23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 89th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will our guests in the galleries please rise. Our prayer today will be given by the Pastor Daymond Talkington, First United Methodist Church, Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Talkington. PASTOR DAYMOND TALKINGTON:

(Prayer by Pastor Daymond Talkington)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Will you please rise for the pledge of allegiance. Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Sieben)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal. Mr. Secretary. Senator Geo-Karis. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, March 1; Thursday, March 2; and Friday, March 3, in the year 1995, be postpone, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Geo-Karis moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcript. There being no objection, so ordered. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. McLennand, 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 358, 505, 560, 567, 587, 8 and 206.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

All passed the House, March 3rd, 1995.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 33, Constitutional Amendment, offered by Senator Jones.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Introduction of Bills.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1214, offered by Senator Palmer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And Senate Bill 1215, by Senator Palmer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 32, offered by Senator Butler.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 115, offered by Senators Dudycz and Tom Dunn.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 207, by Senator O'Malley.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 231, by Senator Carroll.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 481, by Senator Ralph Dunn.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 544, by Senator Mahar.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 561, by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 660, by Senator Cronin.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like the record to reflect that our Leader, Senator Jones, is not here today. He's in Washington with the President - his President our President, and everyone's President.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Well, let's hope he gets lucky. The -- the record will certainly indicate. ...I could have the attention of the Membership, and I understand that there are a lot of Members in their office. If they'd please come up to the Floor of the Senate, we're going to start -- proceed ahead on -- on 2nd Readings. So, be prepared to move your bill, if you so desire. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise, sir?
SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well -- well, Madam President, I -- I know Senator Philip had to be very serious in his call for all the Members to come to the Floor for bills on 2nd Reading. I would like to point out, there are thirty-four bills on 2nd Reading, and there are only three Democratic bills. So I think our Members are here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Which are your three Members? We're going to 2nd -- 2nd -- we're going to 2nd Reading of Senate bills, page 2. WCIA requests permission to videotape. Hearing no objections, permission's granted. Senate Bill 62. Mr. Secretary. Senator Klemm? Senate Bill 68. Senator Raica? Senate Bill 68. Senator Raica. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Senate Bill 68.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Have there been any Floor amendments, Mr. Secretary? SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 72. Senator del Valle. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 72.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 76. Senator Peterson. Senator Peterson? Senate Bill 80. Senator Raica. Senator Raica? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 80.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 100. Senator Raica? Senate Bill 112. Senator Woodyard? Senator Woodyard, 112? Senate Bill 122. Senator Klemm? Senate Bill 133. Senator Peterson? Senate Bill 134. Senator Peterson. Senate Bill 168. Senator Syverson? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 168.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 185. Senator Watson? Senate Bill 231. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 231.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 244. Senator Lauzen? 244? Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 244.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 264. There's a fiscal note requested on Senate Bill 264. So we'll have to go on to 274. Senator Fawell, did you wish to be heard? Senate Bill 274. Will you please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 274.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise? Could we have your attention. Senator Demuzio wishes the Floor. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

...also that Senator Viverito and Senator Farley are not here also because, I think, of the -- due to the -- to the weather. And I was going to yield to Senator O'Daniel. I just saw him a minute ago, but I don't know where he went. Senator O'Daniel, you want to make an announcement about Senator Hall?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator -- Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I -- I talked with Senator Hall's son and his daughter-in-law last night -- last evening about 10 o'clock, and Kenny is in real critical condition. He's got double pneumonia. His heart is -- is weak, and he's got some other serious complications that they didn't much want to discuss. But his wife is just a little bit better, but I'll assure you that he needs all of our prayers. And, you know, he's a super individual and I'm sure we'll all be praying for him and trying to help him through this. But he's in very critical condition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Thank you, Senator O'Daniel. We certainly wish Senator Hall well. Senate Bill 282. Senator DeAngelis? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 282.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 285. Senator Thomas Dunn? Senate Bill 288. Senator O'Daniel? Senate Bill 296. Senator Parker? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 296.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Is there -- has there been any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 363. Senator Syverson? There's a fiscal -- there's a fiscal note on this. Pass it. Senate Bill 364. Senator Karpiel? 364. Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 364.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments have been reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 365. Senator Sieben? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 365.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 383. Senator Parker? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 383.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 387. Senator DeAngelis? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 387.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on State Government Operations reports -- adopted Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 388. Senator DeAngelis? Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 388.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 389. Senator DeAngelis? Madam Secretary, would you please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 389.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 396. Senator DeAngelis? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 396.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 432. Senator DeAngelis? Senator DeAngelis, Senate Bill 432? Senate Bill 461. Senator Karpiel? Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 461.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Are there any Floor amendments to this bill?

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

No Floor amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 465. Senator Maitland? 465. Will you read the bill, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 465.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 472. Senator Peterson? Request permission by WCIA to televise the proceedings. Hearing no objections, permission granted. Senate -- going back to some of the bills on 2nd Reading. Senate Bill 285. Senator Thomas Dunn. Madam Secretary, will you read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 285.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to move to table Senate Bill 702.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Severns moves that Senate Bill 702 be tabled. All those in favor, say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

the bill is tabled. Thank you. We're going to proceed to 3rd Reading on page 4. We ask all of you to come and join us for the consideration of the bills on 3rd Reading. If we can have your attention. Page 4 of your Calendar, Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 8. Senator Watson? Senator Watson, Senate Bill 8? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 17. Senator Cronin? Out of the record. Senate Bill 20. Senator Weaver? Out of the record. Senate Bill 21. Senator Butler? Out of the record. Senator — Senate Bill 41. Senator Woodyard? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 41.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. I was going to start off calling this a kind of one of those merely bills, because it merely prohibits the issuance of General Assembly scholarships after June 1st of 1996. But I think you all realize in this Chamber this is not just a merely bill. legislation that created the General Assembly scholarship was passed in 1905. So if this legislation is to pass, certainly you would be repealing a law that's been on the books for a long time. I first introduced this legislation about three years ago and had absolutely no support. I hope I have a lot more this morning than what I had three years ago, but it just seems to me that we should not, as Senators or House Members, be in the business of awarding scholarships with no criteria whatsoever. The cost of these tuition waivers has now risen to 4.2 million dollars a year. That means the public universities in this State must actually just eat

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

the cost of -- of providing an education to those students. And in essence what happens is that that drives up the tuition cost for other students whose parents or the student themselves must pay for that tuition. How can we even take a look at other tuition waivers, which amount to over a hundred and seven million dollars a year in higher education, if we cannot take it ourselves to eliminate this particular waiver ourselves? That's what the bill does. It's very simple and straightforward. There is no appropriation changing hands, or is no monev. anything else. We just simply are saying that we should not, legislators, be in the business of awarding scholarships. And with that, Madam President, I would be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. I just -- I would just rise in support of this bill. Some people have said that it's a necessary thing that we do this in the Legislature, but we have the Illinois State organization that awards the scholarships. Some people say that 4.2 million dollars in a thirty-three-billion-dollar budget is chicken feed, but where I come from that's a lot of money. It's -- 4.2 million dollars is the cost to educate approximately eight hundred and forty secondary school students in the State of Illinois. It represents the sacrifice that forty-two hundred average Illinois families contribute in income taxes a year, and it represents about a hundred times what the taxpayers of Illinois pay each of us in this legislative Body. I would encourage my fellow colleagues to support Senator Woodyard's proposal, and vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator del Valle.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. I voted against this bill in committee for several reasons, but one of the reasons was that we have, in the State of Illinois, over a hundred and ten million dollars' worth of waivers that are granted. Those waivers go to faculty; they go to foreign students; they go to graduate students. We're not doing an analysis of that amount. Over a hundred million dollars in waivers are not being questioned. Ιf there's a problem with waivers, then let's look at a11 and let's do it in a careful manner and see whether or not these waivers are beneficial. I happen to think that many I happen to think that the legislative scholarship is them are. important. It is the only scholarship, the only waiver, that evenly distributed throughout the entire State of Illinois. legislative district has the same number of scholarships. And while, admittedly, there have been some mistakes in the those have been few and far in between. And what we should be doing is looking at how we can tighten things up, tightening things up, including disclosure requirements, so that we can make sure that the majority of the legislators - the vast majority the legislators - who act responsibly in managing these scholarships are not penalized because of the mistakes that one or two individuals have made over the decades. I would urge a No vote on this bill. I know it's a popular bill and has become so because of some of the things that have happened recently, but let's not forget that many individuals in my district and in other districts who would have been locked out of medical school, would have been locked out of law school -- and I venture to say that the legislative scholarship is probably responsible for minorities, more Hispanics, more African-Americans going into law school and medical school than any other scholarship program the State of Illinois. And these are mostly individuals from

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

families who otherwise could not afford law school or medical school. So I would hope that even though politically it might be a good vote for you, that you'd seriously think about this before you vote against it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Senator O'Daniel. Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. going to vote for this legislation. You know, anytime you give one scholarship, you've made a hundred people mad, but I think we should probably have -- have a bill to take 4.2 million dollar out of higher education's budget. Because, you know, I know those people when they -- when they put their budget together, they're -- they're smart enough that it -- it's not going to cost them anything. And, you know, we read all the time that it's costing them 4.2 million dollars, and -- and I really think that's -that's not the case. I think they put their budget up there. But, you know, I'm going to vote for this thing because, as I say, you know, we -- especially down in rural areas, we have a -- just a unbelievable number of applications and -- and when we give one or two, then we've got the others that aren't happy with us. I do think we should do something about higher education's budget. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Jacobs, from Rock Island.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator O'Daniel basically stole my remarks, but let me ask it in a different way. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, what will happen to these scholarships? If we're not going to be giving them out, as Senator O'Daniel has already alluded to, are these scholarships then not going to be present, or are we just changing the method, and who may be the person that is issuing these scholarships?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator Jacobs, I guess the only way I can answer that is, there is no appropriation, as Senator O'Daniel mentioned, to take away or to add to the higher education budget. It would simply mean that a lot of those students who have applied or would be applying in the future for a General Assembly scholarship would certainly need to apply through the Student Financial Aids <sic> (Assistance) Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

So the answer, Senator, is as Senator O'Daniel has indicated. We're not really talking about any dollars here. We're talking about who is going to be the one giving out the scholarships. Let me tell you my concern. The one thing that I think is so great about the legislative scholarships, it ensures that at least eight people from my district will be able to attend college. Once you take this away from us, then you are telling my district that they have to take their chances, and they may not get anyone from our district that will get one of these scholarships. I think we should take a careful look at this. I think that this truly has become a media bill, and it's one that I hope we don't listen to the media. I get tired of listening to the media telling us how we should vote. We're elected to vote our convictions. I have

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

not had one person from my district tell me, "Oh, you've got to get rid of those horrible things." I share Senator O'Daniel's concerns that when we give them, sometimes we make more enemies than with them we make friends, but I -- I assure you that one thing that I feel very strongly on is that eight young people from my district now can be assured that they will be able to attend college, and they may not have that right if, in fact, this bill passes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I'd like to tell you a couple of experiences that -- that I've had with these legislative scholarships over the past few years. I had a -- a family that came to me and -- and asked for one of these scholarships for one of their daughters. They had two boys and two girls, and if you looked at the gentleman's income tax form, which I always ask - I always ask how much money do the parents make - you would have thought this man would have absolutely no problems whatsoever in sending his two daughters to college. And frankly, the scholarship assembly thought too, 'cause he made over fifty thousand dollars. What didn't come out was that he had two young boys - two -- two boys. One was twenty-four; one was twenty-six. They were his sons. Legally he was not responsible for them, 'cause they were adults. They both had muscular dystrophy. They required twenty-four-hours-a-day nursing care and, frankly, candidates for a nursing home. They both required respirators. And frankly, the State could have been charged with their care. But this was a father and mother who cared a great deal about these children, these young boys, who were frankly dying by inches, and so they had them at home, and they paid for the full-time nursing care. But as a result of that, he did not have

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

enough money to send his daughter to college, and she indeed did get one of the scholarships. I have a committee, and I think most of us do, that look at these scholarship applications. A lot of my scholarships go to sons and daughters of errant parents, particularly fathers, who have not been willing to pay child support. And even though, quite often, it's in the court order that they are supposed to help them with their college, they do not. This is the only chance they have to go to college. You are right, Senator O'Daniel, when you say we make a lot of enemies, but you know what's right is right, and it seems to me that although this may be something that the media may criticize us for, my personal feeling is, we've done a lot of good with these, and I'm not sure why in the world we should be giving them up. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. Question for the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will yield.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Senator Woodyard, I have a tuition and fee waiver document from the universities, and under that document, they give 3.9 -- excuse me, 3.3 million dollars, almost 3.4 million dollars, for out-of-state students. My question to you is: Why are they better at picking deserving people than my committee that sends Illinois students to Illinois universities?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, I assume, Senator, you're talking about out-of-state

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

tuition waivers by the University of Illinois. And I think that goes back to Senator O'Daniel's question. I guess my philosophy is, yes, I would like to personally examine and I think a lot of other people on this Floor would like to examine quite a number of other tuition waivers. I, quite frankly, don't understand why some of the schools in our State issue as many foreign student waivers as we do. But we do that. It was my personal opinion that we needed to address our own tuition waivers before we even take a look at other tuition waivers. You know, when you — when you waive a hundred and seven million dollars and the actual increase in higher education's budget last year was eighty million, you can see what that does to tuition increases to everyone else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Well, Senator Woodyard, you must have an honorary law degree, because you answered a question that I didn't ask. My question didn't relate to Senator Jacobs' or to Senator O'Daniel's question. My question relates to why is their committee better than my committee at determining who's a deserving student.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator, I don't know that I can answer that. I can only tell you in my own area what happens. My home county, Indiana State University issues an out-of-state tuition waiver to students in my home county. The county north of me has no tuition waiver. That's a -- I guess, a -- a decision made by the governing board of those particular universities as to what they offer for out-of-state tuition waivers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

To the bill: On this list there is another Thank you. startling figure and that is that unidentified but listed as is double what's given in our State scholarships to the tune of eight million dollars. Also, in terms of graduate assistance, there is sixty-six million dollars, or sixty-six percent of this hundred-and-seven-million-dollar budget, that is You know, we don't hear anything about those. And -- and further, you know, the argument was used in gun control by certain people that when we talk about handguns, they only comprise three or four percent of the problem, so why are we banning, you know, three or four percent of the problem and not dealing with ninety-seven percent of the problem. Well the same thing could be said here. Here we are dealing with less than four percent of the budget and it's all of a sudden become the problem, and the other ninety-six percent of the budget abuse - alleged abuse - is -- is totally ignored. Senator Jacobs is entirely right. This will merely substitute someone else deciding who spends this money other than ourselves. It won't save a dime.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor of the bill please yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will, ma'am.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Senator Woodyard, just as a matter of information, I think that one of the paramount problems that I have noticed articulated in the newspapers is the fact that the names of some of these students who receive these scholarships had been published,

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

whereas in other instances, they had not, and that the federal Privacy Act mandates that these names not be published unless by subpoena. Is that the situation with your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President. It is my understanding you're -you are correct. I know in our own case, we started a year or two
ago putting kind of a waiver on our application form that we
mailed to students who had requested an application in which they
would authorize us to release their names. Now one of my State
Representatives who also uses this kind of application had two
applications come back that were not -- where the waiver was not
signed on release of name. His committee determined that they
would not award to the person who would not allow their name to be
released.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Bowles.

SENATOR BOWLES:

Just as a comment: I'm in a district -- in my district is a university that is adjacent to the State of Missouri, and we have many, many students who come across from Missouri, set up temporary residence, register to vote, and are thus able to get resident's tuition consideration. And that is a very, very expensive situation wherever you have out-of-staters coming in and -- and qualifying. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank -- thank you very much, Madam President. I just wanted to comment to the bill: that if -- if there is some Members of the General Assembly abusing this opportunity for young people,

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

then those Members should be punished. But to punish the children who -- who are in dire need of these scholarships, I really don't understand that. I don't understand that at all. If there are abuses, punish the abusers. Senator Woodyard, you should have something in here that -- that sanctions and punishes the abusers, and I would support that. But in my community, there are young people who are going to end up with no other way to go to college but by my committee selecting them for these scholarships. they don't get the scholarships, then we're going to be looking at them living a negative life. And we're trying to change negative lifestyles with welfare reform and all that. So why take opportunity? Lastly, it -- it just blows my mind that on the federal level, we'll take care of foreign countries. We have no problem with that. We'll send millions and millions and billions of dollars to foreign countries, but we don't take care of America and Americans. And here we're going to take care and allow foreigners to go to college, we're going to allow out-of-staters to go to college, but yet we're going to deny Illinois students opportunity to go to college because of headline-grabbing, ghost-payroller crap going on in the City of Chicago. I think it's wrong. I think we should vote No on this and come up with a bill that will punish those who would abuse this privilege or sell these scholarships, as they have done in the past in my district. I know it -- it took place. Go after them. Send them to the penitentiary, but don't deny Illinois students the opportunity to go to school. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Margaret Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Madam President and Members and friends of the General Assembly. I stand in opposition of this bill. It's a

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

marvelous thing that we who are legislators here in the State of Illinois can go back to our districts and offer hope to young people who have never had a chance. In my particular district, I have young people - and I can go down the line - they are now doctors, they are nurses, they are dentists, and there's teachers that have come under the scholarship. There's one thing that that they give their talents back to the State of make sure: Illinois. You give incentive to young people to go to school and strive to do good in their primary age -- grades in order that they can work to get a scholarship. And I think that we are doing a disservice and especially in my particular district where have a lot of underprivileged young people who are desirous to become citizens, and better citizens, here in the State of Illinois. If we take this away from them, we offer no incentive whatsoever on a good side of life to say that you can make it you're willing to make the sacrifice. You may live in districts where you don't need it, but I live in a district and serve a district that are eternally grateful for the opportunity, and they give back their services in any way that they possibly can to serve you politically and -- and -- and make good grades. only give them on -- on a yearly basis so that they will get good grades. And I can go down the line and tell you that it pays save these -- scholarships. If people are abusing the -- the privilege, take it away from them, but those who are really doing a service in their community by rendering these scholarships to these young people, to let them know that there is a better of life and that the State of Illinois cares about them, I say, please, do not bother this. Let this bill remain as it is continue to give scholarships to young people who are desirous of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Senator Butler.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Madam President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I kind of resent this bill because it paints the giving of scholarships on our part as something evil, something political, something kind of back-alley. Well, I can tell you in -- in the -- in the people I've talked to here and in my own instance, there's a lot of thought and a lot of -- lot of concern and a lot of empathy given before we will pass out these -- these scholarships. For -- for example, my scholarships are given only upon the advice of the president of the Oakton Community College, the president of Harper Junior College, a gentleman from the University of Illinois, and a local businessman. They make the recommendations and that's the basis on which they are chosen. The only thing I ask of them is, first, look at the scholarship, make sure the -- the -- the student is deserving in the sense of having some aptitude, and, secondly, to means test it, and I think that's the most important thing. I've had scholarships given to a gentleman whose income was declining because he was dying of cancer. He had a child who totally deserved to go to college. And that -- that, to me, was a heartbreaking occurrence that I felt I -- in good conscience, I could award a scholarship. Second thing about it - if you -- if you think about it, this is the only opportunity that the middle class has to get a scholarship. Where else can someone on the -middle class get a scholarship, depending on their own -- on their own situation? So if we knock this out, there is no recourse for -- for a middle-class person or -- earning a modest income. You know, we're -- we're not all millionaires in all of our communities, and here's an opportunity to give somebody something who clearly deserves it. I think this is kind of an elitist thought; that -- that, you know, if you can't afford it, then you don't go to college. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to vote No with a very, very, very clear conscience.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Body. I'd like to ask the sponsor a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Woodyard, in fact, two questions. I just want to ask these for the sake of clarification. Students who receive our scholarships are qualified and accepted at Illinois universities. Is that correct? And secondly, these scholarships are for tuition only?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

In answer to your first question, yes, they must be accepted to one of the four-year public universities. Certainly cannot be awarded to a student at a community college, private school or out-of-state. I'm not certain. I know it does cover full tuition and it's a full yearly tuition, fall-summer -- fall-spring-summer. I'm not absolutely certain that -- that it may -- may not cover some fees. Just tuition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Yes. Thank you, again, Madam President. To the bill: I am very strongly opposed to this bill. I came to this Body in June of '91, at the tail end of a Session, and had a lot to put into place in order to be a fully functioning legislator in a very short time. And one of the things I learned is that in our office we were privileged to be able to give some assistance to people in

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

districts by helping them get scholarships. I was very proud of that privilege. I come out of a university. I have spent time on scholarship committees in the universities and in other bodies. And so, in putting that together, I thought very carefully about I put together a committee of academics, of how to do this. community people, of others, and I used many of the measures that I had found helpful over many, many years, of my own service and of my experiences in universities. And I'm very proud of the fact that this committee has chosen people over the years who have now to our district. I'm proud of the scholarship that that committee -- and believe me, I don't even go to the meetings. These are people who make the decisions in the name of the district and not in my name. The first man who received a scholarship had one year to go at a university. He had a family to take care of, and he could not afford the last year of that university education. He finished, and he is now a teacher. I won't go through all these stories of the various people who have received these. What I will say to you is this: I think you ought to take a look at the other waivers that are given and the amount of money that is spent before you agree to taking away this one means by which we have to give people in our communities. Foreign students, for example, receive two million plus; graduate assistants, sixty-six million; out-of-state students, 3.3 million. I think this is a mistake to do it this way. As others have said, if people are abusing the privilege, then let's focus on that, but let's not take this away.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Thank you. Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Madam President and Members of the Senate. There are many reasons for supporting this bill and there are many reasons for opposing this bill. But I would suggest to

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

those of you who have spoken against Senate Bill 41, make sure you understand why you are opposing it. You're not denying any needy student access to any university in this State. Because, you see, before we ever consider any of these scholarship applications, they have to have been accepted at a university. So that's the first criteria. They're already accepted. If they cannot get a legislative scholarship, their simply going to move into the MAP system. That's where they're going to get their — that's where their going to get their scholarship. So we are not denying anyone anything. Again, there are good points to this bill and bad points to this bill. I plan to support it. But for goodness sakes, oppose it for the right reason. You're not denying access to anybody. For the record. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator Woodyard, does the law require that we give out these scholarships - tuition waivers? Does the law require it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Do you give out all of your scholarships?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Madam President, I would suggest to the people who are thinking about voting No on this bill, that instead they -- they vote Yes and send out a press release saying that they are no longer going to award any scholarships. I'm sorry, vote -- vote No on the bill and then decide that you're going to not give out your scholarships. Do a big press release and just tell the people that you gave the scholarships to last year that they go under the MAP program and -- and just say that you're not going to do it. And you -- and you can talk about how much money you're going to save, because in the -- in the meantime, you're letting people -- those of us who have already spoken against this, you're denying us the right to give out these scholarships. Now, I read the -- the news stories about this, and I absolutely agree with Senator Butler. I resent the implication that this is a perk for us - like this is money in our pocket, like -- that people are going to give us money back in campaign contributions because we give them a scholarship. It's absurd. Or they're going to work precincts for us in Chicago because we give them scholarships. don't do that. I don't think anybody does that. The stories that people talked about are -- are true. I don't know, Senator Maitland, about how this -- this works. I can just tell you that people came to me and said, "I'm accepted in the university. I can't get a scholarship. I can't go to school." Some people have committees. I chose, in my case, to make the decision myself. have no problem with that. Other people have committees do it. And if you think that you're making more people upset, making enemies by turning people down, don't give out the

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

scholarships and you don't make anybody mad, presumably. You know, we complain about the lack of political courage, and if -- if it's true that you need political courage to vote against this bill, then this is the time to show it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of This is a bill that, quite frankly, even up until about ten minutes ago, I didn't know how I was going to vote. first saw it appear on the Calendar, I went back and did a little research. And like many of us, I have a committee of educators that chooses my scholarship recipients; I don't choose them. And I believe that's the proper way to do it, but we each have our own system. But I did a little research, and I went back and I read the applicants who were chosen by my committee for what believe is actually an honor, to be a General scholarship recipient. And I was just looking at some of the pros in these essays. "I'm the youngest of twelve children. 4.0 straight A grade point average at Illinois State University. My family, due to my stepfather's self-employment and illness, has high medical expenses, and in fact, last year over one-half of my family's income went to pay for my father's medical bills." real nice closing on one of my award-winning recipients: Dillard, I plan on working in this community, and if you give me this scholarship, I'm going to live here, I'm going to work here and give this scholarship back to this community." Here's another one: "I'm currently taking the maximum Stafford loan available eighty-five hundred dollars a year, and my mother works an extra job so that I can go to school, so she can pay my living expenses. I went to ISU. I had straight A's at ISU. Now I want to be a doctor and I want to practice medicine in -- in the State of

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Illinois. I have twenty thousand in dollars in debt now and will seek an extra forty thousand in aid over the next two years." just one more: Eric's family has been hit with tremendously high medical bills during the past few years, a good portion of which have not been covered by insurance. His father had open-heart surgery. His mother has diabetes. I mean, I don't view these In fact, I'm pretty proud of the people that my committee chose. But I will tell you this: If this bill passes, I will the first person to offer an amendment to the appropriations of higher education to cut their appropriation by over three million dollars, and we'll use that money somewhere else, if universities in this State don't like to have these exceptional children go to their institutions. I can think of many places to put it, including the fund that funds the retired teachers' health care system in the State of Illinois. But I do believe this really revenue-neutral. I think, as Senator Maitland pointed out, nobody's being denied access to education, that they will find scholarships elsewhere. So I think this is revenue-neutral. I do believe that this is not a perk. And just to close, one thing that I did over the weekend as well when I went back home, I called one of these kids, and I've never met these children. sent them a nice note saying, "You're selected. Do well." But I called one of them up. And he said, "Hey, Senator, you, I really appreciate this." And he said, "And I want to tell you something else. Because I feel that I'm not an anonymous number through the Monetary Award Program of the State of Illinois, or many ways that students get able assistance in the State of Illinois, I feel an extra burden, and I study I go to classes more often. Party a little less, quite frankly, because I know that this scholarship came from the General Assembly of the State of Illinois and I feel an extra burden to do well because you gave me this scholarship."

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

know this is a politically popular bill. I didn't know how I was going to vote about ten minutes ago, but I went and did a little research, and I feel very comfortable, after today's debate, talking to one of these students and reading the essays of the eight that were chosen by a committee of educators, that I believe this is bad legislation and we should vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Trotter. Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Woodyard, to close.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. In closing, I would like to mention to you, I did not introduce this -- this bill with any malice, nor in any intent to embarrass anyone. And I think each and every one of you, I have never asked one of you to vote for or against this particular bill. I just feel personally that I am not qualified to make that kind of decision out of a hundred and thirty-five applicants. I just don't think we ought to be in -- in the business of awarding scholarships. A lot of reference has been made about perks. I have never mentioned that I thought that this was a perk; that has been something that has been raised in the media. I just feel it's time that we should eliminate this, and that time is now. And I certainly encourage your favorable consideration on Senate Bill 41.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 41 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Secretary, take the roll. On that question, there are 19 voting Aye, 33 voting Nay, none voting Present. And this bill, having failed to receive the constitutional majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 42.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Mr. Woodyard? Senator Woodyard. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 42.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. I think you will find that this bill is a lot less controversial than the last one. The genesis of this actually started with a letter that we received from a constituent quite some time ago - several months ago, to be -- to be truthful - in which this was a disabled veteran that wanted to be able to buy either the Purple Heart or the Korean War plate, and it was found that even though this particular veteran qualified for the circuit breaker, which means that the base -- license plate fee of forty-eight dollars, on a circuit breaker is, reduced to half, if he bought a Korean or a Purple Heart veteran plate, he would have to pay the full forty-eight-dollar base price plus the additional fee. And what this bill does is on a -- on a Purple Heart or a Korean plate, to allow the base fee to be reduced to a person on circuit breaker to twenty-four dollars. That's what the bill does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Woodyard, to close. The question is, shall Senate Bill 42 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam Secretary, take the roll. On that question, there are 52 Yeas, none voting No, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 43. Senator Woodyard. Take it out of the record. Senator -- Senate Bill 44. Senator Woodyard. Madam Secretary, will you please read Senate Bill 44.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 44.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. Here's another bill that I think many of you have read about that's maybe created some hilarity not to the people that own this particular breed of animal. I was approached last fall by a young couple in Danville, Illinois, to sponsor legislation that will allow this couple to keep a Vietnamese pot-bellied pig as a pet, and that's what this bill does. I've found out since then that there are quite a number of -- of these animals within the State. found out that -- things about pot-bellied pigs that I never knew and a lot of things I didn't even want to know about a Vietnamese pot-bellied piq. They're even being used as drug-sniffers now and evidently do a better job at that than than even some of the dogs that are used by the police forces. So that's basically what the bill does and be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Without making a big deal out of this bill, I think it's maybe appropriate that this is called on Municipal League Day, because what this is, is we're telling every

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

single city council member in every city -- city and village across this State how they have to vote on this issue. And I -- as I told the proponents of this bill in committee, while if I were sitting on a city council, I might be inclined to vote with them, I'm not. And you're asking me to make a judgment for every city council member in every city and every village in this State. And it's a State mandate. It's taking away their local control, and I think the people back home know best, and that's why I'm voting No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Madam President. Could you please advise us how many votes are needed for passage for this ridiculous bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Madam Severns, thirty votes, because it doesn't come under that provision on the home rule situation of the Constitution. Senator Parker.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. With all due respect to the sponsor of the bill, I rise in opposition to this bill. One of the — the areas that is affected is Glenview, which is in my district. Glenview was one of the areas, actually, that promulgated part of this bill. In that village, there were people that do have a pot-bellied pig. They came to the Village of Glenview and asked them to change their local ordinance. After there was testimony in favor of and against the pot-bellied pig, Glenview decided not to allow them. That has gone to court. Glenview did win that in court, that they were allowed not to have the pot-bellied pigs. That has been appealed and now if it is — it's in appeal in court right now. There's a lot of good reasons to have the pigs. The people would

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

like to have -- a lot of people who are allergic to other animals. And of course, there's the other side. They are newer animals in this country, about nine years. You cannot guarantee the mutation. There are some that have grown from eighty pounds -- in Highland Park there is an ordinance where you can only have the pot-bellied pigs if they're under eighty pounds; however, entered Highland Park over eighty pounds. Now it is two hundred and fifty pounds, and they cannot get it out of Highland Park because they allowed it in over eighty pounds. They also -- we've heard of them having pseudorabies, which can hurt dogs. hites dog that has the pseudorabies, the dog cannot vaccinated against it and will ultimately die. So there are two sides to this story. But ultimately the bottom line is that this shouldn't be our purview in the State Senate to decide whether home rule communities or local municipalities should have these animals or allow them. This really should be left up to the local home rule communities. And by this, we would be usurping their -their power and the home rule community authority. So I would ask you please to vote No, as in my district in Glenview. They are still in court on this, and this would not allow them to have opportunity of going to court and making their own local decision. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes. This bill says to the cities, basically, "We don't trust you. Springfield knows best." And it's ironic that that's what this bill says, because for the last six weeks since we've been down here, we've been told that the local governments know best. We have to trust these local governments. They're closer to the people. They know what the problems are, and we shouldn't be telling them what to do. Of course, that was changed last Friday

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

when we had the tort reform bill, in which the argument was, "Well, the local people told us that we should not trust which are local people. So this week it's a new week and we're back to the argument, we -- we cannot trust the locals. philosophically, this makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. now back to our "Springfield-knows-best" mentality. But I think it's -- it's ironic that this bill just came up after the eloquent speech by Senator Dillard saying how all of us in the General as Senator Dillard said: Those of us in the General Assembly are responsible. We can form committees to hand We resent being treated as if we're being these scholarships. frivolous, that we don't hand out these scholarships properly. And that carried today. It's one of the few times, I think, I've seen an argument on the Floor of the Senate change votes, and I commend Senator Dillard for that. But to follow that up with this bill is a travesty. This is absolutely ridiculous. We should not be handling this type of business here. Just -- it's -- it's absolutely absurd. It does demean the Legislature. And you can in tomorrow's newspaper, the two stories that are going to be the headlines are, number one: Legislature says we're going handle -- hand out scholarships; number Pot-bellied pigs are now on the fast track, and we've got to pass that and send it to the Governor. I think this demeans all of us. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Senator Jacobs. SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I heard the debate on -- on this issue in -- in the Ag Committee. I think the arguments made by the individuals were valid, and it's awful easy to stand up and make light of -- of what we're talking about here. Senator Welch indicated that last week was "local government knows best", and that's being changed. But there's

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

another overriding factor here, and that is the factor of whether we're going to intrude upon people's individual rights. And I think that supersedes all the other discussions we have. These people have these animals. They're considered to be good pets, and this is a -- a -- really a question about whether we are going to tell people whether they can have a pet that is nonviolent and whether they can have that pet or whether they can't. And I think this is a good bill. And as for the reference for following the other bill, it just happens to come that way. I urge an Aye vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Madam President. A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

I -- here a few years back, I bought a heard of Arkansas razorbacks. When I got them fat, they looked about like a possum. You think these -- you think these Vietnamese pot-bellied pigs might be a spin-off from those Arkansas razorbacks?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

I really don't know. I -- I have been told though that they have no relation to the somersaulting pigeons that we had here a year ago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator O'Daniel. Any further discussion? Hearing none, Senator Woodyard, to close.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, thank you, Madam President. I don't know whether it's a sign of the times or whether any of these are getting over to the

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

other side of the aisle, but for some reason or other, people are passing around pork rinds over here. This may seem rather frivolous to several people, but it certainly is not to the owners of these pets. They love them, as you would love, and -- and have family and neighbors that love, dogs and cats and birds. And it just seemed to me that I wanted to give these people who desire those as pets to have that opportunity. And I would urge your support on Senate Bill 44.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 44 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Madam -- Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 15 Yeas, 35 Noes, 2 Present. And this bill, having failed to receive the required constitutional majority, is thereby deemed lost. Senator Mahar. Senate Bill 48. Senate Bill Senator Mahar? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 50. Senator Maitland? Take it out of the record. Senator --Senator Watson? Senator Watson? Out of the record. Senate Bill May we please have 54. Senator Woodyard? Madam Secretary... This is a very important bill for Senator your attention. Woodyard, and he's trying to get your attention. Senate Bill 54. Senator Woodyard. Read the -- read the bill first, Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 54.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. It's very

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

possible that the Illinois State Police will want somebody else to sponsor their bill. Kind of luck I've been having. Anyway, what this bill attempts to do is to allow those twenty-two officers that had to be laid off from the Illinois Commerce Commission to be transferred into the Illinois State Police. And the timing is very critical on this. Part of the reason for -- or the rationale for doing this is the fact that these police officers - or officers, I should say - in the Commerce Commission already had partial law enforcement training to where it did not require nearly the amount of additional training for them to be transferred in as what it would have required for a new officer. I believe the fiscal note on this is around five hundred and sixty thousand dollars. But it certainly is supported by the Illinois State Police, and I would encourage its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Thomas Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank -- thank you, Madam President. Question to the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Do I understand, Senator Woodyard, that they've had the same training as State Police patrolmen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Madam President. You know, this -- this is not generic to the bill, but somebody over here on this side mentioned

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

that the headline ought to be, tomorrow -- we've kind of revised the headline for tomorrow morning. I know Senator Welch did. The headline tomorrow ought to be that pigs lose and pork wins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussions? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd like to ask Senator Woodyard a question. You indicate that they do have or have had the same, identical training as a State Police officer, and I'd like for you to address that, as well as, is it my understanding now that these individuals will be in the State Police pension system, and is it also the fact that the -- that not all of the members of the Illinois Commerce Commission that were so-called police officers did, in fact, make the transfer?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

It's my understanding, Senator, and if I'm answering your question properly, that they were transferred into the State Police pension system last year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well I guess the question is: Why are we doing it? That if they have already been transferred, why -- why are we now being -- as a General Assembly, being asked to ratify a decision that has already taken place? It's also my understanding that not all of the members who were police officers of the Illinois Commerce Commission were allowed the -- afforded the opportunity to transfer into the State Police. Is that not correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, it's my understanding that -- that the reason for the legislation is the fact that the Merit Commission cannot do the transfer: that it requires this to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

It's my understanding they've already done it. They've already gone to the training. The decision was made. It was an executive order signed. Now you're -- somebody's asking us to ratify this decision. That's number one. Number two, is it not a fact that not all of the police officers that were employed in the Illinois Commerce Commission were afforded the opportunity to transfer? How many were there in the -- in the police force? How many were allowed to transfer? How many were not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, I guess the last part of that question, first. Yes, it's my understanding that many of the other officers were afforded that opportunity, but not all of them did that. What was he -- yes. And by the way, Senator, it's my understanding also that these people are in an academy class right now and would be graduating in mid-March.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Then let me -- let me ask this: What happens now -- all these people who have been on the waiting list for -- to go to the State Police to the academy now have been backed up - all these people who have been out there waiting for the last year, year and a

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

half. And all of a sudden now here pops another class that's being established for Illinois Commerce Commission members, did not have the same type of police training that was afforded to the State Police officers, who are now in the -- in the training to get some. That's one problem. The other problem is, is that I don't know -- I don't think that everybody was asked or everyone was transferred into the State Police. I'm trying to determine how many were not transferred. It wasn't a question as to whether or not they were, in fact, afforded the opportunity and declined. The fact of the matter was, as I understand it, that they were selective in who they wanted, and as a consequence, it this only applies to twenty-five members. How many Commerce Commission police officers are not being afforded the opportunity to participate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

...(microphone cutoff)...understanding thirty did -- did apply and twenty-two were accepted. I -- I can't give you much better answer as to why that occurred or -- or why not. But I guess the other -- in answer to another question you had, part of the reason for bringing the Commerce Commission people into the State Police was the fact that it's an awful lot cheaper to do -- you know, a much less rigorous training period than it would be for the new person. I agree with you, Senator, that -- and that was a concern of mine when I first heard about this issue, was it seems to me that we're probably reducing, by twenty-two members, a new class coming in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Demuzio, are you done, sir?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, can you tell me then what happened to the eight that

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

were not selected? You indicate that there were thirty who applied, twenty-two were accepted, eight were not. What -- why weren't those eight afforded the same opportunity?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

It is my understanding that those eight that were not accepted did not meet the criteria requirements for acceptance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Have you finished, Senator Demuzio? Senator -- further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator Woodyard, seniority is determined by, I guess, a graduating class, and I understand these twenty-some new troopers will fall in line in seniority just like everyone else. But I do understand though that when it comes to district assignments, when you graduate from the class, as I guess some three hundred did, I believe - I'm not sure how many there was - but last year, you -- you can select or ask to be assigned to a particular district in the State, and then if you're -- if that -- there's not an opening at that particular district, then you take a second choice or a third choice, or whatever. The problem that I have here or the question that I have is: How was the district assignment decided for these Commerce Commission police officers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

It's -- it's my understanding that -- that when they come out

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

of the academy and assign to a particular post or position, that their seniority does not carry over from the Commerce Commission but, rather, as a new person coming out of the academy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. But let me just maybe further explain my question. People who asked, let's say, to go to Collinsville - it's in my area - but there wasn't any openings, so they got sent to Lawrenceville, or they got sent to Mount Vernon, or they got sent to Joliet. They are on, now, a waiting list to go to Collinsville. They want -- they're from the area. They want to return back to Collinsville. So now they're -- when an opening occurs in Collinsville, they'd like to -- to go back. Now, we have the ICC guys now being assigned. How is their assignment going to impact that waiting list, and will it then prohibit, or inhibit, the ability of some of the younger troopers, the ability to transfer to the district that they would like to be assigned to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodvard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes. In answer to that question - I'm not making myself clear enough, I guess - the instance, or the example that you gave, that person would have seniority to transfer to Collinsville over and above these new people coming out of -- out of the academy.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Watson. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The -- the problem is, just for example: Got a guy living in Collinsville; he's an ICC police officer. There is a friend of mine, who lives in my hometown, whose family still lives there, who -- who now works in -- in Lawrenceville, I believe it is, and -- he's a trooper. Okay? He wants to come back to Collinsville. He says now that the guy who lives in Collinsville, who is going to be assigned to Collinsville, who now is an Illinois Commerce Commission police officer, is going to bump him or at least delay his ability to transfer, because he's going to be filling a spot there that could very well have been filled by the guy from Greenville who -- works in Lawrenceville.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any -- Senator Woodyard. Are you done, Senator Watson?

Senator -- Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to ask the sponsor a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will yield.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Woodyard, this is the same question that I had in the committee, and I just want to find out if this is still the case. What we were told is that the ICC transferees who complete the training will now take the places of veteran State troopers on the highways and veteran State troopers will go to riverboats. Is that correct? Is that still the -- the case?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Well, I thought that that was answered in -- in the committee, that the riverboat people would be on a seniority basis, rather than -- in other words, the ICC academy graduates would not necessarily go to riverboats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

I guess I still have some concern with that, because according to the information I have here, since FY'91, the number of State troopers patrolling Illinois highways is down nearly twenty-two percent. And if — if that's true, then I'm very concerned that we're getting new officers but they're not going to be used as State troopers in a traditional and necessary way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

The only response I know that -- Senator Palmer, that I can give you is that these people would be used to fill vacancies. And as you well indicated, due to early retirement, or whatever reason, we -- we are understaffed, and this is somewhat of an effort to -- to increase that staffing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. Maybe I can help clear up some of the problems here. We, in the Transportation Committee, both in the House and the Senate, held joint meetings talking to the ICC about some of these problems. As -- as you probably know, the feds in their great wisdom has -- have decided that trucks will no longer be regulated by the ICC, whether it's interstate or intrastate. These -- a lot of these policemen have worked for the ICC for as long as fifteen, twenty years, and all of a sudden, because of --

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

of something that happened in Washington that no one in this Body had any control over whatsoever, these men found that they were without a job. What we are attempting to do is to take these veteran policemen, who have -- through no fault of their own, no longer have a job and transfer them into the State Police Department. I've talked to Terry Gainer about this when this all came about. He welcomes them because, frankly, he is short of -of State police. He has taken the ones that he feels are qualified, that have gone through most of the training, and the little training they didn't have, they will -- are now in the process of getting. If we do not pass this bill -- these men have been paid before by fees that used to be collected by the -- from the truck owners. These fees are no longer collected. If we do not pass this bill, very frankly, these men who have served their State well for several years will be without a job and have no place to go. I think it -- it -- this bill benefits both the State and these men, and I think an Aye vote is well in order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Would the sponsor answer a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

He indicates that he will yield. Senator Woodyard?

SENATOR SHADID:

Senator, I understand that there's eight officers who didn't qualify for the State police.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

That's my understanding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shadid.

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

SENATOR SHADID:

Were those eight just fired, terminated, let go, or were they given an opportunity to get a job somewhere else in the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Senator, I -- I really don't know whether -- whether they were offered some other position of employment or not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Would this process then, by taking the twenty-four into the State Police, would their budget then be reduced by twenty-four?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, in -- number one, there's twenty-two of the officers, not twenty-four. And number two, no, in my -- not to my knowledge has the State Police appropriation or budget been reduced.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

My last question: The total number that was appropriated in the budget for State policemen, new ones, does this number of twenty-two affect that, or is that included in that total budget? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

I think what you're asking, are these twenty-two people included in -- in the proposed budget and in the rest of this fiscal year. If that's the question, the answer is yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

So, in other words then, the total amount of troopers that we approved and appropriated in the budget, that number includes the twenty-two that were transferred over.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Okay. Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Madam President. Like a few questions of the sponsor, if I may. Senator -- Senator Woodyard, whose initiative is this? Is this something that the -- that the Director of the State Police wanted? Is this his?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

I noticed that -- I read the bill, and it doesn't mention in the bill the -- the retraining of these police officers with monies from the State Gaming Fund, but it says that in the analysis. Can you tell me -- it says, when the training is complete, twenty-five officers already with the State Police will be assigned to the Gaming Board for riverboat duties. Who is policing the riverboats currently? Are -- are they ICC police, or State Police officers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Yes, in answer to the question on -- on the people who are security personnel, State Police, on the riverboats. It's my understanding that they are State Police officers. They are working overtime, and that's -- rather -- they don't have enough people, and that's why probably there will be a posting, additional people put on the riverboats. And those are paid out of the fees that the boats themselves pay, the salaries are. So, at this point in time, the holes are being plugged by those -- those people working overtime.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator -- Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

So the -- so the twenty-five -- there will be twenty-five additional officers, adding to the current ranks that are out there policing the -- the riverboats. Is that correct? So... How about the -- how about the Director of the Gaming Board? Is he on board with this? Or do -- or do they have any -- the Gaming Board, do they have law enforcement personnel or investigatory personnel within the Gaming Board, such as other states have? Whether it's Las Vegas or -- or Atlantic City or other states with -- with riverboats, many of them have investigators with the Gaming Board who conduct investigations and actually get involved with investigating people who are unsavory characters. Is this completely under the control of the State Police, or does the Gaming Board have their own officers under the -- under their jurisdiction?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Woodyard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Well, I -- I'm getting some mixed reviews over here, Senator,

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

and -- and I'm not really sure whether the Gaming Board itself actually has police officers working for the Board itself. But, yes, the Board actually pays the fees for those security people to be on the boats. I do know that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

So they're -- so they're are police officers that are being paid out of fees from the Gaming Board, which is collected from the boats? Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Who? Oh -- I'm sorry. You looked that way, so I -- I didn't understand.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

But I called you.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know what we're doing here. We're micromanaging. I've never heard questions like this. Why were eight men not picked? Why is this guy assigned to one place? This, seems to me, is an ideal situation. We've got twenty-two highly trained officers. With a minimal amount of additional training, they become full -- fully -- fully trained State police. What are we discussing here? It seems to me there's -- we're -- we're not only micromanaging, but we're -- we seem to be doing casework here on the Floor. If somebody has a problem with an individual, handle it individually, but let's not waste our time. We either want these twenty-two men at work. The twenty-five that will be assigned to the riverboats were assigned by seniority. I don't understand the whole problem. Maybe I'm the only one in this Chamber that -- that doesn't, but I'm going to vote Yes for

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

this 'cause it makes sense.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Shaw. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We currently have a hundred and twenty-two State police officers working on riverboats. We're going to add twenty-two more, making that a hundred and forty-four. Depending on how many boats you say there are, one way or another, that's twelve State police officers per boat, which appears to me to be a little ludicrous that there is a need for twelve police officers per boat. But let me remind you of one thing, and it's the only reason I rise, 'cause I basically stand in support of this legislation, but I think that it's important that this Body knows that those twenty-two police officers, or State police officers, that will go to riverboat gambling is going to take away over a million dollars from education. Because if this money is not spent for these twenty-two police officers, all dollars left over go to the Education Fund. So the more we add to the administrative cost of riverboat gaming, the more we take from education. And I it was just a point that should be made.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Raica, further discussion.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Madam President. Just -- to the bill: Just to clarify a few points. The -- Senator Butler probably hit the nail right on the head, as far as we're attempting to micromanage the Illinois State Police and possibly the -- the Gaming Board. The ICC police officers, the twenty-two members that would be going over to the State Police, would be unemployed if the State Police didn't accept them. They are trained police officers. However, neither a Chicago police officer, a Peoria -- a Peoria police

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

officer, a Cook County sheriff can go to the State Police without going through the academy, because their training is in addition to any training that a local department would give them. So the State Police have additional training that's required, above and beyond that of a -- of a police officer from any of the other To -- to address the issue of the twenty-two municipalities. people coming over and the twenty-five troopers going gaming boats: A lot of the troopers want to go to the gaming boats because it's a special detail, and they would just like to get off the traffic detail or off the regular posts. And it's not a promotion, theoretically, for them; however, it -- it could be, in some ways, a better detail than what they are experiencing now. These twenty-two people coming over wouldn't be, in my opinion or in Senator Woodyard's opinion, filling twenty-two additional slots from a possible cadet class coming into the academy, 'cause they're filling twenty-two positions of police officers that are going over to the other side. And they're going on -- into beat cars on -- on the roads. And according to -- just to answer Senator Jacobs, it's an administrative decision when it comes twelve people on a boat, and the reason for that is days off and time scheduling. Obviously a trooper is not going to be on that boat twenty-four hours, and that's basically how that boat is -is -- is working now. So between working shifts and their days off, that's the reason for the twelve people. This is not a bad idea. They're taking care of twenty-two officers that would be unemployed. And the -- Director Gainer's on board and so is the Gaming Board, and I think Senator Woodyard deserves an Aye vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Woodyard, to close.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. A -- a

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

correction: Senator Jacobs, figures we have showed as of February 1st, there were eighty-nine officers assigned to the boats, rather than the hundred and forty. The other thing I think is very important for you to remember: If this legislation does not pass, we're going to have twenty-two more vacancies than what we would have if it does pass. And at least we're making some progress, it seems to me. And -- and the other important thing is, we would have to go back and start at ground zero, which means it'd go through the selection process and the academy process. These people are practically fully trained now, and -- and I certainly hope, deserve your support on Senate Bill 54. And I certainly urge its passage. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 54 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all those who wish voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all Madam Secretary, take the roll. The votes on voted who wish? this bill, it's 49 Yeas, 2 Nays, 2 voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 58. Senator Molaro. Madam Secretary, will you read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 58.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a relatively simple bill, but I'll explain it as quickly as I can. In Illinois, as you know, we're going through some -- we're...

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Please give your undivided attention to the speaker.

SENATOR MOLARO:

We're -- we're going through some changes - the horse racing industry, gambling industry - and what was the genesis of is, as you well know, Illinois lags far behind in about six or seven different spots of the country for horse racing purses. Jockeys, of course, get a percentage of the purse when they win the race. What's happening in Illinois is that as soon as we out and sort of educate these jockeys, turn them into -- turn them top of their profession, they wind up leaving the State of Illinois because there is no way that they can make the money in Illinois that they can make anywhere throughout the country. Well, what -- what the Jockey Guild would like to do and what jockeys in Illinois would like to do is be able -- there's been a practice now when you take your picture in the winner's circle, you take your hat off and you have the owner's colors. You could only wear what the owner prescribed for you to wear, because that point in time when you're on a horse's back, you are the employee of the owners, not the racetrack. So all we're allowing in Illinois is that the jockey can wear a logo, whether it be a headband or a wristband. Because of simulcasting throughout the country, companies are willing to come up and pay a jockey a promotional fee for wearing a headband that says Adidas or some other type of brand name. Now, he cannot wear the logo without permission of the owner. So he has to go out and get permission of the owner before he can do this. And this is just an attempt to allow jockeys to make a few more dollars, them in Illinois so they don't flee for New York or greener pastures. And that's the intent of the bill, and that's all bill does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Molaro, to close.

SENATOR MOLARO:

I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 58 pass. Those in favor, 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? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that -- on that bill, there are 51 Ayes, 2 voting Nay, none voting Present. And this bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees: Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Conservation - Senate Bills 851, 854, 963, 1031 and Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 43; to the Committee on Appropriations - Senate Bills 834, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1099, 1101, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107 and 1196; to the Committee on Commerce and Industry - Senate Bills 870, 901, 902, 906, 945, 961, 982 1016, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1061, 1157, 1164, 1165, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1205 and 1206; to the Committee on Education - Senate Bills 656, 832, 941, 942, 943, 946, 971, 984, 993, 998, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1014, 1015, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1029, 1034, 1035, 1115, 1122, 1126, 1171, and Senate Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 17; to the Committee on Environment and Energy - Senate Bills 638, 855, 856, 970, 1013. 1058, 1059, 1127 and 1153; to the Committee on -- or re-referred

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

from Environment and Energy to the Rules Committee - Senate 382; referred to the Committee on Executive - Senate Bills 841, 950, 957, 968, 994, 1000, 1003, 1009, 1032, 1033, 1075, 1086, 1087, 1110, 1117, 1121, 1123, 1124, 1132, 1137, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1151, 1152, 1159, 1161, 1162, 1172, 1177, 1184, 1186, 1209 and to the Committee on Financial Institutions - Senate Bills 1210: 1060, 1083 and 1208; to the Committee on Higher 680, 934, Education - Senate Bills 1130, 1131 and 1185; to the Committee on Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - Senate Bills 831, 859, 869, 887, 888, 889, 890, 910, 965, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 1008, 1027, 1037, 1049, 1065, 1081, 1085, 1093, 1094, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1142, 1143, 1160, 1182, 1183, 1191 and 1192; re-referred from Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities to the Rules Committee - Senate Bill 680; referred to the Committee on Judiciary - Senate Bills 381, 402, 833, 836, 837, 838, 844, 845, 857, 858, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 871, 886, 891, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 935, 936, 937, 938, 954, 958, 960, 972, 983, 986, 987, 988, 989, 995, 996, 1001, 1002, 1025, 1028, 1036, 1038, 1063, 1064, 1084, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1100, 1118, 1128, 1129, 1140, 1147, 1148, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1178, 1189, 1190, 1203 and 1204; to the Committee on Local Government and Elections - Senate Bills 835, 850, 852, 903, 904, 907, 908, 931, 932, 933, 947, 948, 949, 951, 952, 953, 955, 959, 974, 1011, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1111, 1112, 1155, 1193, 1194, 1197, 1199 and 1211; to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare - Senate Bills 840, 846, 847, 849, 905, 964, 966, 975, 991, 1023, 1048, 1080, 1082, 1097, 1113, 1114, 1119, 1133, 1156, 1169, 1170, 1195, 1198, 1207, 1212 and Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 159; re-referred from the Committee on Public Health and Welfare to the Rules Committee - Senate Bill 641; referred to the Committee on Revenue - Senate Bills 843, 848, 898, 899, 900, 909, 967, 969, 985, 999,

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

1004, 1012, 1021, 1022, 1108, 1120, 1125, 1141, 1158 and 1163; referred -- re-referred from the Committee on Revenue to the Rules Committee - Senate Bill 656; referred to the Committee on State Government Operations - Senate Bills 641, 853, 892, 962, 973, 992, 997, 1070, 1098, 1116, 1138, 1139, 1149, 1150, 1188, 1200 and Executive Order 95 - 02; to the Committee on Transportation - Senate Bills 976, 990, 1010, 1024, 1026, 1039, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1096, 1154, 1201, 1202, Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 118 and Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 383; and Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 118 and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 185.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Senator Cronin, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Madam President. For purposes of an announcement. To all the Members of the -- to the Republican Members of the Education Committee, we will have a pre-committee meeting in my office right away, please. And then to all the Members of the committee, we will convene at 2:30. 2:30, rather than 2 o'clock. 2:30. Thank you. The minority spokesman gives me the okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

And I understand Transportation Committee is meeting at 2 o'clock. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? Senator Palmer, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Madam President. For purposes also of an announcement. Just for the record, Senator Collins is absent today, as she was last week, because she is recovering from surgery.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

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

23rd Legislative Day

March 7, 1995

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I just wanted to inquire what time we're coming back tomorrow. That's all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

I'll get there. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HARRY:

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

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

House Bill 340.

Passed the House, March 7th, 1995.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR GEO-KARIS)

Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Hasara moves that the Senate stand adjourned until ll a.m., Wednesday morning, March 8. ll a.m., Wednesday morning. Thank you.

PAGE: 001

REPORT: TIFLDAY

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

95/04/11 15:00:19

MARCH 07, 1995

· HB-0032	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HB-0207	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HB-0231	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	FIRST READING	PAGE	2 2 2 2 2
HB-0544	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HB-0561	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HB-0660	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0041	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
SB-0042	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
SB-0044	THIRD READING	PAGE	32
SB-0054	THIRD READING	PAGE	37
SB-0058	THIRD READING	PAGE	53
SB-0068	SECOND READING	PAGE	3
SB-0072	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0080	SECOND READING	PAGE	1
SB-0168	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0231	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
SB-0244	SECOND READING	PAGE	5 5 5
SB-0274	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
SB-0282	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-0285	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-0296	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-0364	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-0365	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-0383	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-0387	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-0388	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-0389	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-0396	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-0461	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-0465	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-0702		PAGE	10
	FIRST READING	PAGE	2 2
	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SJR-0033	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2

SUBJECT MATTER

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

1

1

1

1

1

55

58 58

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP PRAYER-PASTOR DAYMOND TALKINGTON PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE JOURNALS-POSTPONED

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT