, 1933 through 1942, 1943 through 1949, 1951, 1953, 1954, 1956 through 1965, 1966 through 1975, 1976 through 1985, 1986 through 1997, 1998 through 2003, 2004 -- pardon me, 2005 through 2008, 2009 through 2018, 2019 through 2028, 2029 through 2038, 2039 through 2048.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, the Democrat Judiciary staff has a very talented and charming young lady working for them by the name of Jeannie Romas. And we're privileged today to have her mother and father in the President's Gallery upstairs, Nick and Kathy Romas from Westchester, Illinois. And I would like you to welcome them here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome. Messages from the House. Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Geo-Karis. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

 $\mbox{\sc I}$ -- $\mbox{\sc I}$ wanted to mention that they live in Senator Cronin's district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

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:

House Bills 2050 through 2059, 2060 through 2061, pardon me -- that's 2061, 2063 through 2070, 2072 through 2078, 2080 through 2082, 2083 through 2087, 2089 through 2093, 2094 through 2103, 2106 through 2115, 2116, 2117, 2119 through 2126, 2127 through 2135, 2219, 2220, 2360, 2362 {sic} (2361), 2364, 2365, 2362, 2366, 2410, 2518, 2571, 2614, 2615, 2654 through 2657, 2659, 3266 through 3268, 2661 through -- 2663, 2664, 2668, 2669, 2671 through 2674, 2678, 2680 through 2682, 2685 through -- pardon me, 2685, 2686, 2688, 2691, 2693, 2696, 2697, 2698, 2700, 2704, 2705, 2708, 2714, 2716, 2718, 2719, 2721, 2726, 2730, 2735, 2739, 2741 through 2746, 2747, 2749 through 2751, 2753, 2756, 2758, 2759, 2761, 2762, 2763, 3236 through 3239, 3242, 3244, 3250, 3251, 3252, 3255, 3259 through 3262, 3264, 3269, 3270, 3271 through 3412, 3413, 3415, 3417, pardon me,

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

3418, 3639 through 3645, 3647 {sic} (3646) through 3648, 3650 through 3654, 3664, 3665, -- pardon me, 3666, 3667, 3669, 3670, 3711, 3712, 3714, 3715, 3716, 3717, 3718, 565, 710, 2200, 2591, 235, 305, 1256, 1415, 1459, 2215, 2221, 2459, -- pardon me, 2480, 2786, 2840, 2866, 3047, 3061, 3113, 3468, 416, 486, 1180, 1360, 1715, 2317, 2370, 2605, 2870, 3088, 3190, 3309, 3661, 1091, 120, 223, 1475, 1662, 1952, 2187, 2514, 2549, 2778, 2943, 3191, 3218, 3618, 842, 1281, 1809, 2201, 2265, 2280, 2369, -- pardon me, 2439, 2618, 3321, 3398, 3486, 3676, 3676 {sic} (3679) and 209.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

For purposes of an announcement -- or, let the record reflect, Mr. President, Senator Lauzen is absent due to illness today. And it's an excused absence if the record -- reflect that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The record will so reflect. There's a number of House bills here that need to be read in, and at some point, somebody needs to decide what we're going to do. We're going to the Order of House Bills 1st.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 13, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 20, offered by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- 32, offered by Senator Meeks.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 44, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 85, offered by Senator Crotty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 89, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 191, offered by Senator Petka.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 197, offered by Senator Henson. An Act -- Hendon, pardon me.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 206, offered by Senator Silverstein.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 215, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 218, offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 274, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 310, offered by Senator del Valle.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 462, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 468, offered by Senator DeLeo.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 539, offered by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 548, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 962, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1116, offered by Senator Walsh.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1165, offered by Senator Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1166, offered by Senator Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1191, offered by Senator Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1208, offered by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1359, offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1414, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1480, offered by Senator Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 1529, offered by Senator Hendon. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 1577, offered by Senator Wendell Jones. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 1604, offered by Senator Wendell Jones. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 1729, offered by Senator Clayborne. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2088, offered by Senator Silverstein. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2203, offered by Senator Sandoval. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2234, offered by Senator Schoenberg. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2268, offered by Senator Obama. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2298, offered by Senator Geo-Karis. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2316, offered by Senator Walsh. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2331, offered by Senator Cullerton. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2374, offered by Senator Ronen. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2386, offered by Senator Lightford. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2412, offered by Senator Clayborne. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2447, offered by Senator Cronin. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2456, offered by Senator Meeks. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2489, offered by Senator Welch. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 2491, offered by Senator Meeks. (Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2493, offered by Senator Cullerton.

House Bill 2502, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2526, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2553, offered by Senator Maloney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2567, offered by Senator Crotty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2577, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2772, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2779, offered by Senator David Sullivan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2790, offered by Senator Brady.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2996, offered by Senator Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3021, offered by Senators Martinez and Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3022, offered by Senator Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2966, offered by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2995, offered by Senator Garrett.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3023, offered by Senators Martinez and Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3044, offered by Senators Martinez and del Valle.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3057, offered by Senator Garrett.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3062, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3082, offered by Senator Lightford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3086, offered by Senator Meeks.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3095, offered by Senator Crotty.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3316, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3407, offered by Senator Sieben.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3493, offered by Senator Righter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3504, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3512, offered by Senator Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3518, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3530, offered by Senator Sandoval.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3532, offered by Senator Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3547, offered by Senator Hunter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3556, offered by Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3663, offered by Senator Lightford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've arrived at the main event. Chicago Tribune has requested permission to do still photographs. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Ladies and Gentlemen. With leave of the Body, we will move to page 24 on your Calendar. 24 on your Calendar. And the first bill is 1527. Madam Secretary, read the bill. 1527.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1527.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Illinois Senate. Senate Bill 1527, with Floor Amendment No. 3, creates the Illinois Hunting Heritage Protection Act, which specifies that the State public lands will have open access for recreational hunting. Provides that State public land management decisions and actions shall not result in a net loss of land acreage available for hunting on State public lands. Provides that no withdrawals, change of classification, or change of management status that closes one hundred acres or more by the State -public land may occur, unless the Governor has submitted written notification to the General Assembly regarding the reasons for the closure. There's only one thing that -- that needs to be done with this bill whenever it gets over into the House, and it seems as though in the bill that the -- the word "acreage" was misspelled in a couple places. So, we'll do a technical amendment in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Our committee -- on behalf of Senator Jones, he's worked very hard on -- on this piece of legislation and he's -- he's indicated to us that they were going to move it forward to the House and continue to work on it and fine-tune it down. So, we stand in support of -- of Senate Bill 1527.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

Is this a genealogy bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

No, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR WOOLARD:

What -- what -- what -- the -- the title is kind of misleading, because I -- I thought hunting heritage would be maybe genealogy or something like that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Woolard, one thing that we have not put in this bill and you may want to look at it, about a possibility about doing it. You know, our hunters do wear orange vests and orange hats. There may be a possibility that we could amend this over in the House and put reflective tape all the way around 'em.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard. Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

You know, I -- I think that I have realized, without any reservations, that that may wind up being the worst bill that I've ever sent to the other Chamber since I've been in the Legislature. I -- I think, John, that, you know, someone that kind of hides behind the perception of being a seasoned legislator, that if I'd been around as long as you have and this was your first bill, I'd really be upset. You know, is -- is it because your leadership's been holding you back, or is it because this Chamber is controlled by the other Body, or -- or... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is that -- is that a rhetorical question? SENATOR WOOLARD:

No. I'm -- I'm going to -- I'm going to kind of...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Well, I guess, Senator Woolard, that -- the -- the gentleman that's in the Chair today as -- as the presiding President is the -- is the Chairman of the Rules Committee. He and I have a very good relationship. It's getting better. And so, hopefully, in the future, there'll be some more of my bills come out of Rules Committee and -- and we'll be able to hear them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

This one must have slipped me by. Senator Woolard. SENATOR WOOLARD:

One -- one last question. I -- I just wondered if you'd consider taking this out of the record until we can make sure that the title is truly reflective of what the bill's about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

I would be more than happy to do that, Senator Woolard, if you will recall your boat bill and -- and -- on the reflective tape.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I understand that the Environmental Council has some misgivings about this bill but they're willing to have you pass it here and then put amendment in the House which will satisfy them. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Geo-Karis, that's exactly right and that's what we're going to do when it gets over in the House, is clarify some language for them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski. I'm sorry. Senator Geo-Karis. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Oh, thank you, Mr. President. I'm glad you recognized me. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, as long as -- as Senator Jones has given me his word about what he just said to me, I certainly will support his bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Senator, I'm afraid -- I apologize, but I was in the phone booth when you evidently were explaining what this bill does. Can -- can you give me some idea of what it does again? Just very briefly. Doesn't -- just a thumbnail sketch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's going to be another very long day, so we ought to pay attention, be in our seats, or -- or we'll be here till midnight, because -- Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Burzynski, this bill simply says that if the Governor or Department of Natural Resources chooses to take away one hundred acres of our public lands and do something else with it, either for security reasons, you know, terrorism or whatever, that they have to -- to assure us that they give us back a hundred acres.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Is it -- is it specific as to what part of the State this should be in? I mean, it's not like just towards southern Illinois or anything -- and doesn't have anything to do with hunting or wearing shoes while hunting or anything like that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

No, it does not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Do you wear shoes when you hunt? I -- I just was kind of curious about that. I didn't know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Well, it's a little different in Jefferson County than it is in Franklin County, where you originally came from. Yes, we do wear shoes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, question is, shall Senate Bill 1527 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that who wish? question, the Ayes are 50 -- I'm sorry, the -- the Ayes are 49, the Nays are 2, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill -- 1527, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Is there leave to return to 1530? Leave is granted. On the Order of 3rd -- 3rd Reading is House Bill -- I'm sorry, Senate Bill 1535. All right. 1543. Senator Radogno. Radogno, do you wish to have that called? All right. Senator Radogno wishes to have Senate Bill 1543 called. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1543.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill creates the Residential Health Care Facility Resident Sexual Assault and Death Review Team Act. This is patterned after the Child Death Review Act that we have in the State to review deaths of children under the care of DCFS. This will -- whenever there is a confirmed sexual assault in a nursing home or the death of a patient who's had a care violation confirmed by the Department of Public Health within six months, a team will convene to review that death. It's not intended to be punitive, so there are not penalties involved. The team itself is made up of local professionals in the area. They are not intended to be compensated. It's just a matter to try to see if we can't do things better and avoid sexual assaults and unnecessary deaths in nursing homes. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1543 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 -- take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1543, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We'll skip down to, with leave of the Body, to 1573. Senator Ronen. 1576. Senator Link. 1586. Senator Obama. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1586. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1586.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill has been worked on for several years. The basic concern here is the various exceptions that exist for the Open Meetings Act. When people go into closed session, what kind of record is being kept to ensure that in fact they are abiding by the exceptions and the law. The proposal by the Press Association is for a recording to take place within the closed meeting, a closed -- a recording that will be under seal and not divulged except under court order and will be destroyed after eighteen months. It -- after some initial concerns - I think most of them have been addressed - it has bipartisan support. I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield for some questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator, what -- what is the need for all of these recordings to take place in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

The concern is that there may be circumstances in which a public body cites the need for a closed meeting, cites an exception to the Open Meetings Act, but there's no way to determine whether in fact the business that's being discussed behind closed doors in fact is part of the exception. And so, the idea is, is that this recording then would be in place. Again, it's not divulged. I think the assumption is, is that local bodies are going to be following the rules. But if it turned out that in fact there was some concern, then at least there would be a recording available to show that in fact that public body was abiding by the Open Meetings Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator DeLeo temporarily in the Chair. Senator Jones. SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Obama, there are currently minutes taking -- taken at these meetings which -- which record the general subject and the reason for the meeting. Those minutes are then made available to the public as to the general nature of why the meeting was in closed session - might be personnel; it might be purchase of property; it might be litigation. Why isn't that record enough?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Well, Senator Jones, I think you answered your own question. There's -- there's a bald assertion that that's what the discussion in the closed meeting is about, but there's no record of the actual conversation that takes place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Senator, what effect to a candid and forthright discussion will this bill bring to a closed meeting?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

None, I believe, assuming that in fact the body is having a closed meeting for a purpose that is permissible under the Open Meetings Act. The recording, as I indicated, simply needs to be stored. It is not transcribed. There -- there's no, you know, court clerk in there keeping minutes. But the recording is stored and it would only come up if, in fact, a lawsuit was filed because there was a strong indicator that, in fact, other discussions or decisions had been made behind closed doors, other than those that were stated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio back in the Chair. Senator Wendell Jones. SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Have -- Senator, have you had a lot of constituents complaining about a problem with the Open Meetings Act?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

This is an initiative of the Illinois Press Association.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

So, it's the members of the press who think that we're talking about things behind closed doors that we shouldn't. I spent -- I spent ten years in local government, and as the village -- village president, it was my job to make sure that -- that we stayed on the subject, that we stayed on only those subjects that were allowable to be discussed in a closed session. Our attorneys was -- were always with us and -- and if we tended to stray, the attorney would say we're getting into areas that we are not allowed to discuss, we're supposed to be discussing personnel or the purchase of property or something like that. We -- we tried to stay on the straight and narrow and -- and I think, for the most part, our local governments do that. And -- and clearly this bill would be an unfunded mandate, and in my -- my judgment, it is a mistake. I won't speak any longer, but I intend to vote No. I think it would be

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

a mistake to burden our local governments with this additional requirement. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Senator, have you ever served as a village or city attorney?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

No, ma'am.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, I have. For twenty-five years I was village attorney for the Village of Vernon Hills and I gave that up last December because I had just too much to do. And I also served as the mayor, for one term, in the City of Zion. But I can tell you, as a village attorney, there's discussions on personnel, litigation, and buying property. When you say there should be a tape recording, there's nothing infallible about recording. Supposing someone who has a tape recording, they just shut it off and then just start at another point. still won't get what you think you're getting out of it. They -- they keep minutes at the village executive meetings and -executive session meetings and they're -- they're available to the public at the right time. I think we are putting an onerous burden on municipalities to go into recording of their executive committee meetings. I think it's wrong. I think it's -- it's burdensome and expensive, and I don't think we need it at this time. And I'm going to -- I'm rising to speak against it, in spite of the fact that I love the Illinois Press Association, and they may not like me for this, but I have had no complaints about it, but I have had complaints from villages saying, "Are

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

you going to put some more burdens on us?" And therefore, I rise to speak against it. I don't think it's necessary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I also served in a municipal body for eight years, not as long as Senator Geo-Karis or Senator Jones, but I am in support of this bill. In fact, I'm a I think that most municipalities do, in fact, try to stay on the straight and narrow when it comes to discussing the appropriate subjects in a closed meeting. But there is no reassurance for the public that that is, in fact, going on. And the fact of the matter is, these recordings are not going to be routinely opened up. Only when there's a reason to believe that there is an issue. And in -- being in the position we're in where we get to represent a number of municipalities, I have found that there are some, in fact, during certain times, when they've got a lot of strife, where this is a problem. For those that are on the straight and narrow and doing the right thing, this should serve as a protection to them, because they can offer up these recordings and say, "Look, we didn't stray outside the bounds of the discussion that was appropriate." it offers a protection. In terms of the cost, if there is a municipality in this State that can't afford a cassette tape recorder, I will buy them one. That is just not an excuse. And I would urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Very briefly, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Obama, I'm in favor of this legislation. One question I want to ask is, I think that this bill or a similar bill has been presented in the House in the last five years or so, and I think twice before I've supported it. To my recollection, the language in those two bills required the judge, if there was a lawsuit, to review the audio or videotape

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

in camera before anything else happened. It's my recollection your bill says the judge "may" review it in camera. Now, I've talked to the Press Association and they have made a comment to me that maybe that's something they'll explore, but I was interested in your thoughts on that. My concern is that the audiotape or videotape becomes subject to discovery even though the municipality or local government did their jobs and that that could be avoided by requiring an in camera review by the court.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

It's certainly my understanding, as we are moving this bill forward, that in fact such an in camera review would take place. I mean, I -- I guess your question raises two possible issues: One, given the word "may", does that mean that it might be done, rather than in camera, out in the open. Clearly that, I think, is contrary to the intent of the bill, and I think you're right, that maybe we need to change that word. So, I -- I would see that as a technical amendment that -- that we probably will need to address in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Obama may close. SENATOR OBAMA:

I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1586 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 44, the Nays are 9, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1586, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on -- the Chair wants to point out that we're probably not going to get back to these bills if you pass 'em up. So, 1592. Senator Collins. Madam Secretary, 1592. I beg your pardon. I missed one. With leave of the Body, we'll return to Senate Bill 1589. Madam Secretary, I'm sorry. 1589.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senate Bill 1589.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1589 requires the Department of Public Health to sample and collect data on individual cases where obesity is being actively treated and analyze that data in order to evaluate the impact of treating obesity. It also establishes the Obesity Study and Prevention Fund in the State Treasurer {sic}. compliments Senate Bill 810, which is sponsored by Senator Syverson, which passed this Body last week. This bill came out of committee with an 11 to 0 vote. Several states - Louisiana, Ohio, Texas and Indiana - have taken a similar approach and found that the information received from the study has been beneficial in saving lives and reducing health care costs, especially Medicaid. Senate Bill 1589 also addresses the Public Health crisis of obesity in response to a recent U.S. Surgeon General report on the problem of obesity in America. lastly, for the second year in a row, Chicago was ranked as the second fattest city in the United States. I feel that this is an excellent bill, and I appreciate a favorable vote, the same as you gave Senator Syverson last week.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

On the last bill, 1586, I pushed the button and it didn't record. Would just like to be -- would like to go on record as a -- as a green light, please. 1586. Green light. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The record will so reflect. Further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

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

Sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, we have received a fiscal note on this bill, and I don't know if you have a copy of it or not, from the Department of Public Health. Indicates that the total -- if it were -- if it were fully implemented as -- as set forth in your bill, cost is four hundred and sixty-three thousand dollars. That's an -- that's an annual cost. First question I have is, would the money for this come out of the General Revenue Fund or is there another funding source you've identified?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Senator, this bill is subject to appropriation. We have not received a fiscal note on this legislation; however, other states that has this program in operation has indicated that it only costs two hundred thousand dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

We will have a copy of this made for you and get it over to you right away, Senator. I don't know about the other states' programs. This is the Department of Public Health's estimate. The question that I asked, I think, whether or not the funds would come from General Revenue, I don't know that you answered that, but let me -- let me ask you to answer that, along with another question. And that is, the description of the bill requires the hospitals to abstract their medical records for inpatients hospitalized for these issues. In other words, the hospitals are going to do -- have to do some data collection retrieval, pulling some files and getting some information. Will the money in this program, if it's appropriated, be used to reimburse the hospitals for the cost of doing that work for the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

No, Senator Righter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, can I -- I want to ask, again, why you wouldn't consider reimbursing the hospitals for this work, first. And second, I want to go back again to the question of, if funds are appropriated - I understand it's subject to appropriation - but if they are appropriated, will they be appropriated from the General Revenue Fund or is there another funding stream that you've identified?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. That's the second time we asked that question. Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

If this legislation is passed, it will probably come from the General Revenue Fund, Senator. There is no other fund to pull these dollars from.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, have you had any conversations with the Governor's Office with regards to whether or not, in their budget tomorrow, they are going to announce that they are going to put some money into this program? I -- again, my concern, as always, is that we raise expectations, that we pass a great new program and it doesn't have any money in it. Can you tell me whether or not there's any commitment or even any conversation with the Governor's Office that they're going to put any money in this? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

No, Senator. I have not had any conversations with the Governor's Office. We're simply trying to make this program available to those who are in need. We must address the obesity problem in this State, regardless of how much it costs. Obesity is having major effects on -- on -- it has public health issues, major impacts on the central nervous system. Just yesterday I was on my way down here and I heard on the radio

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

that now it has been found that obesity affects mental -- is having mental health impact. So, you know, two hundred thousand dollars, that's not a whole lot of money. We need to address this issue immediately, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I appreciate very much, Senator, answering the questions. I would just ask the Members, especially on my side of the aisle, to be very careful with this piece of legislation. There is an annual cost. It does come from the General Revenue Fund. It is almost half a million dollars. We already do not reimburse our hospitals the way we should be. The question is, do we want to put more expense on the General Revenue Fund and ask the hospitals to pick up another duty mandated by the State for which they're not going to be reimbursed. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Well, thank you very much, Mr. President. To the bill: Under the past two administrations, the Edgar administration and the Ryan administration, these Governors have had a very active Council on Health and Physical Fitness. It's within the And the Governor's Council on Department of Public Health. Health and -- Fitness has looked at this issue extensively. think rather specifically in the area of juvenile obesity. And clearly, this is an issue where an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Now, your bill, as I look at it here on the analysis on the computer screen, talks a lot about doing more studies. And I really don't know that this is an issue that we need to study any further. What's really necessary here is how do we take appropriate action to change behavior, and especially juvenile behavior, in terms of activity, exercise, physical education, nutrition. What we need is, the money actually should be targeted towards behavioral changes so that we can address -- we know what the problems are. absolutely correct in all the different downsides to obesity and all the health problems caused by obesity, especially in -- in

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

young people that lead to a lifetime of illness. So, I don't think your bill -- you're well-intended, but I don't think the - the direction the bill's going is the right direction. We don't need any more studies. We need effective actions that will help change behavior in terms of exercise and nutrition. And for that reason, I intend to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1589 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 31, the Nays are 19, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1589, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSKAM:

To request a verification of the previous vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Roskam has requested a verification. Will all Members be in their seats? Madam Secretary, will you read the names of the Members who voted in the affirmative, please?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Bomke, Collins, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, del Valle, Demuzio, Garrett, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Jacobs, Lightford, Maloney, Martinez, Munoz, Obama, Ronen, Sandoval, Schoenberg, Silverstein, David Sullivan, John Sullivan, Syverson, Trotter, Viverito, Walsh, Welch and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam, do you question the presence of any Member who voted in the affirmative? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Munoz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Munoz on the Floor? Senator Munoz on the Floor? Senator Munoz? Strike his name. ...Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lightford on the Floor? Senator Lightford? Senator Lightford is on the Floor.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Syverson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Syverson. Senator Syverson on the Floor? Strike his name. On the verified roll call, the Nays are -- the Ayes are 29, the Nays are 19, 1 voting Present. Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President, I ask to postpone this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The lady requests Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill -- all right. The bill will be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. 1592. Senator Collins. Madam Secretary, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Bottom of page 24. Senate Bill 1592, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1592.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1592 provides needed technical cleanup to the Illinois affordable housing tax credit, which was signed into law in August 2001. My legislation simply clarifies the intent of the statute, which will permit the purpose of this initiative to allow private sector contributions to affordable housing developments. Thank you very much. And I'm open for questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I would just urge my colleagues to support this legislation. This is a little

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

cleanup on a bill that I passed a year or two ago, and it's good legislation. And would like your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Roskam. None. If -- further If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1592 discussion? Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Have all voted who wish? The voting is open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are none, none voting Senate Bill 1592, having received the required Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. Rules -- Rules Committee, Madam Secretary. I beg your pardon. Senator --Senator Martinez. Senator Martinez, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Mr. President, my button was flashing green, but it didn't register my vote up on the board. Can you please reflect that I'm voting Aye?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm told by the Assistant Secretary of the Senate that you are, in fact, recorded as in the affirmative. All right. Bottom of page 24. I'm sorry. We -- we need to go to Committee Reports to read the Rules Committee. Leave? Leave is granted. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Demuzio, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Executive Committee - Floor Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 155, Floor Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 600, Floor Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 732, and Floor Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1116.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Silverstein, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

For the purpose of an announcement, Mr. President. The Senate Executive Committee will meet at 1:50 in Room -- 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Silverstein. 1:50, the committee will meet in Room 212. Bottom of page 24. Senate Bill 1600, Madam Secretary. Actually, take that out of the record. Let's -- let's -- leave

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

of the Body, page 25. 25, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1640. At the bottom, Madam Secretary. 1640. Senator Obama. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1640.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a -- an initiative that came originally from the National Guard. The idea is to provide waiver of bank fees during the time that reservists are in active service. Obviously, it is an initiative that relates directly to our armed forces fighting overseas. There were no objections in committee, and I would ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1640 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1640, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Leave of the Body, 1649. Senator Wojcik. Madam Secretary, 1649, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1649.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1649 requires the State Registrar to prescribe and distribute a form for a certificate of stillbirth, which is in the same form as -- and filed in the same manner as a certificate of live birth. This legislation was brought to me through a constituent in my district who has had numerous

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

stillborn children, and she feels that she needs something for closure, and something to keep her enhanced, if you will, in -- in -- with the death of this child and two others that she lost. And it also requires a certificate to be prepared in accordance with the rules adopted by the State Registrar. It's a -- it's a good piece of legislation. It's something that would be necessary for a female who lost a child. And I ask for its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall 1649, Senate Bill, 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 54, the Nays are 0, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1649, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, now, with leave of the Body, we'll go to page 27. Page 27. In the middle of page 27 is 1737. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

...Bill 1737.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is a -- a TIF extension in three communities and an additional TIF in my home community of Palatine. So, basically, it's two TIFs in Palatine, an institution of the quick-take in both of those TIFs in Palatine. It's a TIF and quick-take in Crestwood and a TIF and quick-take in Senator John Jones's district in Mt. Vernon. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1737 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? Take the record. On that question -- on that question, the Ayes are 28,

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

the Nays are 17, 7 voting Present. Senate Bill 1737, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is declared lost. Senator Wendell Jones, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. I'd like to take that out of the record, please. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Place the bill on Postponed Consideration. You want to -- you want to put it on Postponed Consideration? We don't take it out of the record. Okay. Postponed Consideration. Bill will... Page 27. Leave of the Body, 1754. Madam Secretary, read the bill. 1754, Ladies and Gentlemen.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1754.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan. John.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1754 creates the Western Illinois Economic Development Authority. Covers thirteen counties in western Illinois. It's a tool to be used for economic development. I'd be -- ask for an Aye vote, and welcome any questions that you might have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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, can you tell us how it works where people are appointed to this board and then ultimately removed from the board. It's my understanding that there's several ways that people can be appointed to the board, but that the Governor can remove anybody. Is that your understanding?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Believe that's correct, Senator.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, why would you allow the Governor to remove anybody on the board when the underlying premise is that a county board chairman actually appoints those people?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

It's my understanding, Senator, that this is -- similar to the way that the other authorities are done throughout the State. As you probably are aware, there's five of these in the State right now. And that's the -- the guidelines that have been set down.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, that's -- I appreciate the answer, but it's sort of a nonanswer, because it's -- to say that we did it before and let's do it again that way. What is it about a county board chairman's decision to appoint somebody to this board that you don't have confidence in?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

I'm sorry. Would you ask that question again, please? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator -- Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

In response to your answer, Senator, to say that we've done it before that way, I understand that, but I don't think that's really persuasive. I think we should always strive to -- to do our best and maybe improve on past practices. Directly to this question, what is it about a county board chairman's appointment do you not have confidence in? Why would you allow the Governor to remove that person, as opposing -- as opposed to having the county board chairman remove that person? And if Senator Welch wants to speak to the bill, we'd love to have him involved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

The -- of course, we're putting the confidence in the county board chairman to make the appointment, obviously. Because it's a -- it's a State authority, the Governor should have that right to -- to take that -- remove an appointee. And also, of course, then the county chairman, again, could appoint somebody to that position. So I don't feel like we're taking authority away. They have the -- the county chair has the authority to go ahead and make -- make those appointments. So, that's being done on a local level.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Let's move on. The salary is paid by the -- the salary of the Executive Director is paid by DCCA, as you've got this bill drafted. Why should DCCA pay? Why wouldn't the Authority pay? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Because it's a -- it's a arm of DCCA. It's an economic development program and that's what DCCA is there for. And that's why the -- the funds would come from DCCA.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, yeah, I mean, that -- that's -- that's a response, but it's not really -- it's not really an answer. Last question, Senator. The -- the -- the way that the board is structured, does it -- the way that the board is structured, does it reflect proportional representation of the various counties or are there some counties that are more represented than others?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, if you would call for quiet -- quiet over here. I really cannot hear you again. If you'd repeat that, please.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't want to be here tonight, but I shall. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, my question was, the appointments -- the way the - the board is structured, how does that reflect the proportion
of the population? It's my understanding that in your bill, you
have some counties with a large population with the same amount
of representation as small counties. How is that fair to the
large counties?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Senator, it's -- it's a regional economic development authority. In other words, we want to make sure that there's representation through all -- throughout all thirteen counties, and that's why we've had an appointee from each of the different -- counties.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski. I'll come back to you if you want to the second time. Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Yeah. I -- I don't think Senator Roskam asked this, but it's my understanding there's some bonding authority in the bill. Can you tell me how much that is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Are you asking about the limit of the authority. It's two hundred and fifty million.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

Thank you. And who's responsible for the payment of those bonds?

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

The -- the borrower. The -- the business, the borrower.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. And are those bonds backed by the moral obligation of the State of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

...can be. Very few of them are. But they're -- some -- there are some moral obligation bonds included. They have that ability, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

In the past, with other regional development — authorities, we've had some problems with defaults on those bonds and the State has been left holding the bag on those. I have some real concerns because of that, in a time when we've got some real strong fiscal restraints on the State of Illinois to see another economic development authority formed with the ability to issue up to two hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of bonds that are at the moral obligation of the State of Illinois. So I really do have some concerns relative to that. Also, Senator, is there the ability of the Authority to have eminent domain or quick-take authority in this bill, or do they have to come back to the General Assembly in order to get that? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR J. SULLIVAN:

There is no quick-take in this legislation. They would have to come back to the General Assembly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I know we have a lot of new staff on -- on the Floor, and I'd like for Senator Sullivan to introduce the young man to his left there that must be new to your staff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Those in favor will -- will vote Aye. Bill 1754 pass. opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, the Ayes are 36, the Nays are 17, none voting Present. Senate Bill -- 1754, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. at the bottom. Senator Schoenberg. Senator Schoenberg on the Floor? All right. Turn the page. Page 28, Ladies and Gentlemen. We'll -- going to call every bill on this page, I'm told, if the sponsor's ready. 1763. Senator Obama. Secretary, 1763. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Ladies -- Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill addresses the issue of domestic violence and some of the fallout that results. It's a proposal, essentially, to provide unpaid leave for victims of domestic violence to assure that they can, in fact, receive medical care, attend court to prosecute, to deal with the various fallout that may arise as a consequence of this. I want to be up front: There is still some problems with the language that need to be worked out. I'm hoping to do some of that work over in the House. I discussed, with some of the members of the committee, some of the issues that had arisen, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Will sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- he indicates he will yield. Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, my recollection is that I voted for your legislation in committee based on an agreement that you would clean that language up before it left this Body. I -- and I think all Republicans did. I've -- I have concern about your definition of a victim and I simply -- I guess I'm concerned that we supported you in committee, now we're advancing the bill without the cleanup language and I'm not sure that's -- I yield to the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Senator -- Senator Brady, you're absolutely right. And I think you'll recall that an amendment was -- I assigned advocates on behalf of domestic violence to do the cleanup that was required. Unfortunately, when the amendment came back, it did not solve the issues that you wanted addressed. And you'll recall, I think, that I spoke to you, as well as a couple of other Senators on the Republican side in the Labor Committee, and indicated that that was the case. We are now in the process of working it. The problem is that, in terms of timing, did not have a chance to do exactly what you asked us to do. That's my intention to do it. We're up against a deadline. understand if you choose to vote Present on this, recognizing that, in fact, it hasn't yet addressed the concerns that you have. Unfortunately, the other -- the group that was assigned to structure the amendment did not do the sort of job that they were supposed to do. So, I guess the -- the way I would phrase it is, is that the intention continues to be to structure the amendment as you had requested. It was not done properly, and I'm now in a position where either we let the bill die or we attach that amendment over in the House. But you are absolutely accurate in your description and -- and that's why I raised it. I didn't want you to think that I was sandbagging you on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brady.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. A -- a couple questions on this that were asked of me to make clear to the Members on both sides of the aisle. First question is, what size employer does this bill apply to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

As currently drafted it applies to twenty-five -- persons with twenty-five employer -- employees or more.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

My understanding in committee, that it was as little as one employee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

That was not my understanding, Senator Brady, but I'm -- I'll consult the language right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

We might go back to that. Second question is, when an employee needs to take leave under the Act, they're required to provide reasonable notice. What is considered reasonable under this? And I'm getting to some of the -- the flaws in this legislation we'd just like cleared -- our intention, by the way -- our preference would be that we'd attach good language onto a House bill, if that is possible. But, anyway, if you might address this issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

The -- the definition of reasonable, I think if what you're suggesting is you'd like a time certain, then I'm not sure that from a public policy perspective that makes sense insofar as, let's say, somebody's been a victim of domestic violence, they may not have received notice themselves from a -- a court, for

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

example, that they need to come in and -- and serve as a witness or obtain a court order, or so forth. They may not have complete control over when they're notified by the -- the public agency involved. So I think reasonableness is something that we commonly use in statutes to indicate that a reasonable person would consider, that -- that it's not dilatory, that you're not just not showing up for work one day and then telling people after the fact that you need this leave. So, I -- I'd be happy discuss it with you, but I don't think reasonableness standard per se is considered problematic.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Brady, he's about -- Senator Obama's just about expiring your time. Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

I understand. Does he have an answer to the first question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama. Senator Brady, with leave of the Body, let's -- let's move on. We'll come back to you in just a moment, till he gets the answer. 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 Obama, just procedurally, I'm -- I'm not in that committee, but was it your understanding that -- that you made a commitment to not move the bill until -- because this is a complicated thing, and my -- my feeling is, would it -- would it make sense -- listen, there's a lot of shell bills. So there's -- there's no -- there's no problem with this issue dying. It would seem to me that, sort of based on some of the Members on our side of the aisle and the questions that they're having, could I suggest that you take it out of the record and then let's keep working on this, and it's the type of bill that may be able to come out unanimously. But in its current form, it seems like there's some -- some problems. Just a suggestion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR OBAMA:

I've just discussed it with staff. The -- if, in fact, there is a shell bill that we can identify that we can utilize, I'm comfortable with that, because I did make a commitment. My intention, as I said, was basically to attach changes that you folks specifically had requested. The problem was, it wasn't drafted properly. With -- with the understanding that I'm going to try to find a shell bill to, in fact, make that happen, I will hold it for now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Take it out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1774. Senator Jacobs. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1774.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Both 1774 and the following bill, 1777, are shell bills. There is discussions ongoing between the Medical Society and -- and the insurance groups, and I just want to keep something out there so if they reach an agreement, which they are making progress. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator Jacobs, in committee we discussed this. You -- you shelled this. My recollection, just so the Members know, was that we'd also hold this bill in this Chamber until we agreed to it, or -- or am I wrong?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

If -- if that's part of our agreement, Senator, I didn't realize that. I -- I thought not, but you know, if you say they are, we can hold 'em. It doesn't make any difference to me. I

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

just want something out there to where if these two groups that have tried for years can put something together. If you felt that they were part of our agreement, I'll -- I'll pull 'em.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, it is a shell bill. I think it's an important difference between this and the previous bill, but I just want our Members to understand, that some of them may have been confused. It's an important issue that everyone wants to see worked out. It is a shell bill. It doesn't do anything. I -- I'm going to vote for your legislation to keep the issue moving and hopefully we can come to some sort of agreement. But for the Members on this side of the aisle who were in committee, there was discussions that may have led them to believe we wouldn't have advanced it till the agreed language. I just wanted to make that for the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1774 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 43, the Nays are 3, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1774, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1777. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1777.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Same as last bill. I don't know if we need both of 'em, but I felt that beings they both issue with different subject matters, we may keep 'em both moving. We might only need one, but I'd like to get both of 'em out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brady.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR BRADY:

Just to reiterate what Senator Jacobs said. Same issue as the previous bill. It's a shell bill. I'll support it in hopes of an agreement. Those of the Members who were in the committee who may have thought otherwise, please play...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1777 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 46, the Nays are 2, 1 voting Present -- 47 -- on that question, the Ayes are 47, the Nays are 2, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1777, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 1803. Senator -- Senator Jones. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1803. Madam -- Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1803.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1803 allows for electronic voting systems in Illinois. Currently, only voting machines that are used in the State are punch cards or push levers. It's very similar to legislation sponsored by Senator Dillard in previous years. The federal Help America Vote Act of 202 {sic} allocates millions of dollars to states to improve their voting systems. Forty-four million dollars will be coming to the State of Illinois. This bill also include a provision for a audit paper trail, which is required by the federal Help America Vote Act to ensure that a person's vote is recorded accurately. Ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the bill. Passed unanimously out of the Executive Committee, and urge its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1803 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1803, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1854. Senator Jacobs. 1855. Senator Ronen. 1864. Jacobs. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, middle of page 28, is Senate Bill 1864. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1864.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 1864, as thoroughly amended, allows for process servers to give notice of the expiration of the period of redemption for property sold at a tax sale. It provides that the order for the tax deed is prima facie evidence of compliance with applicable law. And the bill changes an eighteen-year-old fee from thirty-five dollars to seventy-five dollars if -- if a petition for tax deed has been filed, and four dollars to ten dollars if a notice of sale and redemption right has been filed. And the bill, finally, provides that during the final stages of -- of redemption - that's during the third year - if a property owner redeems and if a title search has been completed that the tax purchaser may recover costs of the title search up to seventy-five dollars, which is about half of what most title searches cost. I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1864 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1864, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1865. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1865. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1865.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an initiative of the Secretary of State. Senate Bill 1865 amends the Illinois Securities Act to enhance investor protection. In addition to the investors taking a stock market loss, investors are falling prey to securities fraud on a local level. To combat this fraud, this bill grants necessary powers to Security Department investigators to effectively investigate fraud and to get money back to investors. Other amendments address the corporate and security scandals that have cost investors tremendous losses. It mandates accurate audit and financial statements, requires firms to keep adequate records, and imposes restrictions on those firms that failed to supervise employees who engaged in misconduct. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Urge -- thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of the bill. It passed unanimously out of the Executive Committee and I urge its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, question is, shall Senate Bill 1865 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1865, having received the required

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1873. Senator Garrett. 1880. Senator Link. 1881. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of page 28, Senate Bill 1881. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1881.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 1881 provides some necessary help to our special recreation associations. Many of you are familiar with They are the intergovernmental cooperative ventures between park districts and local governments to provide recreation services to our children and adults disabilities. The bill itself does two things. First, it essentially exempts the special recreation associations from the And second, it permits the Chicago Park property tax caps. District, currently the only park district in the State that cannot participate in the special rec associations, to do so and to impose the -- the same tax free of the caps. I'd be happy to answer -- this -- to be clear, this does not -- the bill itself increase taxes at all; simply authorizes local governments to make those decisions. It's a good bill. I'd be happy to take any questions, and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator DeLeo on the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Would the sponsor yield for some questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

He indicates he'll yield for a question.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

In -- is there any fiscal impact to the State at all in this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

31st Legislative Day 4/8/2003

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Is it fact that the decisions will be made locally by the elected officials who are elected to those park districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

He indicates he'll yield for a question.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, this is an exception to the tax cap, isn't it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

If the bill is enacted into law, do you anticipate taxes to go up or taxes to go down? A reasonable expectation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

My reasonable expectation, having talked with -- folks participating in special recreation associations, is that property taxes will go up modestly.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

I want to thank the Senator for candor and, you know, his forthrightness. Make no exception about it, Senator Harmon just answered the question, I think, fairly and accurately, and that is, is this going to be an increased tax burden on property taxpayers? Unequivocally, the answer is yes. There's no doubt about it, the answer is yes. You know, over the past few days, we've -- we've seen an erosion of the tax cap, with all due respect to the sponsors of previous legislation. The tax cap was one of the great things that the General Assembly did back a decade ago. It's been a hallmark. It's been a -- something that many of us have campaigned on. And as -- as tough as it is to say no to well-intentioned groups, the bottom line is that people can be supported in other areas. People can be supported The cumulative effect of all of these erosions by referendum. of the tax cap is going to be an unbelievable property tax burden over the course of the years. I urge a No vote on this increased burden on property taxpayers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Roskam, for your -- your -- your comments. In all due respect, at many points during this legislative Session, you have risen in thoughtful opposition to bills, pointing out that while the bills are well intentioned, there are unintended consequences. This bill remedies an unintended consequence of the tax caps. The special recreation associations were -- were capped at about the same time as the Americans with Disabilities Act was enacted. At the same time we capped their revenues, their costs were going through the roof. It's simply a case where the -the -- the -- the needs of the government are not in sync with the -- the -- the tax cap plan. I think, after ten years, it's perfectly appropriate for us to reevaluate this. My sources tell me that a reasonable expectation is the property tax caps would go up about eighty-nine cents on an average house.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

think that's well worth the trade off for the wonderful programs the special recreation associations provide.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Harmon, to close.

SENATOR HARMON:

I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1881 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 36 Ayes, 17 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1881, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the -- Senator -- President Emil Jones, on Senate Bill 1882. Out of the record. Senator -- President Jones, on Senate Bill 1883, sir. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1883.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yeah. Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1883 is a result of the City of Chicago, the Village of Skokie, Chicago Stock Exchange and Chicago Board Options Exchange coming to an agreement on how to capture real estate transfer tax on sophisticated business transaction. This -- this bill provides that the tax is -- is imposed on the privilege of transferring beneficial interest or a controlling interest in a real estate The tax is due regardless of the number of persons entity. involved, regardless of whether -- the number of transactions or whether or not the document is recorded. This bill also provides that a -- if a local unit of government has an existing ordinance or resolution that imposes a real estate transfer tax, that ordinance may be amended to conform with this law. This is to close a loophole for the millions of dollars we lose on those

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

very sophisticated real estate transfer tax, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no discussion, President Jones, to close, sir. Okay. The question is, shall -- Senate Bill 1883 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 44 Ayes, 10 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 1883, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the page 29 of 3rd -- Senate Bills 3rd Reading, let's go to Senate Bill 1906. Senator Demuzio. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, sir.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1906.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I wouldn't want anybody to think that the gentleman in front of me was my advisor, so he's moving. Okay. On the -- Senate Bill 1906, this is a very simple bill. It changes the Department of Community -- Commerce and Community Affairs to the new name as -- as the -- proclaimed by the new Governor, to the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. I know of no opposition, and ask for your support, I guess.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Yes, Senator, does this make my bill legal now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

That's for the sake of compromise, correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes. And I'm getting hungry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1906 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 47 voting Aye, 5 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 1906, having received the constitutional -- required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Demuzio, on 1918. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1918.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you. This is also a housekeeping bill from the -- I think it's Central Management Services where this came from. Apparently, in the federal rate for mileage, there's a provision in our statute for increases, but there is no provision for decreases. And what this does, it says that in the event that the rates set under the federal regulation decreases during the course of the State's fiscal year, that the effective date of the new rate shall be effective date for the change in the federal rate. It's a housekeeping measure. I know no opposition and ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no discussion, the -- Senator Demuzio, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1918 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Present. Senate Bill 1918, received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Demuzio, what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Mr. President, we had leave to go back to Senate Bill 1530. It was the second bill out of the box this morning. I would like to go to that order, if -- if I may, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. With leave of the Body, seeing no objection, we'll return to page 24 of the Calendar, Senate Bill -- 1530. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, sir.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1530.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the -- Comptroller's bill. Current law says that -- under the Illinois Procurement Code, it provides that no person or business convicted of a felony shall do business with the State until five years after the date of completion of the felony sentence and no person held responsible prosecutorial office for the facts upon which the conviction was based continues to have any involvement with the business. This new provision is amended. Says, by virtue of Amendments 1 and 2, it clarifies that the current felony prohibition applies to businesses and individuals convicted of felonies for accountingtype frauds. And it says specifically that the Procurement Code adds a new Section that prohibits a business from bidding or entering into a contract with the State of Illinois or a State agency if any director or officer or partner or any other managerial agent of such business has been convicted of a felony under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 or a Class 3 or Class 2 felony -- the -- under the Illinois Securities Law of 1953. be glad to answer any questions. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Risinger, what purpose do you rise?

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR RISINGER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill, sir.

SENATOR RISINGER:

This -- this bill came through the Government -- State Government Committee, was voted unanimously out of committee, and I support the bill and -- and hope that this side of the aisle will support it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you, Senator. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1530 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 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 1530, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, moving to -- back to page 30 of your Calendar. Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1938. Senator Demuzio. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, sir.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1938.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio, on 1938, sir.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

This is a -- a vehicle bill that -- it's an administration bill. I have no idea what purposes it's to be utilized for, and so I would indicate that if it comes back, I'll be happy to answer any questions. Other than that, I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. Thank you, sir. Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1938 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

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

are 32 Ayes, 21 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1938, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the middle of page 30, Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1961. Senator Schoenberg. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, sir.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1961.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1961 changes the amount required by the Capital Development Board that can be withheld from a contractor's contract to ensure project completion. Currently, the Capital Development Board withholds ten percent. This reduces it down -- that threshold down to five percent. It'll do so in an effort to facilitate more smaller and women- and minority-owned contractors to participate. This is consistent with what other states our size are doing. I'd be happy to answer any questions and know of no opposition to this measure. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Okay. Seeing no discussion, Senator Schoenberg, to close. Okay. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1961 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 56 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 1961, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1963. Senator Demuzio. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, sir. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1963.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the Lieutenant Governor's bill. It creates the Consumer Advocate Act. It authorizes the creation of the Illinois Consumer Advocate. It's a -- to be a non-for-profit corporation charged with ensuring effective representation of consumers before all regulatory agencies of the State and units of local government. It's background is similar to that of CUB. It will have -- do everything, with the exception of utility matters. And I'll be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

He indicates he'll yield for a question, sir.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Demuzio, what is the problem that the Lieutenant Governor is trying to address with this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

If -- if -- you're asking me to -- to -- apparently this is -- this is a bill that he has advocated for a -- a long time. Apparently, as you well know, he's one of those individuals that are pretty versed in consumer protection, and I assume that this is his way of formalizing some State agency of some sort on a voluntary basis to get in the business of -- of advocacy, much like he was when he created the -- the Citizens Utility Board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, Senator, I appreciate you got to put your game face on and you got to do what you got to do. In committee, we were kind of under a lot of time pressure that day, and I don't know if you recall, but there were not a lot of opportunities to ask questions. There's several procedural, I think, drafting problems with this bill. The first is that there is appropriations language and substantive language in the same bill. That, on its face, is a problem. We didn't have the time

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

to get into it in the committee because of the time pressure that we were under. And I've got other questions I can go through, but you're sort of signaling.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I believe that's absolutely correct, and -- and it's my understanding and my intention that the substantive language with respect to the -- the loan would be taken out in the House. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DELEO)

,

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you. Another area that is -- is a concern is how... This whole notion of -- of members who were appointed to these boards, Senator, who appoints them? Are they elected in a particular area? Is it per district and so forth? The bill is silent as to that, I believe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

They have the same origin and the manner in which the Citizens Utility Board was -- was created. There is an appointment process in the beginning and then, until its implementation time apparently, there is an election that takes place within the Congressional District and it functions, the election, just -- much as you and I do, one -- one man for one vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Let me just run through a couple other questions. My hunch is that this will pass, but I really think that these other drafting problems need to be addressed. You're signaling. You need to speak now? Okay. On page 7, lines 1 through 5, provides that a board member shall not be an -- a person who is an employee in any managerial or supervisory capacity, director, officer, or agent or who is a member of the immediate family of any employee or director who is eligible to be a director. The

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

question is, a director, officer or agent of what? And the Lieutenant Governor didn't have an answer to that in committee. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

That is a drafting error. We'll take out that -- that provision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Okay. Another thing for you to consider: The -- page 11, line 6. It provides that the Consumer Action Board can solicit and accept contributions, and authorizes the board to accept funds -- pursuant to Section {sic} (subsection) (b) of Section 2-807 of the Code of Civil Procedure. There is no such Section of the Code of Civil Procedure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, you know, I tried to tell the Lieutenant Governor that, too. He just wouldn't listen. So I suspect we'll be taking that out, too.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you -- thank you, Senator. Page 18, line 6, provides that a candidate must agree in writing to -- incur no more than twenty-five hundred dollars in campaign expenditures from the time he or she commences circulation of petitions for nomination or from four months prior to the election, whichever is earlier. It's got to be a drafting error, because no where in the bill does it require a circulation of petitions or, for that matter, that a candidate be nominated. That's another thing to And then finally, there's a problem -- there's a consider. problem that I don't think the Lieutenant Governor contemplated, and it's this: This has candidates, the incumbent members of the board, Senator, actually tallying the votes in elections on their own behalf. That's a weakness of the bill that I think needs to be remedied. It seems to me that the -- the people who

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

are counting the votes need to be an objective third party, a board of elections or somebody who doesn't have an interest in the underlying -- in the outcome. I thank the Senator for yielding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Thank you. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's very seldom that I stand up and actually talk against a bill that I -- is being given by one of our own Members, and is, of course, one of the most esteemed Members of this Senatorial Body, but it seems to me that this is a bad idea all the way around. And -- and one of the questions I have, Senator, don't you really feel that -- that we have an Attorney General that is already involved in this type of advocacy? Don't you think that this puts this board in conflict with that particular elected office?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

If that were the case then the -- CUB would also -- under your -- your question, would also be in conflict with the Attorney General. The answer to your question is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Not to belabor the issue, but I think that there is a little difference between what the Citizens Utility Board does with a specific instance. This is so broad, I don't see how anyone can really, in -- in good conscience, even though it's a leadership bill - I understand that - how anyone can in good conscience vote for this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Obama, what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR OBAMA:

Just very briefly, I want to stand in support of this bill. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

To the bill.

SENATOR OBAMA:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

The Lieutenant Governor's, I think, basic concept is underscored by what you see, for example, in the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules or some of the other agencies that we have, where it's very difficult, I think, to -- for consumer groups to get before these regulatory agencies that -- business oftentimes is able to get their notifications in. Agencies can, but sometimes consumers can't. And I think he's just trying to provide a vehicle for doing that. Obviously, it still needs some work, but I vote to get this out of committee and set something up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

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

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

He indicates he'll yield, sir.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, in going through the analysis here, I noted that in order to become a member you have to pay a five-dollar fee. And guess the question I have is, if this were to become law and I were to send in my five dollars to the Lieutenant Governor, what -- what privileges do I enjoy that my neighbor, who did not send in five dollar, will not enjoy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yeah, it's -- it is identical to the language in -- in CUB. And it is envisioned that it would be the same, and that is that you would get publications, you would get notices that are relevant to consumer advocacy and things of that nature. That's what you would get.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

If -- if my neighbor chooses not to pay the five dollars, will he or she still enjoy whatever representation or advocacy work that this entity will do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I am told that, yes, the answer to that question is yes, and it affects all citizens whether you are a member or not. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Last question, Senator. This bill passes and I go back to my district, you go back to your district and some constituent will ask us, "Well, I saw that you passed this legislation to create the Illinois Consumer Advocate." I assume a couple of questions will be first. "I see it's a private not-for-profit. Why do we need any legislation at all to do this?" And second, maybe, "What specific areas could we look forward to the Lieutenant Governor and the ICA moving on?"

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you. Again, as I indicated that the purpose is to promote the health, welfare, prosperity of the citizens of Illinois and ensure its -- effective and democratic representation of consumers before all regulatory agencies and -- of units of local and State government, provides for consumer education of regulatory agencies, and utilizes any legal means to promote and protect the consumer's rights. That is apparently the preamble or -- or, the objectives of some of the -- of the provisions in the CUB bill, and I'd be happy to -- roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1963 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all who -- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 29 Ayes, 19 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1963, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. On the bottom of page 30. Senate Bill 1983. Senator Demuzio. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senate Bill 1983.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

This is the pharmacist bill, and all it does, it changes the definition of a -- a pharmacy {sic} under the Pharmacy Practice Act. It also says that the pharmacy {sic} must also be a health care professional and provider. And -- and again, I don't know of any opposition on this one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DeLEO)

Seeing no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1983 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all who -- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1983, received the required constitutional majority, is declared Ladies and Gentlemen, we've come to that --Okay. bottom of page 30. We're going to stop on 2nd -- on 3rd Readings. As there was a committee announcement just a short time ago by Senator Silverstein, Executive Committee will meet immediately. So the Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committee meetings, the Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. The Senate stands in recess. One further announcement. Executive is expected to meet approximately thirty minutes, so please stay close to the Floor. We will be back here around 2:40. Executive Committee will meet for around thirty minutes.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

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

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 155,

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senate Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 600, and Senate Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1116 do -- all Be Adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

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

House Bills 198, 1489 and 3048.

All passed the House, April 8, 2003.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

On the Order of 2nd Reading, on page 2 of the Calendar. Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 12. There's leave to come back to that? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 14. Senator Senate Bill 71. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate John Sullivan. Bill 77. Senator John Cullerton. Senate Bill 79. Is there leave to come to that bill? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 80. Is there leave to come back to that bill? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 127. Senate Bill 247. Senator Obama. Brady. Senate Bill 397. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 429. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 430. Senator Clayborne. Senate Senate Bill 501. Bill 498. Senator Halvorson. Halvorson. Senate Bill 580. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 581. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 582. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 583. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 584. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 585. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 586. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 588. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 589. Senate Bill 909. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 910. Clayborne. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 910 -- 11. Senator DeLeo. Senate Senate Bill 1103. Bill 1033. Senator Halvorson. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 1119. Senator Roskam. Senate Bill 1120. Senator Roskam. Senate Bill 1134. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 1151. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1152. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1157. Senator Righter. Senate Bill 1195. Senator Harmon. Munoz. Senate Bill 1208. Senate Bill 1213. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 1358. Senator Harmon. Bill 1359. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1361. Senator Lauzen.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senate Bill 1377. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 1476. Senator John Sullivan. Senator Sullivan asks -- Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1476.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1509. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate Bill 1511. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 1516. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 1572. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 1768. Senator Lauzen. Senate Bill 1770. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 1856. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 1857. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 2000. Senator Obama. On the Order of 3rd Reading, page 5, Senate Bill 3. Senator Halvorson. ...Bill No. 3. Senator Halvorson, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, read the bill. Senator Halvorson seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 3 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 3. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Halvorson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is just a technical change to make sure that throughout this program that people are not prohibited from using a mail-order system to get their prescription drugs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none... Senator Watson, on Senate Bill -- on the amendment to Senate Bill -- no? Oh. Okay, Senator Watson. Seeing no Members seeking recognition, all in favor of the amendment, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 32. Senator Emil Jones. Senate Bill 63. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 67. Senator... With leave of the Body, we will return to Senate Bill 3, now on the Order of 3rd Reading. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Senator Halvorson, on Senate Bill 3. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Member of the Senate. First of all, let me say, this is a culmination of three years of hard work. And I want to thank everybody in this Chamber, as well as the Pharmacists Association, IRMA, and everybody who has helped make this become a reality. We spent a lot of time working out the details, and what Senate Bill 3 does is create the Senior Citizen Prescription Drug Discount Program. It establishes a buying program where senior citizens, as well as those with disabilities, could purchase their prescription drugs at a For the twenty-five-dollar administrative fee, it would allow them to be a part of this program. The -- CMS would then negotiate, and if they don't choose to negotiate for the lesser prices, they would put it out to a pharmacist benefits manager. We have negotiated. We've done everything we need to. I'm very proud to say that this exact bill came out of the House 118 to nothing. And I'll answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Halvorson, first I want to congratulate you on the work that you've done. I know that you've spent a lot of time We've had some opportunity to discuss this on this bill. legislation in Health and Human Services Committee, and I want to go over some of those points and maybe explore a -- a few new ones with some of the Members out on the Floor. We -- we all talk about discounts for seniors for prescription drugs. mean, it's something that I would assume that in the last few election cycles that not one person who's run for the General Assembly has not said that they are -- they are for. they're adamantly for and they've supported this and they've supported that. One of the concerns I have about that is the expectations that that creates. As you know, the Circuit Breaker Program creates huge discounts for enrollees. What kind of discounts can seniors expect under this program if it becomes law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, I have a list of the top ten most common prescribed prescriptions for seniors and they range in a discount of anywhere from eleven percent to forty-nine percent. We are advocating that on an average that this would save our senior citizens and those with disabilities approximately thirty percent overall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Does the percentage discount that a senior would receive on a particular drug depend on the negotiated price that -- that the -- that the PBM or whoever's been able to work out with the pharmaceutical supplier? And if that's the case, then how do we know now that it'll be somewhere between eleven and forty-nine percent for the drugs that you referenced?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes. It would be based on the -- the PBM and what they negotiate. And the reason we know that it would be this is

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

because it's already being done now for others. We have to remember that this is a program for those who do not currently have prescription drug coverage, regardless of their income. And I think that's important. If somebody already has prescription drug coverage, this would not be a program they'd even be interested in. The reason we know that these are the negotiated prices, again, is because it's already being done for others.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

In the original form of the legislation, I believe, Senator, there was an appropriation of twenty-seven million dollars from the General Revenue Fund to -- to pay for the start-up of this program. Now, it's my understanding that that's been taken out. If that's the case, then how are we paying for the start-up of the program to -- to provide these benefits?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes. That -- that is true. We have taken out that -- the start-up cost. And now, through the fees and through the rebates and through the negotiated prices, the average wholesale price minus twelve percent on brand names, plus a dispensing fee, and then, average wholesale price, or AWP, minus thirty-five percent for generics. Now, the dispensing fee is what the pharmacist then gets back. For the name brand, we have a three-dollar-and-fifty-cent dispensing fee, and for generics four dollars and twenty-five cents. The reason the generic is higher is to give the pharmacist and the pharmacy an incentive to use generic drugs over the brand name.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

What kind of administrative overhead are we adding to the Department or other entities in -- in State government in order to manage this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, with the twenty-five-dollar fee -- now, you have to remember, there's approximately four hundred and fifty thousand seniors that could take advantage of this program. If, say, thirty-eight -- thirty-five to thirty-eight percent of the seniors take advantage of it, we're already talking over eleven million dollars. We, during negotiations, had even thought we could do away or make the twenty-five-dollar fee even less because of the amount of money that we will be collecting to administer this program. And you have to remember, if CMS decides not to administer it themselves and they solicit bids from the PBM, they now take on the cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR WATSON:

Is mail order a part of this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes, it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Explain how.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

As you have currently with Caremark, you can -- if you have a drug that you use every month, you can get it refilled every month if you want or you can send a prescription in and get three months at a time. That's the mail order. It's not the Internet. It's not the other companies from Canada. It's the prescription where you can send it in and receive three months at a time at even a lesser cost.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

What's the difference of the cost?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, in our case -- and again, that's part of the bidding process, part of the solicitation. In our case, you and I, generics would be seven dollars a month. Well, if you did that for three months, that's twenty-one dollars. Well, if you send in your -- your prescription, it's fourteen. So you save a month basically.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Why not give that same opportunity to retail pharmacists?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

So that's not something that you can do, is give 'em three months at a time? I thought you could.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, you -- we can. But from what you just said, they would have to pay the three months' co-pay - each co-pay each month. I believe that's what you said. And if you get it from mail order, then you only have to pay a lesser co-pay. Why not allow that same ability for local retail pharmacists to pass that on to the consumer also? Why just mail order?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, in the negotiations, that did not come up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

You should have asked me. That's a big problem. And we've been fighting. I'm not sure where the Pharmacy Association or the Illinois Retail Merchants - unless what you're telling me is not accurate - I don't know where they were, because this is a huge issue with us at the -- at the -- at the local independent pharmacy level, and even the chain level, is the ability to have the same right to offer, if we so wish, that same benefit to the consumer that you're now making available only to mail order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, I'll tell you what, the people that were there negotiating on your behalf are for this. That would be something else maybe we could take up in another bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The -- and I would appreciate that. I think it definitely needs to be looked into. Is this the same bill now as what we commonly call the McHenry County Representative's bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Well, I'm not sure where Jack Franks is from, but he has the bill in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Same bill. Identical. Do you know that people can join the Farm Bureau, or they can join -- in fact you can get these discount cards for really next to nothing. Five bucks. We're going to charge 'em twenty-five dollars now, annual fee I guess, to -- to maybe do nothing more than what's being made available right now by these other discount cards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

This program is completely voluntary. It also has no income cap. Many, if not all of the other programs out there,

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

have an income cap. And it's our middle-class senior citizens that still cannot afford the six, seven, eight hundred dollars a month for their prescription drugs. Again, if they can find a program that works better than this one, so be it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

So, I suppose when Hugh Heffner needs his Viagra, he could participate in this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

There's no incentive in this program for him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a question that -- and -- and, Senator, we raised this during the committee. The -- the one concern we have with -- with -- with this is, this is a voluntary program for the pharmaceutical companies to participate. This does not mandate that they participate or that they give any -- any certain amount of discount, like we currently have under our Medicaid budget. Is that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

That is correct. We took out all of that language because we have found, in other programs that had anything to do with Medicaid, it did end up -- it could possibly end up in the courts. There's nothing in here that guarantees any discounts, and it does not mandate anybody to participate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

And -- and that's, I guess, to the point which we talked a little bit about the education process. I -- this could work very well. Like Senator Watson said, it's going to be very similar to discount cards that are given to members of other organizations, AARP, Blue Cross, or others, that aren't income-

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

driven either. What I don't want to do is, I guess, mislead a senior who buys his card, who believes that with this card that the drug that they're currently taking, they're going to be able to get at a much deeper discount than they are currently getting with their Blue Cross card or through their Walgreens Thursday senior discount day, that it's not going to be any less expensive. Is that message going to be communicated with this card, that it's possible that there will not be a savings in utilizing this card versus not utilizing the card?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

I believe, as you probably believe, our senior citizens are very educated on how to save a dollar. And they will be looking into how this -- if this will save them. AARP, I might add, is also in favor of this program. I think it's our responsibility to offer people something that they're already not receiving. And if they already have a card or a program that benefits them, this -- there's no incentive in this for them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Move -- move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Motion to move the previous question. On that, there are three speakers remaining. Were you done Senator Syverson? Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President -- and -- question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

I came on the -- I was off the Floor for a little bit, and this question may have been asked. So if it is, I'm sorry. It -- it just occurs to me that - obviously this -- this program has some merit - but drug companies are going to want to make a certain profit. I mean, they -- they -- they operate -- that's their business. And if they are, let's say, in a way forced to -- and -- and in -- in a roundabout way, they will be forced to

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

negotiate these prices. My concern is, that they're going to make a certain profit and that they will then pass on what they haven't -- won't make, for instance with the seniors, to younger generation. You know, I know that it's impossible to say just how that will work out, but I -- I really believe it will - that someone's going to pay for this, and probably younger people who sometimes can't afford -- afford -- afford a lot of these drugs too. Would you agree with that, or -- or do you disagree with that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

First of all, nobody is mandated to participate. Second of all, the senior citizens who currently have no opportunity to join a prescription drug discount program, such as -- such as this, are the ones paying the bulk of the prices for prescription drugs. It is our responsibility to start here. Maybe we'll find out that this is so popular we may want to lower the age someday. But I think this is a place to start. Again, nobody is mandated. This is voluntary on all sides.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

And I -- I agree with what you said, but did -- you didn't answer the question. Do you anticipate that younger people will pay for what they lose to senior citizens? I -- I can't help believing that that's going to be the case, that they're -- you know, and we may never know exactly how much, but they will raise the prices on other things to make up the difference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

No. I do not think that they'll be paying more.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in strong support of this bill. It's a bill that we've been working on, as Senator Halvorson has said, for

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

about four years. I commend Senator Halvorson for doing some more work with it. And it is -- it is a long time coming. I know our seniors back home in every one of our districts are going to be able to have an opportunity to get a reduced price on their -- on their prescriptions. Not only that, persons on disabilities, and their medications are -- costs are going up and they're also on a fixed income. But as I walk through my district, there's many people my age that are paying for the prescriptions for our parents now because they can't afford it. So, again, I urge an affirmative vote and thank Debbie Halvorson for all of her work. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson, to close.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Basically, thank you all. I want to thank you for the debate. This has been a long time coming. I think this is very important, but I do want to clarify one thing if I misspoke. When Senator Watson was talking about the difference in mail order, I -- I think when I said what's happening with us on how mail order works, it's not necessarily that this is the way the bill will work. Whether you get a thirty-day supply or a ninety-day supply, most likely the price will not change. Again, I commend everybody for the hard work. And I -- I think we can all expect an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill No. 3 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 56 Members voting Yes, none voting No, and 1 Member voting Present. Senate Bill 3, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 63. Senator del Valle. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Hold it. Out of the record, Madam Secretary. Senate Bill 67. Senator del Valle. Senate Bill 73. Senator Halvorson. ...the bill, Madam Secretary. Senator Halvorson seeks leave of

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

the Body to return Senate Bill No. 73 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 73. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes, Floor Amendment No. 6, offered by Senator Halvorson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment just adds grants as another something that's exempt of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Wojcik. Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, it adds grants. Can you tell us a little more about what kinds of grants and designed for what and go on to that -- and -- and the reason I ask is because -- and we don't want to debate this on 2nd, but this bill has been through so many revisions that I think we're having trouble keeping track of what we're doing here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes. As we started exempting things from this bill, we exempted grants for purchase of care, and we all know what purchase of care is. We found out that there are people, such as the Boys & Girls Clubs, that get grants that aren't necessarily purchase for care. So we wanted to exempt anything that comes in the form of grants based on the Procurement Code.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong support of Senator Halvorson's bill. If you look at the pattern that we've been following in this State for many years as to subcontract

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

more and more services out to private agencies, those are tax dollars that are being spent, and I think we, as a Body, have a responsibility to make sure those tax dollars are spent well and spent wisely. And -- and I'm just speaking to the amendment, and I think it's a great amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Geo-Karis. Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 73. Senator Halvorson, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 73.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 73 has been a wonderful work in progress. I believe we've all been lobbied We've worked hard. one way or another. We've had meetings every day. Basically, it requires -- the intent of this is that Senate Bill 73 requires that when State services currently provided by State employees are privatized, that privatization show a savings and provide the same level of service as provided by the public entity. The cost savings should not be achieved by drastically reducing workers' Workers at the privatized job must be paid a compensation. total cash benefit package roughly equivalent to what the State workers were making. Now, we also have to remember that if the government is going to contract out this public service, three things have to happen. The tax -- taxpayer money be used wisely to provide quality public services. But the only time things happen is if -- the agreement for the services to be provided, first of all, must be at least one hundred thousand dollar in

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

value. The agreement must call for providing services that are The agreement must currently performed by State employees. cause at least one or more permanent State employees to be laid Now, what we did as we worked through this bill is we exempted a lot of things. I'm going to read off the exemptions because I believe that the -- the table must be set so that when we're asking questions you know who's exempted and who this still currently includes, and then I think it'll be a lot easier to -- for everybody to ask questions. The exemptions are contracts for purchase of care, which we went through. removed the language of mandating that agencies must solicit competitive sealed bids. We removed language of mandating that the bidders on a contract must disclose political contributions. We exempted the agreements for highway, airport, structure, transit and building construction. We exempted - like in this last amendment - grants according to the Procurement Code, not just grants for purchase of care. We exempted facilities licensed under the Nursing Home Care Act. We removed language of mandated extensive disclosure by private entities who are interested in gaining State work. We removed the contract limitations of two years, which will allow the contract length. Let me also give an example of what this does include and who still is included in this. This still includes the Department of Corrections, the Department of Transportation, the State Tollway Authority, Department of Employment Security, Secretary of State and Central Management Services. Basically, everything having to do with the Department of Human Services was taken out. A -- a example would be, say, for instance, the Secretary of State decided to privatize the work. They have a department of about fifty or sixty people that issue duplicate titles to private companies. You know, you lose a title and you need to Three things would have to happen. replace it. First of all, if the Secretary of State decided to privatize this contract, the union would then have thirty-five days to say, "Okay. you know, maybe we can lower our wages, lower our compensation. We'll work with you." If after those thirty-five days the Secretary of State still decides to privatize, again, contract has to be for more than a hundred thousand dollars, the work must be currently performed by State employees, and the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

-- it has to be to lay one person off - after that decision has been made. Now the recipient of the contract - the person who now is going to privatize those fifty or sixty jobs - will have to show that they can perform that work at a savings over the current cost of performing it with State employees. The private company must offer qualified employees. The employer now can interview the fifty or sixty employees that were laid off, and if that employer says this person is qualified, they can then offer them a comparable package. The cash value of the comparable salary and benefit package of this private company just must be comparable, not saying exact, of what the State employees currently do. So with that introduction, I'm more than happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs moves the previous question. There are four Members seeking to speak. Five Members, pardon me. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I have a memo here telling me that the Catholic Charities is opposed to your bill. Are you aware of that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes. We have basically worked with all the not-for-profits, given them everything they've asked for. In fact, in committee -- in Labor and Commerce Committee, we also asked for opposition, because -- you know, when we first came to -- with this bill, nobody wanted to let it out of committee. The opponents said, "This is our only forum. Don't let it out of here, because unless we have the committee, those of us in the not-for-profits do not have a forum." So, every time we had an

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

amendment, we came back to committee. Now, the last two times we've had amendments in committee, the opponents chose not to speak. They're, I think, just philosophically opposed. But we've done everything. We've exempted them. I don't know what else to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

In other words, they are still opposed to your bill, are they not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

I don't know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have great respect for the sponsor, but the Catholic Charities does an awful lot of good work to help the needed -- needy people, an awful lot of good work and volunteer work, and they can't pay high salaries. You and I both know it. All of us here. And I feel that you have to take them into consideration, and I do not think your bill has taken them into consideration. The fact that they didn't appear, didn't speak, they probably figured they didn't have any votes there. But I am telling you right now, I cannot support the bill and go against the Catholic Charities. I'm not Catholic myself, but I know the good work they do in my county. They do an awful lot of it. So I have to oppose your bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this bill, as well-intentioned as it is, is - - is a real bad idea. You can get the -- the sense of this by listening to how the sponsor described the negotiating process. In other words, an opponent -- I mean, a -- a private entity that this State relies heavily on, as we all know, to deliver a

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

lot of services and -- and to -- to take care of things, we basically set up a situation where they've got to bid against In other words, we say, "Private entity, we want themselves. you to come alongside and see if you can save us money, because we have an incredible financial pressure on this State. and please give us your best shot." Once we've got that best shot, then we go to the union and say, "Okay. Here's their plan. Now renegotiate your cost and drive your cost down into Then, in order for the private entity, which the ground." through their creativity, through their investment, through their wisdom, through their tenacity, they're the ones that came up with the cost savings opportunity in the first place, we say, "Now, drive your cost even lower. And, if you drive your cost even lower, you've got to hire ex-State workers if you're going to do it." It seems like it's putting them in a very unfair, very difficult situation. We want the private sector to come alongside us to help us solve our problems. We don't want an environment in this State where it becomes so problematic and so difficult that you've got to prove this and prove that. I mean, with all due respect to the sponsor, at the introduction of her legislation, she's charming and she presents a very sort of nice idea, but she presents it almost like it's a suggestion. It's not a suggestion. There's very declaratory language in this. "No amendment to a privatization contract shall be...", boom, very aggressive language. There's no way out of this. This isn't -this isn't just a hunch or, "Hey, you know, here's kind of a -a new fresh approach on it." This is the law. And what it's going to do is it's going to be a restraining influence on the very people that we're all reaching out to to help us solve our problems. I urge you to vote No on this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

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

She indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Does the Public Service Accountability apply only to services that are currently being provided by State agencies at the time the bill becomes law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

No. It -- anything that people currently have in no way are affected by this. This is completely prospective.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

How can the State save money if it requires private contractors to pay at least the same wages and provide the same benefits as the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

That'll be part of the negotiation. I -- I believe that it's our responsibility to -- as taxpayers, to require accountability. And that's what this reporting part of the bill does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

What effect would this bill have on the State's ability to meet it's need -- it's obligation to people with disabilities under the Olmstead decision?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

It's exempt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

...the bill take away the ability of the Executive Branch of State government to be flexible in terms of how State services are to be provided?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR HALVORSON:

I'm not sure exactly how the Executive Branch -- it hurts them. I -- 'cause I think it gives them more flexibility.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

I could go on and on with more questions, but I won't belabor the issue. I would like to point out who the opponents Catholic Charities of Illinois, the ARC of Illinois, Illinois Alcoholism and Drug Dependence Association, Chicago Area Project, Community Behavioral Healthcare Association of United Cerebral Palsy, Catholic Conferences of Illinois, Illinois, Illinois Hospital Association, Association Community -- Mental Health Authorities of Illinois, Child Care Association, Illinois Health Care Association, Illinois Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. I think it speaks for itself. I think it's a bad bill, and I would ask for a No vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Carol Ronen. Further discussion? SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. By the way, Amendment No. 6 really made this a great bill. I just want to say that. For the edification of my colleagues back here, I just wanted to clarify something we've been discussing. Is it true that Catholic Charities would not be covered by this bill? Would -- they would be exempted because the -- the services that they provide don't fall within the purview of this bill now? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Yes. All those services are exempt. And, Senator Wojcik, since the acceptance of Amendment No. 6, the majority of the people you mentioned have become neutral.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Yes. Thank you, Senator. Thank you for clarifying that also. All the groups that Senator Wojcik mentioned were not-for-profits who would be basically exempted from this bill. I

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

think this a really good idea. I commend you for all the hard work that you've put into this to make this a better and better bill. We have a responsibility as public servants to make sure that we are spending taxpayer dollars wisely. And that's all this bill is about. Where if we're spending money on services, we have to make sure that those services are of the highest quality and performed by the best staff possible. make any sense to -- to provide services and -- and try to do it on the backs of poor working people and not give them a living wage, because we know not only is that not fair to workers, it's not fair to the people who receive -- receive the service because those kind of wages only lead to high turnovers and a lack of quality service. So, I think this bill is really a step in the right direction. It's troubling to so many of us that some of the -- the -- Catholic Charities and others would -- are in - really, now, it's only Catholic Charities - would oppose this when it -- it is clear that the over two hundred and fifty million dollars that they receive from the State wouldn't be covered by that. But maybe that's an issue for -- for some further legislation and further discussion. I would just urge all my colleagues to take a step for good government and take a step for greater accountability and take a step for the -- the families that receive the services and the working men and women who provide the services in the State of Illinois and vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

She indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, I asked you a question on 2nds about the grants that you said had become exempt, and then as I'm sitting here listening, I listened to Senator Wojcik go through the litany of opponents to this bill. And there may be in that list some people who have a philosophical objection, but I also heard some that I don't think that that would apply to: ARC and some other maybe human service providers. The issue that's been raised to me in my district, and I think that's true for a fair number of

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

legislators, has been the idea that this will make it more difficult for human service providers to provide cost-effective services to the State with regards to the care of people who may be mentally ill or developmentally disabled. Now, my concern is, you said that Amendment, I think it was 6, took care of those people. My question is, if that's the case, for those people who wouldn't necessarily have a philosophical objection, why are they still against the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Senator Righter, thank you. But as I said, Amendment 6 takes care of those concerns. And the majority of them have come to me to say that they are now neutral. They -- this is prospective. It has nothing to do with any of the grants they receive. It has nothing to do with anything they do. And we all know how important it is for all of those organizations and what they do. And -- and I have assured them, through meeting after meeting, that they have been exempt, and for the life of me, I just don't know why they're still on your list. Because over on our list they've been taken off. They are now neutral. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Can you be more specific about which ones have come to you and said that they're neutral, and which ones -- I mean, are there still human service providers out there that apparently are not yet neutral? Because from what I gleaned from your comments is that we don't have accurate information on that issue. So, could you share that with -- in detail with us? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Sure. And -- and the -- things have been moving fast, and I believe that the Catholic Charities are just philosophically opposed. The ARC has come to me. And the -- I can't even name 'em without having 'em in front of me. But Phil Milsk and all of them who represent - Tony Paulauski - the ARC and all of the -- the human service not-for-profits have basically said, "Thank

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

you. We're fine now. We're just neutral." Because, through these exemptions, I don't know what they're worried about. I just can't fill you in any further except for the fact that they have come to me after committee now and said, "Thank you." I've gotten many notes and phone calls. And all it says is thank you for taking us out of this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, I want to talk now about the requirements that an entity would have to go through in order to demonstrate that there will be a cost savings from privatization. And I know that what you're, and I think what most of us are, trying to do is find the appropriate balance for when privatization should be considered or done and when it shouldn't. With the study that they have to do, the evaluation, whatever you want to call it, and then to pay a wage that is comparable to what the State employees who were providing that service before, that requirement, and the ten-percent savings, I mean, can you realistically tell me that you think that there are any instances in which they can achieve that? After having to fulfill so many of those commitments, is there a way that any of them can achieve that ten-percent savings? And if you've got one in mind, could you share it with us?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

If you'll notice in the bill, all of what you said, Senator, "or", it says, "the private sector compensation rate". So, their own compensation rate. The private sector compensation rate, or prevailing rate, including the value of all the other benefits. So it's their own compensation rate. All this says is you need to give that person first right of refusal. You need to interview them. The employer is still in charge. The employer still decides whether they will find out if they're qualified, and then decide if they want to hire them. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

If the language says or the private sector wage, then how does the employer or the contractor know which one to go to? Is it the higher of the two?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

They have to give that State employee first interview. After that, the employer of this privatization entity decides. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter, could you bring your remarks to a close? Okay. Thank you. Senator Halvorson, to close.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

I just ask for Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 73 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 36 Members voting Yes, 20 voting No, and no Members voting Present. Senate Bill 73, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 84. Senator del Valle. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 84.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 84 amends the School Code to reflect a change in the Pension Code that was done a while ago through House Bill 5169 that indicates that teachers are allowed to use up to two years of accumulated uncompensated sick leave for service credit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing that there is none -- pardon me. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

He indicates he will yield, Senator.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, do you have an estimate on the cost and -- and who would bear the cost for this change? Or is it cost neutral?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I think this is cost neutral. I don't see it costing. As a matter of fact, what it amounts to is encouraging teachers to be in their classrooms, rather than using up sick -- sick days.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Just for the benefit, Senator, of those of us that aren't on the Education Committee, could you explain, it -- it's -- it's taking -- it's taking sick and vacation time and letting them use that as pension credit, or am I misunderstanding that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

No. This addresses only the sick days. They have up to -ten sick days a year. So it's the accumulation of the sick days.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

And it allows them to apply that to their pension. Is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

That's right, the current pension law, and -- and we did this with House Bill 5169 that passed both Chambers unanimously. House Bill 5169 changed the Pension Code to allow teacher members to use up to two years of accumulated sick days. What this does, is that it brings the -- the School Code in line with that provision. So, really, you might even consider it a technical amendment more than anything else.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Just so I'm clear then. The -- the Pension Code already does this. Is that right? You're indicating yes. And this only brings the -- the School Code into compliance with that. Is that correct? That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski. No? Okay. Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator del Valle, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 84 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 is 56 Members voting Yes, none voting No, and no Members voting Present. Senate Bill 84, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 93. Senator Larry Walsh. Senator Peterson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe the sponsor didn't vote for his bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Please record me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle wishes to be recorded as having voted Yes on Senate Bill No. 84. The record will so reflect. Senate Bill 95. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill 99. Senator Carol Ronen. Senate Bill 100. Senator Cullerton. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 100.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Last year the Senate unanimously voted to pass a bill which would prohibit us from receiving our cost-of-living adjustments, and that included legislators and judges as well. It was later brought to my attention that the -- the COLA bill that we passed in 1991 provides that the COLA is considered part of your salary. unfortunately, the Illinois Constitution is very clear, that Article VI, Section 14 says that you shall not be able -- you cannot diminish the salary of a judge during the term. So that is then, that what we did last year unconstitutional. Because we have to have an independent judiciary, we can't have the ability to -- you know, if they had an unpopular decision, we can't have the ability to take their salary and reduce it. So, in order to avoid a lawsuit and the cost of a lawsuit, I present this bill which would reinstate their COLA, but at the same time, we're saying that the cost -the Compensation Review Panel cannot meet next year to consider recommending any pay raises. They have to be -- put off their decisions for a year to send the signal that this is a tough time in the State and we can't afford to even consider any pay raises. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs moves to -- the previous question. There are four speakers asking to speak on this bill. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Cullerton, first, I want to ask a question on the one part of the bill, has to do with the -- the Compensation Review Board report. And you said it won't be able to meet next year, but after that, is it my understanding, that the reports will be offered in the odd-numbered years rather than the even-numbered years? Does this bill make that change?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Right now the Compensation Review Panel meets every two years. I wanted to send the signal that we don't want to consider a pay raise next year, so I keep it -- I keep it in this bill where they meet every two years, but they can't meet next year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

But the net effect of that though, Senator, isn't it that now the Compensation Review Board report will not be presented in an election year anymore; it'll be presented in an off year. Is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

If -- if you think it makes a difference. It doesn't to me. But that's fair to say.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Now, turning to the constitutionality issue with regards to the COLAs for the judges, my understanding from your comments was, is that the language that was contained, I think, in the 1990 or 1991 COLA report is the basis for the claim that taking away the COLAs last year was unconstitutional. Is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

The law that we -- yeah. The law we passed in '91 says provided for the -- this provision shall be considered to be a component of salary fully vested at the time the other provisions of the report become law. So it's clearly part of a salary. The COLA is -- is your salary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Is there any court case on this issue with regard to constitutionality, or an Attorney General's opinion even, on this -- strictly on this issue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

On that provision, on the COLA, not that I know of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill. Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's take a look at what we're doing here. Now, judges do a good job in this State. I have a family member who is a judge. But this year, when the fiscal times are tight, we're going to send a message out of this Chamber that says, "Well, to the school districts, maybe we don't have enough money to send out to you to keep you from deficit spending; to the human service providers, maybe we don't have enough money to give to you to adequately care for the populations that really need that care; to the nursing homes, we don't have the money to restore the 5.9 percent cut we made in Medicaid reimbursement rates last year, but we do have the money, not in fiscal year 2004, the money in the current budget, retroactive, to make sure that the State employees who, while they do a good job, making well in excess of six figures a year to make sure that they get their COLA." That's one thing. Here's the other By changing the date in which the -- the message we send. Compensation Review Board report is presented, we don't present it in an election year anymore. Now, what do we have to do now in order to get that pay raise that may be in there? We have to do nothing. It's a loaded system already. We sit, and if we do

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

nothing, we get the pay raise. The -- the -- the Compensation Review Board report was placed in an election year on purpose, and that is to provide a little balance and a little pressure for the lawmakers to have some responsibility on this issue. And now that's being taken away. We're going to get twelve months before the election cycle now to decide whether or not we want to raise our wages. I think this is a terrible message for us to send. This is supposed to be a new day in Springfield and a new leadership here in the Senate. This is business as usual and I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

All I can do is say "ditto" to that. But we're talking about a fiscal impact of 4. -- little over four -- well, four million two hundred and seventy-nine thousand dollars. know, let 'em sue us. If they think it's unconstitutional, come and get us. Come and get us. I mean, this is ridiculous to cave in on a threat of a lawsuit by the Judicial Branch of this government. When the only people now who are going to get any kind of consideration in regard to pay raises - we gave ours up; merit comp people have been frozen - the only people now who are going to be considered for pay increases is a bargaining unit, the union and judges. Six-figure people making a pretty good living in this State have taken exception to the fact that we have a budget crisis in this State and we think that everyone everyone - should participate. "Oh, no. No. Not us. Not us. And if you don't, well, we'll sue you." Well, you know, let's -- let's have some gumption every now -- around here, and just say no and let 'em come and get us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a monumental day in the Illinois Senate. I am -- I am rising -- I am rising in agreement with Senator Righter and Senator Watson. They are absolutely correct. They are absolutely correct. And this isn't about judges. You know, judges do do a wonderful job, and many of the judges that I've talked to don't really support this

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

effort. We are sending a very bad message and sending a very bad precedent when we can't -- we can't give home health care workers a cost-of-living increase; we can't give human services providers a cost-of-living increase. This is really bad policy and I -- I -- I couldn't agree with the -- the prior speakers more than I do right now. This -- this is old-time politics. This is not the way the new -- a new day in the Senate and a new day in Springfield. We need -- we need to be more consistent and we need to say no to this. Because by -- because if we don't say no to this, it's a shame for all the people that we have said no to, all the schoolchildren and all the seniors and all the -- the people who -- who try to put their -- their life together on such a small salary. We must say no to this. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cullerton, to close.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senator Righter, you mentioned the issue about the Compensation Review Panel. It was my intention to delay, by a year, the ability for us to even vote on a pay raise. That was the motivation, and then I kept it every two years. So, if you think it's significant about the -- the fact that it's an election year, I -- I, quite frankly, don't agree with you. That's the motivation there. The -- the -- it's not a pay It's not a pay raise. The Constitution is very clear, and there's a reason for it. If you don't like an opinion -- if the General Assembly doesn't like an opinion of the Supreme Court or some other judge, we could theoretically come in here and -- and change their -- their salary. So the Constitution is different, Senators, for the judges than it is for us. It's the Constitution which drives this bill. We are restoring the constitutional provisions. I voted for the bill last year. was unaware of the fact that this constitutional provision was even there and it was different for the judges. I voted to take away their -- their COLA as well. They did not -- if somebody wanted to file a lawsuit, they could have filed it by now. instead of filing a lawsuit, the Judges Association, which came and testified on -- on this bill, said, "We'd like to avoid

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

filing a lawsuit." Because if they do file a lawsuit, it's as clear as can be they're going to get the money. But the difference is, we're going to have to, then, spend the money trying to defend this in litigation. So it's going to end up costing hundreds of thousands of dollars more defending what is something which is so obviously covered by the Constitution, and that's the reason why I'm asking you to do this. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 100 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ...the record. On that question, there are 31 Members voting Yes, 24 voting No, and 2 Members voting Present. Senate Bill 100, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, we might as well just see if everybody's here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson requests a verification of the affirmative vote. Will all Members be in their seats? The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Clayborne, Collins, Cronin, Crotty, Cullerton, DeLeo, del Valle, Demuzio, Dillard, Haine, Halvorson, Harmon, Hendon, Hunter, Jacobs, Lightford, Link, Maloney, Martinez, Meeks, Munoz, Petka, Roskam, Sandoval, Schoenberg, Shadid, Silverstein, Trotter, Viverito, Walsh and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Would all Members please be in their seats? Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, Mr. President. And that's an excellent suggestion. It's too bad you didn't make it before the verification. And I think lawyers ought to declare a conflict of interest on this one. Senator Hunter.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Hunter is in the aisle. In the middle aisle, on the Democratic side.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Martinez -- Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Martinez is at her desk.

SENATOR WATSON:

Martinez. Excuse me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any other Member?

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Petka.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ed Petka. Senator Petka is sitting in his seat. Senator Watson, do you question the presence of any other Member?

SENATOR WATSON:

No. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Thank you, Senator Watson. On a verified roll call, there are 31 Ayes, 24 Nays, and 2 Members voting Present. Having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 100 Senator Carol Ronen. is declared passed. Senate Bill 101. Senate Bill 102. Senator James Clayborne. Senate Bill 109. Senator Frank Watson. Senate Bill 111. Senator Jacobs. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 113. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill -- Senator, 113? Senate Bill 114. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill 123. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 152. Senator Terry Link. 152. Senate Bill 155. Senator Halvorson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary. I'm sorry. There's an amendment. Senator Halvorson seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 155 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 155. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Halvorson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Basically, we can debate this on 3rd Reading, but Senate Amendment No. 5, it becomes the bill and it just makes some technical changes...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator, it's Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

4? Oh, 4. Well, then I -- we can -- see table -- 4 was what was done last week, so this isn't the one that was in committee today? Okay, then, can we just table?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson asks leave to table Senate Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

No. 4.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there leave? Leave is granted. Amendment No. 4 is tabled. Are there any further amendments, Madam Secretary? SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Halvorson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Amendment No. 5 just makes some technical changes to the State agency with regards to hearing on the subcontractors. We can debate the -- the bill on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing no one requests discussion, the -- all those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. 3rd Reading -- are there any further amendments, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 155. Senator Halvorson, do you wish to proceed? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 155.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 155 requires that a contractor, within fifteen days of receipt of payment from a State agency, to make full payment to their subcontractors and material suppliers. It also creates a four-percent-per-month interest penalty on the balance if payments are not made to subcontractors by the fifteen days of receipt. Also permits a subcontractor or material supplier to submit notice to the State agency. I'll answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Dale Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 155 was a terrible bill whenever it started. And after it's gone through several amendments, I'm still not sure it's a perfect bill, but it does address an issue that has been a problem around construction for a period of time and that's getting payment on time to subcontractors. The Illinois Department of Transportation worked with the contractors, both the primes and the subs, to —to work on this amendment, and while I don't think this is a perfect bill, I think it is one that gets us started in the right direction and I think it's one that we can fine-tune as we go along and one that, obviously, the Department thinks they can live with. So, I will support the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Further discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, we were able to talk about this bill a little bit a couple minutes ago in the Executive Committee and one of the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

things that we talked about were the procedures, because what you're doing is -- is setting up procedures where if there is a grievance, a subcontractor is able to go in and make a petition to a State agency or a State official. Those things in the bill aren't very well defined and we talked about that in committee. Can you reassure the Members about how that's going to get cleared up? 'Cause right now, I described it as clear as mud. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Senator Roskam. We have said that there is a problem. What -- the -- the prime gets paid, the subcontractor now has to take the responsibility of knowing that that prime contractor was paid. They, then, will get their portion within fifteen days. The IDOT will set up a procedure, which isn't quite ironed out perfectly, as -- which has been said, and to set up the due process. And I agree with you, Senator Roskam. There's a few little things that we still need to fix that we will intend to fix over in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

To the bill: You know, what this bill does in a nutshell is a -- it's a decent underlying concept, but us moving forward on this is -- is sort of the ultimate irony, I think, of this Session. What the bill says is that if a subcontractor has a grievance with the contractor on a State job, that they can -and they haven't been paid within fifteen days, where they think that they should be paid, that they go to the State agency and the State agency listens to the evidence and then it's going to be cleared up, like Senator Halvorson said, and there will be a process and the subcontractor gets -- gets paid. But let's think about what would happen if our subcontractors came to the State, where we're the contractor, and did this exact, same thing. Right now, men and women of the Senate, we owe three billion dollars. We owe three billion dollars in accounts payable to various contractors and folks across the State of Illinois. for us to sit here and act as if we have clean hands and try to tell contractors how to do their business when we're not even

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

living up to this - not by one time or two times or three times or five times; we're a hundred days out, we're a hundred and ten, we're a hundred and twenty, a hundred and thirty days out - we're not living up to the very standard that we're telling contractors that they have to live up to. We're telling the contractors, "You get your money and, boy, fifteen days later, you better pay that dough out." We're sitting on three billion dollars in obligations and the people that we contract with are screaming for relief. I would urge a -- a No or Present vote on this, just -- just sort of for our own pride. I don't see how we can foist a standard like this when we are so lacking ourselves. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. The former speaker's analogy really is to -- to be -- with all due respect, as you would say, Senator Roskam, is really quite ludicrous. What this bill says is when a contractor gets paid, when they have the money, then fifteen days later they must pay the subcontractor. That's quite a different situation than the one he was alluding to. I really commend the sponsor for all the hard work she's put into this bill. I think it's very important. The work of subcontractors is extremely important and they -- they can't be expected to perform work and not get paid when the contractor has already been paid. It's only fair and it's only right. And I would suggest that, especially if you're concerned with women-owned businesses and minority businesses that are most often subcontractors, that this is a very important bill for you, and I would urge all my colleagues to vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Garrett, further discussion.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I just want to say that I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. Other states have forwarded what they call the Prompt Payment Act because many subcontractors are forced to go out of business, because while the contractor has been paid, many times the --subcontractor hasn't been and they are having to borrow money to pay some of the people that have done the work. There are many

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

states that have already put this through. The devil is in the details but I know that the Senator's working on that, and it really is a good government type of legislation. I hope everybody supports it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Halvorson, to close.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I -- I appreciate my closing remarks being summed up by Senator Ronen and Senator Garrett. It is true. We're talking about two different things. The State doesn't have the money, necessarily, to pay its bills. The prime contractor had the money. We don't want them sitting on that money to -- in order to pay their subcontractors. So, I encourage everybody to vote Aye. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 155 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 46 Members voting Yes, 7 voting No and 2 Members voting Present. Senate Bill 155, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 158. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 174. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate Bill 175. Senate Bill 176. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate Bill 196. Senator David Sullivan. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 196.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator David Sullivan.

SENATOR D. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 196 deals with park districts in Cook County. It allows them to increase the rate in one fund as long as they decrease the rate in a separate fund, so that it has to be neutral and it has to remain under the tax cap. There —there's no known opposition. Passed unanimously out of committee. I ask for an Aye vote.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing no Member seeking recognition, the question is, shall Senate Bill 196 pass. All in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, 1 Member voting No and none are voting Senate Bill 196, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 223. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 224. Senator Clayborne. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 248. Senator Carol Ronen. Senate Bill 263. Senator Obama. Senator Obama. Senate Senate Bill 281. Senator Haine. Senator Haine. Senate Bill 309. Senator Carol Ronen. Senate Bill 315. Senator Louis Viverito. Senate Bill 328. Senator Terry Link. Senate Bill 331. Senator Kim Lightford. At the top of page 8, on the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 399. Schoenberg. Senate Bill 405. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 409. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 415. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate Bill 425. Senator Haine. Senate Bill 427. Senate Bill 452. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 476. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 478. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 480. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 481. Senate Bill 494. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 506. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 517. Senator Schoenberg. Senator Schoenberg. Senator -- Senate Bill 552. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 567. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 576. Bill 573. Senator Obama. Senator Woolard. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 599. Senate Bill 578. Lauzen. Senate Bill 600. Senator Lightford. That bill is on the recall list. Senator Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 600 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 600. Madam there any Floor amendments approved Secretary, are for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Floor Amendment No. 5, offered by Senator Lightford. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford, on the amendment.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Body. Senate Amendment No. 5 provides for a stipend of the minimum wage increase; beginning September of this year, wages for eighteen and over to six dollars an hour, and effective September 1 of the following year, six fifty an hour.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing no Member seeking recognition, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 600. Senator Lightford, do you wish to proceed? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 600.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm so happy to be at this point, unexpectedly; however, I'm very proud of Senate Bill 600. It is the proposed legislation to increase the minimum wage here in the State of Illinois. It currently cites that -- it's currently stated at five fifteen an hour, which is the federal Act that has been in place since 1997. There has not been a federal increase, neither has there been a State increase. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR W. JONES:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Lightford, I've been getting a lot of mail from places like Burger King, and, matter of fact, I got a -- a mailing from the Burger King International Headquarters opposing this bill before you amended it. I'm -- I'm sure I can speak for them. I doubt that they're any happier that you amended it to make it six instead of six fifty. But to the -- to the point: I've talked to people who -- who work in this business and they tell me that when they raise the minimum wage in -- in a place like Burger King, they have to lay somebody off. Now, clearly, the intent of our record here in -- in this Session ought to be to try to get our economy back on the right track, and when you raise the minimum wage and lay people off, it seems to me it sends the wrong message. Can you -- can you explain to me why every Burger King in Illinois is against this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator, let me just say first that the Illinois Restaurant Association is a proponent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Well, I'll -- I'll check, Senator, to see if Burger King's a member of that organization, but I have a letter here from the Midwest representative of the national franchise association representing all the Burger Kings in Illinois and they are opposed to it. I've had an awful lot of calls and letters on this legislation. I commend you for amending it. It helps a little bit because it's a -- as they say around here, a step in the right direction, but it certainly doesn't solve the problem of raising the cost of doing business. All we're doing is raising the cost of doing business. We're helping the sixteento twenty-four-year-olds who work in restaurants, who work parttime. We're raising the cost of doing business in many, many of our retail places in Illinois, and it is going to be an antibusiness vote on this bill. I urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Munoz.

SENATOR MUNOZ:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. Just move the previous question. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Munoz moves the previous question. At this time, there are one, two, three, four, five, six Members seeking recognition. Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

She indicates she will yield, Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

I have a few questions. What -- at what minimum wage would it be if you were fifteen or sixteen years old and working?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

The age is from sixteen to eighteen. The Director of the Department of Labor will set that wage. It's currently five fifteen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

And your amendment addresses eighteen and over and you're going to graduate it? You go at six dollars an hour, then you go up to six fifty an hour the next year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

I just would like to speak to the bill. According to what I hear and according to what I have in my records, it shows that, again, the small businesses would be hurt. If you have a gentleman who owns a nursery and in the summer he hires summer help, and if he's subjected to this type of minimum wage, what'll happen to him if he has twenty employees, ten of them will have to go. So, it -- it's well-intended. I can understand

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

the sponsor's reasoning for this, but it's a bad bill for small businesses. So, vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Woolard, for further discussion.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

I think I'll just go to the bill, if I may. You know, I know that all of us have, various times, things that affect us or impact us in our regions that are of great concern to us. And I want to commend the sponsor of this legislation for being receptive, to listen to some of those concerns. I know that in many parts of the State, you're probably just exactly like we are in southern Illinois. We have a concern and a compassion for those people who are making the minimal amounts of money and we have a responsibility, as legislators, to do anything and everything in our power to ensure that we protect their interests to the best of our ability. Sometimes it's very difficult for us, especially me, to discern whether or not we're taking the right step in order to ensure that we help rather I've heard a lot of people talk about the fact than hinder. that there could be massive layoffs and I think that there probably will be some unintended repercussions of this type of legislation. But as I recognize the responsibility that I have, that we have to protect the interest of business, but probably our prime concern is to protect those people who are most vulnerable and those people at the minimum wage scale. not necessarily talking about kids. I'm talking about family wage earners for families. I'm talking about those people who are going to be impacted very significantly if we don't do something to help them as inflation continues to erode the base that they live on. As I talked to the sponsor, I said that I think it's imperative that we find a way to phase in the cost of I think that if, in fact, we had dropped a dollar this raise. thirty-five an hour on many of the small businesses in the region that I represent, there would have been catastrophic results. With this phase-in, it's going to be much better. would rather have had a three-step procedure rather than two, but I can live with this. And once again, I'm going to be voting in favor and I very much commend the sponsor of this legislation

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

for listening to the needs of those of us from other parts of this State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam, further -- further debate.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: You know, we can live with this. We're all going to be fine. We can absolutely live with this, but the problem is that there's a lot of businesses that we represent, a lot of businesses in our district, that absolutely cannot live with this. You know, there's been a lot of talk about minimum wage earners and so forth, but the real question is whether those folks are the heads of households and let's dispel that myth. There's there's study after study - and I'll quote one, the Census Bureau - they say that seventy-six percent of all minimum wage earners are not heads of households. Furthermore, the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that only 2.2 percent of working adults are earning the minimum wage. So, what are we doing? We're creating an environment where businesses are going to drive their costs up, they're not going to be able to hire the teenagers and so forth that many of us want to get off the streets, many of us want to create opportunities for. I know that that's been a theme on the other side, and it's something that our side joins in on as well. There is study after study after study that I have in my hand, ranging from Stanford University to the Cato Institute and everyplace in between, that says the minimum wage is a fallacy if you believe it helps people. In fact, it's called illogical compassion by some. doesn't work. Here's the net effect: If we increase the minimum wage, we're not just going in on those workers lower down on the food chain. But the cumulative effect, everything is negotiated all the way up and down the line so that workers who are not only minimum wage workers but one tier up, two tier, three tier, and so forth, become very, very costly. All of this at a time when we're trying to create a competitive environment. You know, the Chicago Tribune called this, on their editorial page, a misguided effort. They were very, very critical of it. Why? Because they recognize that we've got to do everything that we can to attract business into this State. We just saw the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Illinois Department of Employment Security a couple of weeks ago, in fact, say that reductions in employer payrolls drove unemployment rates higher than levels a year ago. We're going in the wrong direction from a jobs point of view, and all we're doing is adding legislative gasoline to a smoldering fire. not going to help us. What we've got to do is create an environment where Illinois becomes a competitive place and where people want to come to work. I just want to close and quote one colleagues who, last month, on some other unrelated, admittedly, but setting the same tone, said these We have to attract businesses and jobs. We have to be competitive, and we have to ensure that we do everything we can so we don't lose jobs and businesses to our border states. So, you could maybe say that there's some competitiveness. I just hope that my colleagues would agree that Illinois needs to do as much as we possibly can to keep our jobs, keep our businesses and become economically competitive. That was Senator Garrett, who made the argument that we need to be a competitive state. To do this, Mr. President, is a move in the wrong direction. told by Senator Jones, in closing, that he recently met --Senator -- Senator John O. Jones, that he recently had a meeting down in his neck of the woods, so to speak, with business people from southern Illinois, and to a person, they all said, "Please, do not pass this minimum wage bill." I ask that we stand with those businesses in southern Illinois that Senator represents and let's do the right thing and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Further discussion? Senator Carol Ronen. Pardon me, Senator Ronen. Senator Susan Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Point of personal privilege. I'd like to respond to the last speaker.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I appreciate using the comments that I made in committee and -- and what I said I believe is true, that we have to do everything we can to attract new businesses and keep businesses within our own State. But I also think that when you're talking

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

about Burger King as the one and only -- one of the major employers that is speaking out against the minimum wage, but you're also looking at thousands and thousands of families who are being affected because they have to comply with a five-dollar-and-fifteen-cent-an-hour wage, and that really isn't fair. And then what happens is they come back to the State for additional help. So, in many ways, the State subsidizes what we aren't asking business to do. And I think any good business owner who is worthy of what they are doing will, in fact, support a -- a wage of six dollars an hour. I think that's how Illinois does maintain competitiveness in this -- in this State. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Carol Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong support of Senator Lightford's bill. I commend her for all the hard work that she's done not only this year, for the past three or four years that she's worked on this. And it's great that we can finally be debating and discussing this in -- in this Chamber. You know, I -- I have a study here also and this study from the Center for Urban Economic Development says that there will -there is -- there is not an economic impact to business if we raise the minimum wage. So, I think they can talk about their studies and we have other studies, but I think what we're here today to do is to speak for and support the working men and women of Illinois and that's what this bill does. If we raise the minimum wage, that will directly affect over four hundred and fifty thousand Illinois workers who currently receive five dollars and fifteen cents an hour. And they're not students, The overwhelming majority, almost seventy they're not kids. percent, are -- are over twenty years old and nearly a third statewide are heads of household supporting families on the minimum wage, and that is just wrong. It's just flat wrong. And we have a chance today to not stand with a few -- maybe a few businesses, but to stand with the people and to stand with working families and to do what's right. And I would urge all of my colleagues to vote Aye on this very important bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Hendon, for further discussion.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I -- I have to say to my esteemed colleague, Senator Roskam, who I find to be quite intellectual, to use one of your comments, one -- a line you use a lot - out of all due respect - in all due respect, Senator Roskam, I -- I can't even imagine the last time you've been in a Burger King. Don't look like you go to "have it your way". addition, I saw your vote on Senate Bill 100. It didn't bother you at all to give a raise to judges who're making over a hundred and thirty or a hundred and forty thousand, but, yet, you don't want to give a little person -- he voted for it and he stands by his doggone vote. He voted to give the people who're making over a hundred and twenty thousand a raise, but somebody making a little five dollars and fifteen cents, you want to get up and say how bad it is. What hypocrisy, my friend. Be for real about this. And you talk about no head of households are making this small money. They are in my district. They may not in your district because we represent two different districts. Illinois is not just built -- made up of -- high-class people. There are some people out here who are really struggling, Senators, really struggling day to day. They take a job at five fifteen an hour because that's all they can get. they can get. I urge an Aye vote. Senator Lightford has worked very hard on this. We put the amendment on there to put it in two year increments because we understand business. love business over here on the Democratic side of the aisle as well. So we did and made the necessary adjustments to make this palatable to everyone, and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I did not vote for the judges' bill and I'm a lawyer, practicing for many years and still practicing. And it might hurt me but I did not feel it was justified at this time. Also, I've gone to burgers and what have you, and I know what it is to have minimum wage. I worked for a very much less minimum wage many years ago. However, what worries me is this: Why cannot we wait till the federal Congress sets the minimum wage that they've got to

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

think about and to work on so it'll be uniform the whole -- all over? You know, the backbone of this country is not the big businesses, like Burger Kings and the others; it's the small businessmen, the small business people who have to struggle to If they have to go up now in these critical times, it's very difficult. I'm not against anyone making a good wage. I like to do it myself, but -- but we have to be realistic. It's the small businesses, which are the backbone of this country, are the ones who are going to suffer, not the big I couldn't care less about Burger King McDonald's and what have you. And I have relatives who are in the McDonald's business and I still don't care. The point is, are we helping the small businesses that are struggling today? And I -- I have mixed emotions. I'm not against anyone making a decent salary, but that's -- that's what it is. Minimum wage usually is for part-time jobs. And therefore, I -- I don't know that it's wise at this time to raise the minimum wage in Illinois. I wish the -- the national government would do it. And I might say that I have the utmost respect for the sponsor, but this is the way I feel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Meeks, the last speaker.

SENATOR MEEKS:

Thank you so much, Mr. President. Let me rise in support -- in strong support of this bill. I've listened to a lot of debate. I would hope that we're in the process of making sure that Illinois is a State that sends a strong message to the rest of this country that we actually care about people. And I do believe that small businesses will be helped because the more money individuals have in their pockets, the more money they could spend. I keep hearing this analogy that if we helped big businesses, that money would somehow trickle down and then all of the people at the bottom would somehow be able to be helped because the money has trickled down. I hurt my knee the other day. I ran into the wall. I wasn't paying any attention to where I was going. A big gash was on my knee. It was bleeding. I didn't pour the alcohol on my head so that it could trickle down to my knee. I put it directly on the spot that was hurting. And in that, the individuals in our community, those

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

who need this raise, these are the people that we need to help the most. Rather than causing the money to go from the top down, it's time to come from the bottom up. And I rise in strong support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask the Body to be patient with me for a moment considering I didn't have the opportunity to jump back in there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator, you -- there were no questions to respond to.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Well, Mr. President, I want it to be clear that there isn't a cost to business from my analysis that I have. And also, Senator Ronen was able to answer the study questions. actually there was comments made that I would have liked to address. So, now that you're back here for my closing, I want to just go back to Senator Roskam. Senator, in terms of the cost to businesses, you -- you probably can't find that information because it's less than one percent. Actually, it will be a .35 percent of wages in Illinois businesses that were paid out to workers in 2001. It's called spillover. With that spillover wage increase to workers, it would -- for employees earning between six fifty and seven fifty an hour, it would only push that amount to a .49 percent. Only .49 of one percent. impact is so low, that's probably why you didn't find it in a It's not even one percent. But businesses would, in fact, see an increase of 1.2 billion dollars in sales as a result of over eight hundred thousand workers having more purchasing power. The more money they have, the greater ability they have to make purchases. I believe this is to be safe and a great investment in our State and in our future. bounce back over and talk about Welfare to Work for a moment. We have been pressing and pressing and pressing women to -- and men to get off our welfare rolls, to return to work. They're receiving Section 8 subsidies, babysitting check subsidies, LINK cards to purchase food. Why don't we just pay them decent wages so that they would not have to rely on the State system as much?

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

We're also moving into this force of trying to get them to be married. So, now we're wanting to pressure people into marriage just so that they can afford to survive, for the women who are supporting their children alone on five fifteen an hour. let me say this about our economy: We were voted number one in the nation for economic development over the past two years, especially this last year. Chicago alone have put over thirteen billion dollars in investing and attracting new businesses to I don't believe we're in a position here where State's businesses will just up and move and relocate. now we are the number one State in the nation for attracting Another point I'd like to make is, businesses to our State. this is the point now, this is where we are: We're right here, we're right now. We have the ability to help over eight hundred thousand low-wage workers. I've been using this analogy all along. On five fifteen an hour, you can't purchase a number one at McDonald's for that amount. We blow, as Members here in this Body, five dollars that we give to Pages just to go to our car, just to go down to our office, anything that we need here. tip people five dollars an hour in local bars where you're having cocktails after you're done here. I think it's time for us to take a look at families who are under the poverty level by fifty-five percent. That's what we're doing here. There's over eleven states that have implemented a minimum wage increase. ...let you know who we're affecting by this. Sixty percent of those workers are women, 15.7 are African-American, 19.2 are Hispanics, 70.8 are adults over the age of twenty, and one-third of them whom are family age -- wage earners. Forty-eight percent of minimum wage workers are full time. Thirty-one percent, they work between twenty to thirty-four hours per week. Ninety-five percent of minimum wage workers are nonunion and between twentysix and forty-three percent of Illinois households with a minimum or near minimum wage earner fall below the selfsufficiency standard for meeting basic household needs. a responsibility to be the best public servants that we can be, and this is diversity. This is opportunity. This is allowing a family to survive. And I thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to try to gather up all my thoughts and get it out and

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

express the importance of a minimum wage increase. And I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 600 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Members voting Yes, 23 voting No, 1 Member voting Present. Senate Bill 600, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 605. Senate Bill 623. Senator Sieben. Senate Bill 624. Radogno. Senator Sieben. Senate Bill 655. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill Senate Bill 657. Senator Radogno. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 658. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 659. Radogno. Senate Bill 660. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 661. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 662. Senator Radogno. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 664. Bill 663. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 665. Senator Radogno. Senate Bill 666. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 667. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 668. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 669. Senator Syverson. Bill 670. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 671. Syverson. Senate Bill 672. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 673. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 674. Senator Syverson. Senate Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 676. Senator Syverson. Senator Syverson. Senate Bill 677. Senate Bill 678. Senate Bill 681. Senator Carol Ronen. Senate Bill Syverson. 681. Senate Bill 683. Senator Lightford. Read the bill, Madam {sic} Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 683.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam -- Mr. President. Sorry. This is a bill that the Illinois Bankers brought to my attention. The Community Bankers are in support, as well as the credit unions, with the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

last amendment that we applied to this bill, and it's regarding banking. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing that no Member wants to speak on this bill, the question is, shall Senate Bill 681 --All those in favor will vote Aye. 683, excuse me, pass. The voting is open. Opposed, vote Nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On that question, there are 57 Members voting Yes, no Members voting No, and no Members are voting Present. Senate Bill 683, having received the required constitutional majority, Senate Bill 732. Senator James Clayborne. is declared passed. Senate Bill 732. Senate Bill 813. Senator Miguel del Valle. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 813.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill, as it is before you, would allow individuals who, through no fault of their own, had omitted property through the assessment process, and once the assessor establishes that that property was omitted due to an error, then it allows the individual sixteen months to pay what is due. Now, it's a bill that's being worked on. We're going to see this bill again. We're working with the county -- Cook County Assessor's Office and we're working on an amendment that will be put on in the House that would basically say that the omitted assessments -- the language that would allow -- it would allow the bill for omitted assessments to be sent when the first installment property bill is sent and then the assessment bill will not become due or accrue interest until the date of the second installment. And so, that would give an individual about six months, rather than the -- the sixteen months that the bill calls for. Again here, it's an issue of fairness. We want to allow individuals time. As it stands right now, many of them have to come up with the full amount within

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

thirty days, and it's just not fair. So, the Cook County Assessor's -- agrees that a change is in order. This bill is not in its final form. I've described to you what will be in the final bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

He indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator del Valle, just kind of for just a point of clarification. Senator Lauzen, who usually talks on these bills, is not here today, so I'm just trying to, for the benefit of our Members, see if I can relay to you back what I think you said, and -- and if so, I -- I think it's a good idea. Is -- are you trying to address a problem, Senator, where an innocent taxpayer does not receive a notice, they have a tax liability, they don't realize it, and you're -- you're allowing the process to catch up with them but over a -- over an extended period of time so they're not hit all at once? Is that it, in a nutshell? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

That's correct. The -- the -- the owners were not aware of -- of the mistake. The assessor determined that a mistake was made and now the owner is being told you have to come up with all the money at once.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator del Valle, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 813 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, no Members voting No, and no Members are voting Present. Senate Bill 813, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 814. Senator del Valle. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senate Bill 814.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill basically establishes a requirement that's been imposed on us by the No Child Left Behind Law to require schools — districts to establish procedures for allowing children to be transferred out of persistently dangerous schools. There was some initial opposition to this bill because there wasn't a definition of dangerous schools. We took care of that with the amendment and now there's no opposition. Basically, the definition put into the statute is the federal definition. I'll be glad to answer any other questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? No Member seeking recognition, the question is, shall Senate Bill 814 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, no Members voting No, and none are voting Present. Senate Bill 814, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On page 14, Senate Bill 854. Senator Lightford. Is there leave to come back to that bill? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 878. Senator del Valle. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 878.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. There was an amendment to this bill. I -- I tabled the amendment. The amendment had what I thought was -- was an agreement with all the groups. I thought it included the recommendations from the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Task Force on Assessment -- and Accountability. We found out in committee that there were a couple of provisions in the amendment that were not agreed to. I tabled the amendment. What I want to do is move this out over to the House so that we could work on this and be able to see this bill again. Again...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is...

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

...it incorporates the -- the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. You know, the House is going to have a lot of work to do. We're just sending everything over there for them to do for us. Used to be, traditionally, things started here. We were the -- we were the Body that'd stand up. We were the Body of reason. But, no, not now. We're just going to send everything over to the House. Send it all over there. Let them take care of it. Very good. Very good.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: This is a shell bill, as I -- as I recall anyway, right now. And I understand what the Senator's intention is with this bill, but if you're like me and you have some concerns with federal mandates relative to No Child Left Behind, you might want to either vote Present or No on this building, as I intend -- on this bill, as I intend to do. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator del Valle, to close.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I just want to remind the Members that you will be able to vote on -- on the final product, and I think we did the right thing by -- by pushing this bill forward and tabling the amendment. We were the voice of reason. Instead of trying to ram through something that -- that had problems with it, we

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

decided to hold it. So, I think the responsible thing is to move this process along, because whether we like it or not, we have to comply with the No Child Left Behind federal law. We -- we have no other choice. It is a federal mandate. As much as I know some of you hate that word, it is a federal mandate and it's a mandate that comes from the President of the United States.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 878 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Members voting Yes, 9 voting No, and 8 Members voting Senate Bill 878, having received the required Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 882. Senator James Clayborne. Senate Bill 892. Senator Lauzen. Middle of page 15, Senate Bill 941. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 954. Senator Haine. 954. Near the top of the page 16, Senate Bill 973. Senator James DeLeo. Senate Bill 1001. Senator Clayborne. ...of page 17, Senate Bill 1031. Senator Meeks. Senator Meeks. Senate Bill 1036. Senator Collins. Senate Bill 1037. Senator Trotter. Senate Bill 1045. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 1051. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 1060. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 1070. Senator Carol Ronen. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1070.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Illinois Senate. We started discussing this bill yesterday -- last week, rather, and because there were some different staff opinions on one side of the aisle to the other, we took it out of the record. Let me just rephrase. This is a bill that relates only to the bargaining rights at University of Illinois. It amends the Labor Relations Act to include graduate students who are

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

teaching. This bill codifies an agreement between the University of Illinois and the Illinois Federation of Teachers. It has only minimal impact on the other universities but does not --does not require them to do anything. There is no opposition to this bill. I would urge that all my colleagues support me in --in voting for this. This legislation is really necessary now so that we can avoid future costly legal battles that have been too much in the history, that this bill would -- would --would eliminate. So, I would urge all my colleagues to vote Aye. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

She indicates she will yield, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, in your opening comments there, you -- you stated that you wanted to make it clear that this bill only codified language and would only pertain to the University of Illinois. Now, in reading the text of the bill, I don't see any limiting language there with regards to the University of Illinois. It's my understanding that this new definition that's being put in the law will apply to all the public universities. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Only in a very narrow sense, in that it would allow universities, should they wish, to embark upon negotiations but does not require them to, and those universities who might be impacted are not opposed to this bill, are, in fact, neutral in -- in regard to this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. That's -- that's not my information. I represent Eastern Illinois University, and it's my understanding that Illinois State University are listed as opponents. That's the information I have, Senator. I know that

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

they were not part of the talks between the Education Labor Relations Board and the University of Illinois about the definition that would wind up applying to them. I mean, the definition that's been agreed to is going to be binding - is it not? - on all the other State universities, not just the University of Illinois. Isn't that true?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

It -- it -- that definition would open the door should they choose to negotiate, and -- and my information, as of this afternoon as of one hour ago, is that Eastern Illinois is not opposed to this, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, to the bill, Mr. President, just very briefly. Just, I guess, mostly for Members on our side of the aisle, this would apply to all the public universities. All those other universities, exception of -- of the University of Illinois, were not part of the discussions with regards to how this definition will play out with regards to what's on their campuses. So, just a note of caution there, that the other universities really didn't have an opportunity to provide input on this definition. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Ronen, to close.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the -- of the Senate. I would urge that we support this bill. The other universities that were mentioned did not participate because they chose not to participate, not because they -- they could not participate. The language in the bill codifies an agreement that would apply to the University of Illinois system and with the Illinois Federation of Teachers. There's nothing in this bill that requires the other universities to take any steps. It opens a tiny, little door should they wish to. Because this issue came up last week, we took great pains to have a discussion with all

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

of those universities, and I -- from what I am told is, in every case, each of those universities told us that they are not opposed to this bill. I would urge my colleagues to support this good piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1070 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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, there are 39 Members voting Yes, 16 Members voting No, and 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1070, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1110. Senate Bill 1111. Senator Hendon. Top of page 18. Senate Bill 1115. Senator Hendon. Senate Bill 1116. Senator Hendon. It's a recall -- on the recall list. Senator Hendon seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1116 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 1116. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Hendon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill has been debated in large degree. I'll be happy to debate again on 3rd if necessary, but Amendment No. 3 satisfies the local banking community with this credit card Act and I'd ask for its approval -- adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor of the amendment will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1116. Senator Hendon, do you wish to proceed? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1116.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a -- an initiative from esteemed Treasurer, Judy Baar Topinka. We're simply attempting to let the credit cardholder beware, to make them more informed as to why they may have gotten an increase on their rate that they're paying on the credit card. Sometimes the credit card companies will raise their rate based on a late payment in another area. We should let the consumer beware, then the consumer can check that out or they can choose to use a different card. Pretty much that's what it does. The bill also expands the -- disclosure requirements a facilitator must specifically disclose to a borrower who applies for a refund anticipation loan to include the annual percentage rate based on the ten-day loan period rather than a year, which is better for the borrower, and their costs in securing the loan. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, Senator, this came up in the Executive Committee a couple minutes ago and we were able to talk about it then and maybe you can just give us a little bit more detail now. One of the things that -- when you and I spoke, you were pretty candid and admitted that a weakness in the bill is that while it puts credit cardholders on notice that there is a problem, it doesn't tell 'em where the problem is. Is that right?

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

That is correct, Senator Roskam, and I certainly appreciated your questions in committee and your questions here on the Floor because I would have liked the bill to be stronger than it currently is. And that is one of the problems with the bill -- where it could be stronger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, let me just make this suggestion and I said it in committee, if -- if we had been involved in that process a little bit earlier, we may have been able to help you to have a stronger bill, because I think, while your bill does some nice things, it's kind of window dressing. I know that's not your intention, but they negotiated you down to -- to not much of a bill, with -- with all due respect. And maybe we can talk about the next -- the next bill together at Burger King. What do you say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Hendon, to close.

SENATOR HENDON:

I thought you were going to say "over a beer". Burger King or a beer would be fine with me, Senator Roskam. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1116 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, none voting Nay, and no Members vote --voted Present. Senate Bill 1116, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1125. Senator Sieben. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1125.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This bill is a shell bill and remains as a shell bill. The subject that it deals with is Illinois' restricted call registry bill that's due to kick in Yeah, a shell bill. later this year. It is a shell bill. me -- the parties involved in the discussion on this bill involve the Illinois Bankers Association, the Illinois Realtors' and the Illinois Licensed Insurance Agents. We're trying to reach some agreement on definitions as Illinois folds their restricted call or no call registry bill in with the federal bill that's going to kick in this year. Like -- like to move it to the House. Hopefully we can make the agreement there with the amendment and then it'll have to come back to the Senate to act on that amendment. That's what the bill will do if we can reach an agreement on the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Obama. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of Senate Bill 1125, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, 13 voting No, and 1 Member voted Present. Senate Bill 1125, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1164. Senator Hunter. Senate Bill 1201. Senator Emil Jones. Senate Bill 1212. Senator Larry Walsh. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1212.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1212, as amended, amends the Prevailing Wage Act in several simple ways that codify the recent court cases and opinions, bolsters the enforcement and brings the Act

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

back into its original purpose, the purpose of payment of good wages on public-funded construction projects. It amends the definition of a public works project. It specifies that all Illinois FIRST-funded projects, much like the Build Illinois projects have been covered for years, are covered by the Act. Clarifies the coverage of maintenance projects. Eliminates language in the definition of public body that has been used in court to object to the Act's coverage. It codifies a court decision, creating the definition of fixed work, and it also requires wages -- wage rates be posted on the job site. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is for purpose of legislative intent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

As it pertains to Prevailing Wage Law, do the changes proposed in Senate Bill 1212 affect infrastructure improvements constructed by the private sector and later dedicated to a public body?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh. We didn't hear you.

SENATOR WALSH:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Do the proposed changes in Senate Bill 1212 expand prevailing wage to the private sector prior to the dedication and acceptance of infrastructure improvements from a private developer to a unit of government?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Wojcik.

SENATOR WOJCIK:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Also for the same issue, but I want to elaborate on it a little bit afterwards: Does Senate Bill 1212 change the exemption from the Prevailing Wage Act for local government employees who perform construction or maintenance work for their government employees {sic} as established by the City of Monmouth versus Lorenz and other court cases?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I -- I understand and I accept that. I still would like to see the bill massaged, if we could, because I'm a believer that if you go on the -- premise of a court case, that just breeds another court case and I'd like to see the language tightened on that, if we could, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski, further discussion.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

He indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you -- thank you. Senator Walsh, just a couple of questions. I think I heard you say that this adds Illinois FIRST projects.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

That's correct, Senator.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. What if there is an entity that has received a grant for an Illinois FIRST -- or, for a Member initiative, for instance. They've received that grant and now all of a sudden -- or maybe it's a grant that's on hold. Maybe you know there's some things that are going to open up that we don't know about. I don't know. But -- but let's say that someone has been committed some funds to do a -- a project that they think is -- is valuable. They say the cost is going to be ten grand. Now, does your bill go back and address those types of projects that -- where the funds have already been committed or is this prospective?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Our intent is to be prospective.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

You understand my concern is if there's a commitment already made and those people are expecting to spend X amount of dollars for a project, now they find out, "Uh-oh, we got to do prevailing wage", it creates a concern, for all of us, I think. So, I would appreciate it if you could maybe figure out a way to massage that, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Walsh, prospective as of when?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Roskam, it's my understanding that -- that former Attorney General Ryan issued an opinion regarding the coverage of the Act of a private project that received Illinois FIRST monies in 2000, that the bill was not intended to apply to projects funded by the Illinois FIRST program retroactively.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

I -- I understand the sentence that you just said, but my concern is -- just following up on Senator Burzynski's example. Let's say there's a program for the developmentally -- disabled and if they get money that is sort of pending review right now in the Governor's Office, would they be subject to this bill, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

I believe, Senator, that the effective date of the bill would be the effective date of when the projects would then be required to perform under the prevailing wage. I'm not an attorney like you, but I would think that that's what our interpretation is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, then I would urge the Members caution because what Senator Walsh is saying is that there could be projects where the various groups and entities that have come to us and sought our support under a Member-initiative program, have come and they've -- they've put their bid together, they've put their plan together and they've gone out and they have - and you know how -- how closely these groups and how sharply they -- they go through this budget process and how they -- they are very, very strapped financially - and they -- they, generally - I'm sure your districts are like mine - they come in and -- and this money that we're trying to get to them under a Member-initiative program is sort of just enough for them to be able to -- to do what it is they want to do - to care for the elderly, to take care of the disabled, to come up with a new program for

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

schoolchildren - and what may end up happening is if the date is, as Senator Walsh says -- if this bill passes and then a Member-initiative project is released from the Governor's Office, then they'll have to recalibrate that whole deal, and it could be a big, big problem. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you -- thank you for the question, Senator. In all due respect, basically what we are trying to do here is to -- say that -- that the Illinois FIRST projects are the same as what the guidelines were under the Build Illinois projects. And what we're saying, that basically that should be done or should have been done anyway. I am sure that many of the Illinois FIRST projects that went to our fire departments, our townships, our municipalities that went out and secured new maintenance equipments had to follow the same procedure, guidelines, like putting things out for public bid, for sealed bids if they were over a certain amount of dollars that they were -- they were expending. So, all we're really trying to do here is to make sure that it is understood that Illinois FIRST monies that go to our -- our recipients, that they follow those guidelines.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR WATSON:

And I'm sorry if you've been asked this, Larry, but I have a school -- a charter school, actually, over in Decatur, one of the few downstate charter schools and -- or, Member-initiative money was made available to -- for them to purchase playground equipment for the school. Now, they've got volunteers. Let's say they have volunteers who want to assemble that playground equipment. How does this law impact that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

It's truly my belief, Senator Watson, that if we have volunteers - and I'm sure that there were many; I had the same thing in my district, that we purchased some playground equipment - that it is not -- my understanding, would not be the intent because we're not paying anybody prevailing wage -- or, paying any wages, basically. They're putting it up as -- as volunteers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

There used to be JTPA. And I don't know if that's still around or not, but that was an effort to try to get people to -- into -- into the workforce and help 'em. Would -- if these people -- if people from that type of program would make themselves available at some lower cost to assemble this playground equipment, would they then, if they're being paid, have to be paid the prevailing wage?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

I would believe that the intent of the bill would be yes. I don't -- I -- you know, I really don't have a clear-cut answer for you, Senator Watson, but I believe that if there are payments that are going to be made, that the intent of the bill would be yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson. Senator Ronen, for further discussion. SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just rise in support of the gentleman's legislation and congratulate him on the hard work that he's done to make this a better and better bill. I think it -- it's another example of how we are here helping to support working -- working families of Illinois, and I would urge all my colleagues to vote for this and point out that this did receive the bipartisan unanimous support of the Labor Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Further discussion? Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

He indicates he'll yield, Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Just to clarify on previous questions and there may be this situation. If an Illinois FIRST project is already completed or built and they're waiting for Illinois FIRST reimbursement, does your legislation, this bill, apply, Senator Walsh?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Senator Dillard, I -- I truly believe that I -- my interpretation would be that that would not fall under the guidelines of -- of this piece of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Dillard. Senator Walsh, to close.

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you very much for the discussion. I think -- I think this is a good piece of legislation and I would ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1212 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 43 Members voting Yes, 7 Members voting No, and 2 Members voting Present. Senate Bill 1212, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go to page 22, the top of the page. Senate Bill 1321. Senator Crotty. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1321.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. think I -- in the last three weeks, I think I've come and spoke to a lot of you about Senate Bill 1321, pointing out that some of your districts may be affected. But this is corrective language to restore the ability of the double-whammy school districts to get State aid claim adjustments to offset property Prior to 1999, the law allowed all tax refunds. districts to adjust prior-year State aid claims for the full value of the property tax refunds. Then after legislation was adopted which fixed the double-whammy problem in the State aid formula, the State Board of Ed determined that the new doublewhammy provision will prevent school districts that use the double-whammy provision from getting all the benefit of the prior year's adjustments for tax refunds. And because of this problem, any school district that's using the double-whammy provisions of the State aid formula will not be able to adjust the year's general State aid claim to reflect the full impact of those tax refunds. So, the School Code should be adjusted to allow school districts that use that provision of the double whammy for the State aid formula to fully benefit from the adjustments to the prior-year claims for the tax refunds. be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates she will yield.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Senator Crotty, this is sort of complex for a lot of people, especially me, and I just wanted to walk through it a little bit, probably for the edification of the -- of the Body. First of all, you're talking about redistributing money, and as we know, there's a limited number of dollars, especially when it comes to education. If you were -- and I know it depends on the refunds, but if you were to look at the double-whammy legislation that we passed back in, I don't know, '91 or whenever that was -- '93. I can't remember. In any event --

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

yeah, I'm talking the tax caps were '91, so it was like '95, '96, in that area. Eighty-eight percent of that pool of money, those refunds, went to the City of Chicago. Isn't that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

If -- I think the Chicago schools also fall under the double whammy. I don't know about it being eighty-eight percent. I'm not sure, but I know school boards -- the schools in the City of Chicago fall under double-whammy provisions, yes. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Well, if you look -- there's PTABs statewide and we know that the overwhelming majority of the dollars that will be impacted by this bill are going to be redirected to the City of Chicago. Isn't that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Because the majority of schools may be in the City of Chicago, that might be true, but if -- if you look -- and I know I came and spoke to you also, Senator. Your school districts fall under this, as many of our school districts across the State do, just as the double-whammy legislation helped a lot of our school districts. And -- and that's really the reason for the State aid formula, is to allow school districts to be able to utilize the local wealth that they get. But if, in fact, in this piece legislation, some of that local wealth is refunded back to the property taxpayers, it's very unfair for any of our school districts, no matter where they happen to be in the State of Illinois, that they should not be able to utilize that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you. I'm running out of time, thanks to your very comprehensive answer. I'm going to just go to the bill, if I may. You know, this is a bill that I think all of you need to be very careful about. If you look at the experience, we know

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

that the majority of dollars are going to be directed to the City of Chicago. Now, all of the other hundred and one counties throughout the State do not have the particularly unique and arcane system of property tax assessments that Cook County has; namely, the classification system. So, if you're sitting in a downstate county, you got to ask yourself, you know: Do I want the majority of dollars to be funneled to the City of Chicago? Is it my responsibility that they impose a classification system on themselves that tries to cut some breaks for people and tries to impose greater responsibility on -- on -- on businesses? PTAB is a system that works statewide. It's working in Cook County. The reason that it's working is evidenced by this bill, and this bill, the effect of it, is going to take an arcane system and try to say that it doesn't matter, they can still go their merry way with their classification system, and they don't have to pay a price because we're going to take money out of everybody else's school budget and put it into the City of Chicago. Now, I know it helps everybody to some extent, but you got to be real careful about this one and I would caution you to vote accordingly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

I just -- I just happened to look over here at some more notes. We have a hundred and sixty-eight districts that are -- across the State that utilize this. Thirty-seven of these districts, including Chicago, are in Cook; forty-three are located in collar counties; and eighty-eight are located in downstate. So, you know, you need to make sure that you've -- you take a look at -- at least on this side of the aisle, our analysis tells of those districts. So, that's to better answer that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will sponsor yield? This...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

This -- I think this bill would be an improvement in my county, too, would it not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Yes, it would, Senator, and you're a cosponsor. So, thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Crotty, to close.

SENATOR CROTTY:

I just ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1321 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 46 Members voting Yes, 7 voting No, and 3 voting Present. Senate Bill 1321, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1329. Senator Dillard. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1329.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is an Act I commonly refer to as the "Jury Patriotism Act." This bill would make several beneficial changes to the law that governs jury service in the State to encourage universal jury service. The legislation would lessen the burden on jury service on citizens but ensure a more representative jury would be there, of all kinds of people regardless of profession or status. It's a unique bill that has been explored in many other states of late, and it is supported by the National AFL-CIO, but also the National Federation of Independent Businesses. So, both big labor and little business are for it. It makes the jury system in Illinois a little bit

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

more fair. And to coin the old adage, it really makes more certain that a jury of your peers, whether you're a criminal defendant or somebody in civil litigation, sits on your jury. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1329 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, 1 voting No, and no Members are voting Present. Senate Bill -- 1 Member voting Present. Senate Bill 1329, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1331. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 1378. Senator James Clayborne. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1378.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate your enthusiasm in the way you pronounced my name. Senate Bill 1378 just basically -- Senator Burzynski, I'm sure you'll like this bill. no fee increase. None of that. This -- Senate Bill 1378, there's a requirement that a purchaser of tax-delinquent property must reimburse a municipality for certain advancements made from public funds with respect to that property or that the municipality waive its lien on the property before a tax deed may be issued; however, this does not apply if the purchaser is a county acting as a trustee for a taxing district. In other words, this provision is there. A lot of times municipalities may cut weeds down of -- of vacant properties. If they're sold, then the purchaser of that property is required to either get a lien or to reimburse that municipality for the funds expended. However, since the county acts as a trustee for properties, then the county should not be held responsible for reimbursing those municipalities.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1378 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, no Members voted no, and no Members voted Present. Senate Bill 1378, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hunter, Senate Bill 1384. Senate Bill 1405. Senator Woolard. Senate Bill 1414. Senator Obama. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1414.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We had some brief discussion of this last week. This is a shell bill that is going to serve as the vehicle for an agreement between the Hospital Association, the Trial Association {sic}, with respect to the protection of and confidential access of medical information. I just confirmed with the parties that, in fact, the Trial Lawyers have received language from the hospitals and they are in the process of working it up. I'm happy to answer any questions about the internal aspects of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Obama, I do recall we -- we talked about this just a couple minutes late last week. What is the problem that the bill is trying to address?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Several -- several years ago, and I'm trying to remember the exact Session that we did this, we passed a Medical Privacy Act with respect to medical records. And what happened was that the Supreme Court, in a close opinion, ruled that that would encompass the ability of hospitals to access a patient's medical records in the case of a lawsuit in an ex parte fashion. the -- the Trial Lawyers initially wanted a bill that would completely overturn the Supreme Court opinion. Based on my reading of the opinion, I think the court was correct in wanting to protect the hospital's ability to interview its own employees when an adverse event had occurred without intrusion by a plaintiff's attorney, because that would be necessary for issues of public health. On the other hand, it appears that some hospitals were abusing this by then interviewing non-employees, independent contractors, who for other purposes of litigation they denied as having any agency or -- responsibility over, but they still wanted the same protection in terms of being able to interview them ex parte. So, essentially, what we're trying to do here is split the difference - protect medical access and the ability of hospitals to do this, but without it including independent contractors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Obama, to close. SENATOR OBAMA:

I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1414 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Members voting Yes, 12 Members voting No, no Members voted Present. Senate Bill 1414, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1417. Senator Obama. Read the bill -- pardon me. Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise?

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. Just an inquiry of the Chair. Last week Senator Rauschenberger asked two or three times relative to the number of shell bills that had been passed, and I was wondering if we had that -- that number yet. We just added another one, so I was just kind of curious.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

I've just been informed by our staff they've been looking for Senator Rauschenberger to give him that number and they cannot find him. So... Senate Bill 1417. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1417.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This is also a bill that we briefly discussed and had some fun with last week. This is not a shell bill. This actually relates to colorectal cancer examinations. As many of you know, this is the third most common cancer and is highly preventable with early detection. Essentially, the American -- this is an American Cancer Society bill that sets forth the sorts of examinations that a patient should access and can access. The insurance industry was initially opposed. My understanding in conversations is, in fact, that they are now okay with it. I just confirmed that with Senator Righter. I would ask for an affirmative roll call. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Any discussion? Senator Geo-Karis. I'm sorry. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, it's wonderful they're for this, I guess. But all of us get phone calls, all of us get letters about the high cost of health insurance and this is exactly how those costs continue to rise. I mean, we pass a mandate on - and obviously this will -- this will pass, and we've done several of 'em, I believe, already this year - mandated coverage, and it just increases costs. And I don't think, generally, that's what the -- the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

public's interest is right now. We're -- we're -- people are going without insurance. We don't have what we would call just a bare-bones policy that could even be made available to people. We just continue to demand more and more of coverage and all this is doing is just raising the price. So, I -- I think we just ought to be concerned about what we're doing here and how that impacts the cost and accessibility and availability of insurance -- health insurance. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, Mr. President. This is a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

On Senate Bill 1378, I inadvertently hit my speaker button instead of the Yes button.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator, the record will reflect your intention. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Obama, to close.

SENATOR OBAMA:

I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1417 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, 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 48 Members voting Yes, 8 Members voting No, and no Members voting Present. Senate Bill 1417, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1430. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 1442. Senator Woolard. Is there leave to come back to Senate Bill 1461? Leave is granted. Senate Bill -- top of page 23. Senate Bill 1474. Senator Collins. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1474.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 1474 exempts residential rental units solely in the City of Chicago that are used for public housing and related uses from the Property Tax Code. Senate Bill 1474 is needed because, in Chicago, the Housing Authority owns acres of land, primarily because of the demolition of previous Housing Authority high-rise buildings, but cannot afford to build new units on that land. In these areas, the goal is to sell singlefamily homes, but to provide the Housing Authority rental units in the same neighborhoods. The Chicago Housing Authority enters into agreement -- enters into agreements with private developers so that the land may be used for mixed-income, low to middle, Then CHA enters into long-term contracts with the housing. developers for the rental units. CHA wants to ensure that those rental units are exempt from property tax for the duration of the long-term contract CHA has with the developer. presented this, I think, Friday, and Senator Roskam asked about the State Mandate Act, if there were any implications. And I went back and researched it and I have a copy here -- a note that says there's no -- State Mandate Act implications on this legislation. And I'm open for other questions, as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill, and I appreciate the Senator's response. The question really isn't whether a State mandate note is required, but what is the implication that this does not amend the State Mandates Act. My concern and my caution of the Members of -- of the Senate is that the State would be obligated for any loss to State and -- to any local units of government as a result of the passage of this bill, and I think it could be very costly to the State. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The question is, shall Senate Bill -- there wasn't a question, Senator. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1474 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 voting Yes, 12 Members voting No, and no Members voted Present. Senate Bill 1474, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1478. Senator James Clayborne. Senate Bill 1479. Senator James Clayborne. Senate Bill 1480. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 1492. Senator Carol Ronen. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1492.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill offers victims of employment discrimination the right to sue in civil court. It does not change any of the procedures in the —the Department of Human Rights but says that once somebody is in that process and has been through that process for three hundred and sixty-five days, then they retain the right to — to go to civil court. I would urge my colleagues to vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

She indicates she'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator, first, it's my understanding of the law right now that if an individual has a complaint with the Department of Human Rights, that they can choose, at some point, to go out and sue in federal court but not State court. Is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And this bill, with the amendment that I think you put on last week, would require that a complainant have their case pending with the Illinois Department of Human Rights for, I think, a year before they can go out and file suit in State court. Is that right?

SENATOR RONEN:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Yes, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Ronen, in -- in my discussions with some of the other Members about this legislation, and my discussions with you as well, I've raised a concern that we have in the Illinois Department of Human Rights, an agency which, for some time, has not come even close to doing the job it's supposed to be doing in helping people find or redress their grievances, and the concern is now we're letting off the pressure. Now we're going to let people go into State court and sue and so this Department is never going to be held accountable for actually having to do the jobs that it is assigned to do. Can you walk through that with me and -- and explain to me how that's not the case?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you for that question, Senator. I think because now we're giving -- I think this bill helps to put the -- the Department's feet to the fire, so to speak. If something doesn't happen within a year's time, then the Department becomes irrelevant and somebody goes to civil court. I have every belief that the Department, under its new leadership, will do a better job. And you -- you are correct that over the past, you know, ten years or however, it was -- the record was abysmal. I -- I feel very strongly that new leadership there and new

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

direction given by the Governor will cause this to be a better agency and -- but I think this bill is necessary right now as we go through this transition. A year -- a year time elapses and nothing has changed and nothing has happened, where the -- we still have to worry about the rights of that individual who was discriminated against. I'd be happy to work with you. You know, if we come back in a year from now, two years from now, let's look at what the -- the practice has been there, how it's improved or how it hasn't improved and see what we have to do at that point. But I think this bill is a good first step that honors the rights, the very important rights, of individuals who are victims of discrimination.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Senator. I -- and I appreciate that and agree with most of what you said and I -- just in closing, I want to say that I hope that we stick to that commitment, that in the next twelve to twenty-four months that we don't just walk away from this, that we hold the Department's feet to the fire. Because we're paying a lot of money to those people to do this job and I don't want to provide this outlet and then walk away and say, "Well, we've done our part," 'cause we haven't done our part just by doing that. So, thank you, Senator. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Ronen, to close.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Madam President. I would just ask -- I -- I appreciate Senator Righter's comments and I think this -- this is a bill that will help us make the Department of Human Rights a better agency, not a -- not worse, and at the same time, we're establishing ourselves as in the corner of victims of discrimination. I would ask all my colleagues to vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1492 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, 1

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1492, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1499. Senator Link. Senate Bill 1504. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1505. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1506. Senator -- Harmon. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1506.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1506 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. It is fairly described as a clean-up bill, which provides for various amendments to the Business Corporations {sic} (Corporation) Act, the Not for Profit Act and the Limited Liability Company Act. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1506 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 1506, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1507. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 1510. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1510.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1510 amends the Freedom of Information Act to protect from disclosure certain confidential data and information that comes into the possession of a State agency

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

when it invests as a limited partner in a private equity venture. It is an agreed bill, the product of negotiations between the Illinois Venture Capital Association and the Illinois Press Association. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, I'm not sure I'm clear on what we're trying to achieve with this bill. We're creating a FOIA exemption with regards to information pertaining to entities who are responsible for helping invest public funds. Is that a fair characterization of the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

It -- not -- not really, and this -- this is -- this is not a -- a particularly easy area to -- to understand the -- the -the stratification. This -- the public agency would invest with a -- a venture capital fund. The -- the investments of that fund, the returns of that fund, all of that information would still be publicly available. What would be excluded from disclosure is the particulars of the investment companies that are -- that are in which the venture capital fund invests. level of detail -- the level of information disclosed to the public agency as a private investor far exceeds anything you would expect as an investor in a publicly traded company, for And instance. that's the reason it's important, for competitiveness, to protect that information.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

What is the virtue in exempting this information? I guess -- and maybe I don't understand it well enough, Senator, but when I hear that we're going to provide a FOIA exemption for

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

entities that are involved in helping invest public pension funds - retired teachers' funds, State employees' funds, State universities' retirement, all of those - when we're going to somehow create a FOIA exemption for those, I -- I guess I get a little nervous. I think that that feeling is shared by a number here. What is the virtue in doing this? What public policy goal are we achieving by doing this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

I can give you two specific examples, but just a little bit of background before I do that. The kind of information we're talking about here, when -- when a venture capital fund invests in -- in a -- in a -- in a company, they're typically smaller, private, often struggling companies that need an infusion of information that's being transmitted are equity. The confidential reviews of the performance of management, projections on sales, things that if disclosed would really be a competitive disadvantage to that company. They -- the public benefit of this are twofold: One, it provides an alternative for investment to diversify the public agency's investment portfolio; and second, it allows the State to offer capital -or, through -- through these funds, to smaller, struggling companies that would not otherwise have access to the capital

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, now, Senator, you've said something that I guess — and I know you didn't intend to do this, but makes me even a little more nervous about the bill because you're talking now about this venture capital group that the State is going to give this money to and ask them to invest, is going to turn around and invest in these small, struggling companies that need the infusion of cash. And again, as I speak to the annuitants in my district and — and everywhere — we all do across the State, the question then becomes, why do we need to hide what these groups are doing or — or who they are? I mean — and — and — and again, maybe — Senator, I apologize, maybe I'm not getting

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

it. But to me it's a situation where we are creating some kind of cover, especially after -- you know, last week passing -- a ten-billion-dollar bond issuance and now we're creating a Freedom of Information Act exemption for where some of this money -- might wind up to be. I mean, is there a -- is there some -- something I can say to my retired teachers, my State employees that is going to make them feel secure in the day where they have gone through WorldCom and Enron and Arthur Andersen and all this stuff that we shouldn't worry about this, that this -- this FOIA exemption, the fact that they can't get their hands on this information, really shouldn't concern them? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Senator, I appreciate your frustration. It really is a bit of apples and oranges here. The Enrons, the -- the WorldComs, those are large, publicly traded companies where a reasonable amount of information is available to the investor. We're not talking at all about hiding from the public the funds that are being invested in, even the identities and the performance of the -- the companies in which the funds invest. All of that information would be disclosed. In fact, it -- it's roughly parallel to what you would expect as an investor in a public What you don't get are the nitty-gritty details about how the internal business operations are running, things that would never be disclosed to an investor in a public company. It's -- it's a -- it's a peculiar function of equity and private equity investments, and the fact is, you can tell your teachers, you can tell your -- your pensioners that this is simply a part of a well-thought-out, balanced, diversified investment strategy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he will.

SENATOR GARRETT:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Okay. The question I have about this bill is, the Illinois Press Association is a proponent, and in doing that, you have talked with them and you have gone over this bill with them and they are in agreement that these kinds of details need not be released?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Yes. The negotiations were somewhat protracted. We found a way to accommodate all of the Press Association's concerns without compromising the -- the needs of the -- the venture capital investors. It -- it was -- it was a good negotiation. I think everybody's very happy with the outcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

The other question I have, Senator, is, has this been a problem in the past whereas people have requested information from these smaller, private venture capital companies, that they have, in fact, felt that they've been imposed upon?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

It -- it appears to be an issue brewing in other states, and the venture capital funds are very cognizant of the fact that if they accept public investors, this information may be at risk of disclosure and it would give them a second thought about continuing with public investments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

So, pertaining to the State of Illinois, it hasn't really been a problem yet?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Not that I'm aware of, but we certainly would want it not to be a problem in the future.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

The -- the other states -- I'm curious which states you're talking about and if, in fact, they have passed similar kinds of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

There -- there's been discussion in California. I was interviewed recently by a venture capital magazine that tells me that there are many states considering this -- this sort of action, but I'm not aware of others that have taken legislative action.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he will.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Just very briefly because this is an issue that came up with the previous speaker. Am I correct, Senator, that -- that part of the function of wanting to invest in private equity -- I'm sorry. Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Can we please hold it down a little? We only have a few more bills to go.

SENATOR OBAMA:

The -- part of the function here is to diversify. I mean, we've got fixed asset investments and the stock market, we've got real estate investments, and one of the ways to protect our people who invest in the -- in the -- in the pension funds is to, in fact, have a broad array of investment opportunities. Am I correct about that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Absolutely.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

And so, the -- the main objective of this bill is -- is to, in fact, ensure that private equity, venture capital, is one of the menu of investments that's made by Illinois pension funds.

Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

You are correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

And -- and so just going to the bill then. The problem I think here is, is that private equity is structured differently. Oftentimes these are limited partnerships. They're not publicly held companies and what that means is, is that when they make their presentations to these pension funds, the pension funds may ask for a great deal of information that normally would be shielded in the case of a public company from competitors. That's not something that they can do here. They've got to really disclose everything to -- to the pension funds or the venture capital fund that's in terms -- in turn investing in smaller companies. And so it's that kind of protection that's being sought. But I just wanted to make sure that Senator Righter did not feel that somehow by voting for this bill, that -- that, in fact, he is putting the assets of our pension funds at -- at risk. These are, in fact, relatively small proportion of the investments that are made by the pension funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. To the bill: You know, one of the reasons that we've got committee processes and sort of multiple opportunities for a hearing is then we can ask questions and -- and so forth, and that's a situation that I find myself in today. When the Executive Committee heard this the first time, there was kind of

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

-- kind of a -- I -- I can't speak for all the Members on this side, but kind of a reluctant Yes that we gave this bill, and then Senator amended it and kind of gave it a reluctant Yes again. And now my reluctance is coming to fore, and let me tell you my -- my concern about this bill. It's a fairly limited amendment that became the bill and it's -- it's not extensive and it -- it says that -- that in terms of a -- enjoying a FOIA exemption -- this is what enjoys a FOIA exemption now if Senate 1510 becomes law: Venture capital and private equity portfolio information of privately held companies possessed by a public body, including a public pension fund, for the purpose of investing and managing public funds. The exemption contained in this item does not apply to the aggregate financial performance of a venture capital or private equity firm. Now, let's go back to the first sentence. That means that really any type of information is offline. Let's -- let's realize what we're doing We're creating a FOIA exemption. We're saying to annuitants, we're saying to taxpayers, we're saying to people that are fundamentally invested in this, "You're not welcome to know this information. You can ask about everything else here in this investment portfolio, but this little area is secret." Let's call it what it is. It's secret. It's off limits. It's And if you ask the question about what's in the details of the secret, it's secret and you can't have information. That's what we're doing. Let's make no exception. Venture capital and private equity portfolio information of publicly {sic} held companies possessed by a public body, including a public pension fund, for purposes of investing and managing public funds. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's anything. That's not a limited scope. That's not a tiny amount of information. So here's the problem: The problem is that you can have politically connected people that are not interested in being disclosed, that are not interested in the public knowing of their connection to this process, that can -- that can be managing public money. Remember, we're not talking about private investments. This is public money that annuitants have entrusted to us. I urge caution on the part of my colleagues You put this in connection with the bill that we moved out last week, the -- the big pension bonding bill. The -- the

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

-- the timing is wrong. This is the wrong move. All you got to do is look no further than Enron and WorldCom, and some may say, "Oh, those are extreme examples," but look at what they were able to accomplish and they were doing it in full light, with full Securities and Exchange Commission disclosure. This is a bad bill at a bad time, and I urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon, would you like to close? SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you. Senator Roskam, I believe that you misunderstand the bill. This does not, in any way, limit disclosure of fund managers or the investments they're making. It simply protects the very nuanced information about the investment companies. It is, in fact, a good bill. It is agreed to by all involved, and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1510 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 Ayes, 19 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 1510, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to go back to page 7. Senate Bill 263. Senator Obama. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Appropriately enough, this, I -- I believe, is the last bill of the evening and it is -- no? Oh, there are more. Okay. I -- I won't go there. I'm sorry. The -- this is a bill that -- Senator Cullerton and I had two separate bills dealing with prenatal AIDS -- postnatal -- perinatal AIDS testing. Let me see if -- I -- I probably got the phraseology wrong, but

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

essentially the question is, how do we test effectively for children to make sure that they do not have AIDS, because it turns out that the earlier the intervention, potentially you can actually eliminate HIV from an infant's system if it's caught early enough. Children's Memorial had one version of the bill. The AIDS Foundation had another version of the bill. They have been reconciled, but the language was not drawn up quickly enough for it to go to committee. So we are going to attach this to the bill once it gets over to the Senate {sic}.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill -- oh, I'm sorry, Senator Righter. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Obama, we discussed this -- this bill in committee and I caught the tail end of your comments there about the fact that we did discuss that there was -- an amendment be attached and that's something you do over in the House. Is that what you're telling us? And something that's agreed language for all the parties. Is that fair to say? SENATOR OBAMA:

The -- the amendment's already been agreed to. It's just that the committee's not meeting again. So...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Great. I just wanted to clarify that point, Madam President. Thank you and I would encourage all the Members on this side of the aisle to vote Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 263 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes,

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 263, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 16. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 973. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 973.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you know and -- those of you who were in Senate Exec, the amendment -- this has been gutted. It's just a -- it's just a vehicle bill on the towing. We're working with all the people for the language. We're just going to move it over to the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 973 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 48 Ayes, 7 Nays, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 973, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Page 22. Senate Bill 1442. Senator Woolard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1442.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House -- Senate. I think that this is one of those bills that John Jones, who is the expert on the issue of oil drilling, et cetera, in this State, probably brings more to the table than any of us. It's -- it's a very delicate, very different, very difficult issue for us to deal with in southern Illinois.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

There's a new commodity that has just come onto the scene, methane gas, and it's something that we're going to do everything in our power to address some issues of concern, but we're not ready yet. Once again, this is something that we need to pass on to the -- to the House in order to rectify this. The Farm Bureau, the Oil and Gas Association, the Land Owners Association, the utility companies are all sitting at the table. There's five members that are going to participate. They will report back to John and I and the House sponsor, and when and if there is any kind of recommendation, then we'll proceed, but otherwise it'll die for lack of coming to some kind of an agreement. It will not move without John or myself both being in agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Woolard explained it very well. In fact, he met with a -- with a group yesterday. I wasn't able to. But he's put a small group together. They will come back to us with a recommendation, and if it's agreeable by all parties, then we will move forward with this. But we need to move it over to the House just to -- just to keep a bill alive, and hopefully everybody on my side can support it also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he will.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Senator Woolard. You know this is a concern that I have relative to southern Illinois as well. Just as a -- as a point of clarification, will one of things that you try and address in the bill be the ownership of the -- the gas -- methane gas that you were talking about, relative to whether or not it's considered to be a mineral right or something new? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator...

SENATOR WOOLARD:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

I think that that probably has already been established, Senator Burzynski. I think that if there's -- better for clarification, we'll do it. But the severance of those surface rights and mineral rights has really created some consternation for some people who have land that they might want to future develop, et cetera, that there are gas collection lines that are being ringed around the county in various ways up and down roads and it's a very serious issue. It's a great -- you know, it's a great asset that we have, but we have to -- find a way to make it work for those people who live there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. To the bill, then. I -- I will be voting for this shell bill, unlike some of the others, but also I -- it is a very serious issue and I certainly hope that property owners' rights are foremost and -- in the minds of those that are negotiating this and that certainly that we have some strong advocates of property owner rights involved in those meetings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Woolard, to close.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

One -- one of the -- one of the groups, Senator Burzynski, that's actively engaged is the owners organization in Franklin County, and they'll be one of the five groups that will be sitting at the table along with, as I said, the other people that have an interest in this very critical issue. And so we certainly hope that we're successful in moving the bill along and finding an answer that rectifies the wrong.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1442 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 1442, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1461. Senator Welch. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

Senate Bill 1461.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam -- Madam President. This bill is a shell bill that I shelled out in the Revenue Committee. We want it to pass to the House. The House sponsor over there has a bill that she passed last year, and she's going to amend it on to this bill, is my understanding. So I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Welch, can you tell us -- can you tell us what the amendment from the House will be? Will it pertain to the assessment or the Grundy County proposal? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, it pertains to Grundy County. It's a question of their -- their tax system and whether they belong to the -- they impose the -- the equipment tax that other counties don't. We're trying to change that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Peterson.

SENATOR PETERSON:

To the bill, Madam President: If this bill gets to the Governor's desk and is signed, everybody will lose, except Grundy County. So I recommend that my side vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam turned his light off. Okay. The -- Senator Welch, would you like to close?

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes. Well, let me just say that that's not completely accurate, because the people of Grundy County have been paying into this fund for many, many years. And what they are trying to do is get some of the money back that they've been putting in. They've been putting in and not drawing out of this fund.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

So it's a question of equity, as Senator Roskam would put. He's been quoting many equitable maxims over there, and I think this is one more that he -- he could relate to. But the purpose of this bill is to make all one hundred and two counties on the same level as opposed to just one hundred and one county on the same fund. So I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 1461 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 22 Nays, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 1461, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Request a verification.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam has requested a verification. Will all Members be in their seats? Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Does Senator Roskam question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Ronen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Ronen. Is Senator Ronen in the Chamber? There's Senator Ronen. Senator Roskam, anybody else? If not, on a verified roll call, there are 32 Yeas, 22 Nays, 1 voting Present. And the bill, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise?

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I'd just like to point out, it looks like we're -- we're all acting like Republicans over here; we're all in our seats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate will stand in Perfunctory Session for receipt of Messages, the Introduction of Bills and other matters not requiring Floor action, after which the Senate will stand adjourned until the hour of 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 8th {sic}, 2003. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 115, offered by Senator Hunter.

It is a death resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Consent Calendar. Introduction of Bills. House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 248, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 552, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 553, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 555, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

All of these bills being read are offered by Senator Emil Jones. House Bill 556.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 557.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 558.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 559.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 560.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 561.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 562.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 563.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 564.

(Secretary reads title of bill)
House Bill 567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 568.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 569.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 570.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 571.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 572.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

...House Bill -- 565 {sic} (575).

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 576.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 577.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 578.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 579.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 580.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 581.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 582.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 583.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 584.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 585.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 586.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 587.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 588.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 589.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 590.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 591.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 592.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 593.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 594.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 595.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 596.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 597.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 598.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 599.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 600.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 601.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 602.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 603.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 604.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 605.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 606.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 607.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 608.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 609.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 610.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 611.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 612.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 613.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 614.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 616.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 617.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 618.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 619.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 621.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 622.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 623.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 625.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 626.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 627.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 628.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 629.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 630.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 631.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 632.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 633.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 634.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 635.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 636.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 637.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 638.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 639.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 640.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 641.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 642.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 643.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 644.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 645.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 646.

4/8/2003

31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 647. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 648. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 649. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 650. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 651. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 652. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 653. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 654. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 655. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 656. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 657. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 658. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 659. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 660. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 661. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 662. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 664.

House Bill 665.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 666.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 667.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 668.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 669.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 670.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 672.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 673.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 674.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 675.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 676.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 677.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 678.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 679.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 680.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 681.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 682.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 683.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 684.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 685.

4/8/2003

31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 686. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill -- 687. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 688. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 689. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 690. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 691. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 692. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 693. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 694. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 695. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 696. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 697. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 699. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 700. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 701. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 702. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 703.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 704.

House Bill 705.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 706.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 707.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 708.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 709.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 711.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 712.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 713.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 714.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 715.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 716.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 718.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 720.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 721.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 722.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 723.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 724.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 726.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 727.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 728.

STATE OF ILLINOIS 93rd GENERAL ASSEMBLY REGULAR SESSION

4/8/2003

SENATE TRANSCRIPT 31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 729. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 730. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 731. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 732. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 733. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 734. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 735. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 736. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 737. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 738. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 739.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 740.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 741.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 742.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 743.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 744.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 745.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 746.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 747.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 748.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 749.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 750.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 752.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 753.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 754.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 755.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 756.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 757.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 759.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 760.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 761.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 762.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 764.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 765.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 766.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 767.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 768.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 769.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 770.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 771.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 772.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 773.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 774.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 775.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 776.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 777.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 778.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 779.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 780.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 781.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 782.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 783.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 784.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 785.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 786.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 787.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 788.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 789.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 790.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 791.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 792.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 793.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 794.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 795.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 796.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 797.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 798.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 799.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 800.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 801.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 802.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 803.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 804.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 805.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 806.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 807.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 808.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 809.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 810.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 811.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 812.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 813.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 814.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 815.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 816.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 817.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 818.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 819.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 820.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 821.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 822.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 823.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 824.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 825.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 826.

4/8/2003

31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 827. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 828. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 829. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 830. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 831. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 832. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 833. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 834. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 835. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 836. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 837. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 838. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 839. (Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 840.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 841.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 843.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 844.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 845.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 846.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 848.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 849.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 850.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- House Bill 851.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 852.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 853.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 854.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 855.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 856.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 857.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 858.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 859.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 860.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 861.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 862.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 863.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 864.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 865.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 866.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 867.

4/8/2003

31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 868. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 869. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 870. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 871. (Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 872.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 873.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 874.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 875.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 876.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 877.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 878.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 879.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 880.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 881.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 882.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 883.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 884.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 885.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 886.

31st Legislative Day 4/8/2003

House Bill 887.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 888.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 889.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 890.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 891.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 892.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

...House Bill 893.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 894.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 895.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 896.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 897.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 898.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 899.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 900.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 901.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 902.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 903.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 904.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 905.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 906.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 907.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 908.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 910.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 911.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 913.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 914.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 916.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 917.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 918.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 919.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 920.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 921.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 922.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 923.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 924.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 925.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 926.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 927.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 928.

4/8/2003

31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 929. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 930. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 931. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 932. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 933. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 934. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 935. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 936. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 937. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 938. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 940. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 941. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 942. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 943. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 944. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 945. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 946.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 947.

House Bill 948.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 949.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 951.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 952.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 953.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 954.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 955.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 956.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 957.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 958.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 959.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 960.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 961.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 963.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 964.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 965.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 966.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 967.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 950.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 968.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 969.

4/8/2003

31st Legislative Day (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 970. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 971. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 972. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 973. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 974. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 975. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 976. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 977. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 978. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 979. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 980. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 981. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 982. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 983. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 984. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 985. (Secretary reads title of bill) House Bill 986. (Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 987.

House Bill 988.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 989.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 990.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 991.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 992.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 993.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 994.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 995.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 996.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 997.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 998.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 999.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1000.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1001.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1002.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1003.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1004.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1006.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 1007.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1008.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 1009.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1010.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1011.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1012.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1013.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1014.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1015.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1016.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1017.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1018.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1019.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1020.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1021.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1022.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1023.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1024.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1025.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1026.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1027.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1028.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1029.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1030.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1031.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1032.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1033.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1034.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1035.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1036.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1037.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1038.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1039.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1040.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1041.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

...House Bill 1042.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1043.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1044.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1045.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1046.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1047.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 1048.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1049.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1050.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1051.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1052.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1053.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1054.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1055.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1056.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1057.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1058.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1059.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1060.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1061.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1062.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1063.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1064.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1065.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1066.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1067.

31st Legislative Day 4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1068...

House Bill 1064.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1065 -- or, House Bill 1067, by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1065, by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1066.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

By Senator Emil Jones.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

...House Bill 1068, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1069, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1070, offered Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1071, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1072, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1073, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1074, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1075, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1076, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1077, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1078, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1079, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1080, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1081, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

- (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1082, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 - (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill -- 1083, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1084, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1085, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1086, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1111, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1112, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1113, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1114, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1300, offered by Senator Emil Jones. (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1301, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1312, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1313, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1336, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1337, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1339, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1340, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1341, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)
- House Bill 1342, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
 (Secretary reads title of bill)

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 1343, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1402, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1403, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1404, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1405, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1406, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1407, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1408, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1409, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1410, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1411, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1519, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1520, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1580, offered by Senator Emil Jones.
(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2571, offered Senator Woolard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3714, offered by Senator Cronin.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

The remainder of the bills will all be offered by Senator Emil Jones.

House Bill 2219.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2220.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2360.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2361.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2362.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2364.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2365.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2366.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2518.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2614.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2654.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2655.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2656.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2657.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2659.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2661.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2668.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2669.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2671.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 2672.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2673.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2674.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2678.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2680.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2681.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2682.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2685.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2686, offered by Senator Emil Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2688.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2691.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2693.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2696.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2697.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2698.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2700.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2704.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2705.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2708.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2714.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2716.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2718.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2721.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2726.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2730.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2735.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2739.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2741.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2742.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2743.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2744.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2745.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2746.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2747.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2749.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2750.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2751.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2753.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 2756.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2759.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2761.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2762.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3409.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- pardon me, 3410.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3412.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3413.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3414.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3415.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3417.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3418.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3639.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3640.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3641.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3642.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- pardon me, 3643.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3644.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3645.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3646.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3647.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3650.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3651.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3652.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3653.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3654.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3665.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3666.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- pardon me, 3667.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3669.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3670.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3711.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3712.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3715.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3716.

31st Legislative Day

4/8/2003

House Bill 3717.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3718.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

Pursuant to prior direction from the Chair, the Senate will reconvene tomorrow at the hour of 10:30.